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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

**Background**

i. PMP were appointed to undertake an audit and assessment of open space across the Kettering Borough in accordance with the requirements of the latest Planning Policy Guidance Note 17 (Planning for Open Space Sport and Recreation, July 2002) and its Companion Guide (September 2002).

ii. The Companion Guide sets out a five step logical process for undertaking a local assessment of open space. Although presented as a linear process below, in reality, many stages were undertaken in parallel.

iii. The five step process is as follows:

- Step 1 - Identifying Local Needs
- Step 2 - Auditing Local Provision
- Step 3 - Setting Provision Standards
- Step 4 - Applying Provision Standards
- Step 5 - Drafting Policies - recommendations and strategic priorities.

iv. The study considers ten typologies of open space facilities, namely:

- parks and gardens
- natural and semi natural open space
- amenity greenspace
- provision for children
- provision for young people
- outdoor sports facilities
- allotments and community gardens
- green corridors
- churchyards and cemeteries.

v. The analysis has therefore been undertaken by type of open space looking at different areas across the local authority boundary. These are referred to as analysis areas. The use of analysis areas allows examination of data at a more detailed local level, and provides a geographical background to the analysis.
vi. The Borough has been split into six areas, specifically the three main urban areas of Desborough and Rothwell, Kettering, Burton Latimer, and two rural areas incorporating the wards of Buccleuch and Queen Eleanor in the east and Welland in the north. These analysis areas are illustrated on Map 1 overleaf. Many of the areas audited are covered by a Town or Parish Council. Where the term “the Council” is used, it often refers to a Parish/Town Council rather than the Borough Council.

Map 1 - Analysis areas of Kettering Borough

vii. The key outputs of the study include:
- a full audit of all applicable open spaces across Kettering Borough categorised according to the primary purpose of the site (in line with the typologies highlighted previously). This audit is stored on a GIS layer and linked Microsoft Access database.
- an assessment of the open space, sport and recreational needs of people living, working and visiting Kettering Borough derived from a series of consultations.
- production of local provision standards (quantity, quality and accessibility) for each type of open space where appropriate, in accordance with local needs.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

• application of local standards to the existing open space provision, enabling the identification of surpluses and deficiencies based on quantity, quality and accessibility

• recommendations to address the key findings and drive future policy.

viii. Full details of the methodology can be found in Section 2 of the report and the standard setting process can be found in appendices I, J and K. The recommended local standards for each typology are summarised below. In light of the overlapping roles that parks, natural areas and amenity spaces have, the application of these standards, key findings and recommendations have been considered together. This ensures a full understanding of the interaction between the typologies and an assessment of true deficiencies.
## Table 2  Open space standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Typology</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>Accessibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Parks and Gardens      | URBAN - 0.3 ha per 1000 population | "A welcoming, clean and litter free site providing a one-stop community facility with a wide range of leisure, recreational and enriched play opportunities for all ages. Parks and gardens should be well maintained, providing varied vegetation, clear pathways, appropriate lighting and ancillary accommodation (including seating and litter bins) and well-signed to and within the site. Sites should have a written management plan and measures should be taken to address identified issues at these sites."
                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 | 10 minute walk time (480 meters)                                                               |
| Natural and Semi-       | 0.9 ha per 1000 population | A clean, well vegetated, litter free site with clear pathways and natural features that encourages wildlife conservation, biodiversity and environmental awareness. Management of local sites should involve the community/stakeholder if at all possible and there should be a clear focus on maintaining and increasing the conservation and biodiversity value of these sites and ensuring public access where appropriate. Sites should have a written management plan and measures should be taken to address identified issues at these sites.'
|    natural            |                           |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 | URBAN - 15 minutes walk time (720 metres)                                                     |
| Amenity Greenspace     | 0.8 ha per 1000 population | A clean and well-maintained greenspace site. Sites should have appropriate ancillary accommodation (dog and litter bins etc), pathways and landscaping in the right places providing a spacious outlook and overall enhancing the appearance of the local environment. Larger sites should be suitable for informal play opportunities and should be enhanced to encourage the site to become a community focus. Smaller sites should adopt a design led approach to discourage inappropriate informal play"                                                                                                                                                                                  | 10 minutes walk time (480 metres)                                                             |
| Provision for Children | 1,000 population          | A site providing a mix of well-maintained formal equipment and enriched play environment in a safe a secure convenient location overlooked by housing and footpaths or located within a larger park facility. The site should have clear boundaries; be clean; be litter, dog, vandalism and graffiti free; and be lit. Sites should also comply with appropriate national guidelines for design and safety"                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 | URBAN – 10 minute walk time 9480 metres RURAL - 10 minutes walk time                           |
## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

### Standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Typology</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>Accessibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provision for Young People</td>
<td>0.25 young people facilities per 1,000 population</td>
<td>&quot;A site providing a robust yet imaginative play environment for older children in a safe and secure location, with clear separation from younger children facilities, that promotes a sense of ownership. The site should include clean, litter and dog free areas for more informal play and areas of shelter (with seating) and where appropriate sites should be well lit. Sites should also comply with appropriate national guidelines for design and safety.&quot;</td>
<td>URBAN - 10 minute walk time (480 metres) RURAL - 10 minute walk time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Sports Facilities</td>
<td>1.8hs per 1,000 population</td>
<td>&quot;A well-planned, clean and litter and dog fouling free sports facility site, with level and well-drained good quality surfaces, appropriate good quality ancillary accommodation including changing accommodation, toilets and car parking. The site should have appropriate management ensuring community safety and include lighting and the use of mobile CCTV where appropriate to address anti-social behaviour.&quot;</td>
<td>20 minute walk time for outdoor sports facilities (960m) (exc. bowls and golf) 20 minute drive for golf courses and bowling greens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allotments</td>
<td>0.40ha per 1,000 population</td>
<td>&quot;A clean, secure and well-kept site that encourages sustainable development, bio-diversity, healthy living and education objectives with appropriate ancillary facilities (eg litter bins and water supply) to meet local needs, well kept grass and good quality soils. The site should be spacious providing appropriate access and clear boundaries and conform to current best practice and local policy for allotment management.</td>
<td>15 minutes walk time (720 metres)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Corridors</td>
<td>N/a</td>
<td>&quot;A clean, well-maintained, safe and secure corridor with clear pathways, linking major open spaces together and enhancing natural features. Corridors should provide ancillary facilities such as bins, seating and lighting in appropriate places and signage.&quot;</td>
<td>N/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Typology</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>Accessibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cemeteries and Churchyards</td>
<td>N/a</td>
<td>“A clean and well-maintained site providing long-term burial capacity, an area of quiet contemplation and a sanctuary for wildlife. Sites should have clear pathways and varied vegetation and landscaping and provide appropriate ancillary accommodation (e.g. facilities for flowers, litter bins, and seating.) Access to sites should be enhanced by parking facilities and by public transport routes, particularly in urban areas.”</td>
<td>N/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Spaces</td>
<td>N/a</td>
<td>“A clean, well-maintained, safe and secure site, with generally hard landscaping but may accommodate soft areas. Sites should be adequately designed and maintained in order to serve a particular civic function. Ancillary accommodation, including toilets, lighting, and CCTV should be provided where appropriate.”</td>
<td>N/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The table below sets out the key priorities in each analysis area that should be addressed in order to meet standards set:

**Table 3  Area priorities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analysis Area</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - Welland</td>
<td>This rural analysis area has a good coverage of publicly accessible green space with all but one of the major settlements having access to a variety of typologies. The one exception is the village of Ashley, which only has a childrens play area and an amenity green space. It is recommended that the Council investigate the possibility of an additional typology being made available in Ashley with the most likely greenspace types being either a natural or semi natural site or an outdoor sports facility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2- Slade</td>
<td>Again a good coverage of open space is evident in this rural analysis area but there is one area within it that only access to a childrens play area and amenity greenspace - this is Mawsley. It is recommended that this area is the first priority for any new greenspace provision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - Desborough</td>
<td>The areas of Desborough and Rothwell do have a good range of high quality greenspace in both settlements but both suffer from the location of the sites being very centralised. This is particularly evident on the west, and to a lesser extent east, side of Desborough and it is recommended that future public open space is located in this area to help even out this imbalance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Rothwell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - Kettering</td>
<td>The area of urban Kettering is the most complete area in terms of the variety of open spaces area. However, because of its level of urbanisation it has the most gaps in accessibility in terms of population. The first priorities for this area should be to ensure there is a complete overlap between amenity greenspaces and parks or gardens so that everyone can access one of these typologies within the agreed catchment areas. The Council should also look to improve the large gaps in children’s and young persons provision that are evident.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - Burton Latimer</td>
<td>The area of Burton Latimer has two main deficiencies in terms of open spaces, the first is allotments but as this is a demand led typology it may be that no demand is evident for the town. The second deficiency is for childrens play areas where the centralised provision has left significant areas to the north east and south outside of the catchment area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6- Buccleuch,</td>
<td>As the largest settlement in this analysis area, the main focus for provision should be Geddington. There is a lack of both park and garden and natural or semi natural provision and the Council should work towards one of these deficiencies being corrected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queen Elenor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION 1

INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND
Introduction and background

The study

Why public open space?

1.1 Planning Policy Guidance Note 17 (PPG17) states that well designed and implemented planning policies for open space, sport and recreation are fundamental to delivering broader government objectives, which include:

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

1.2 Open space and recreation provision in the Borough of Kettering therefore has an important role to play in supporting the implementation of these objectives.

Function and benefits of open space

1.3 Open spaces can provide a number of functions within the urban fabric of towns and villages. For example the provision for play and informal recreation, a landscaping buffer within and between the built environment and/or a habitat for the promotion of biodiversity.

1.4 Each type of open space has various benefits, which depend on the type of open space. For example allotments for the growing of own produce, play areas for children’s play and playing pitches for formal sports events. Open space can additionally perform a secondary function, for example outdoor sports facilities have an amenity value in addition to facilitating sport and recreation.

1.5 There is a requisite need to provide a balance between different types of open space in order to meet local needs. Not all residents’ needs in particular areas will show a demand for open space in the form of playing pitches or allotments. Some areas will have specific local demand for ‘green corridor’ sites such as nature walks or bridleways.

1.6 Changing social and economic circumstances, changed work and leisure practices, more sophisticated consumer tastes and higher public expectations have placed new demands on open spaces. They have to serve more diverse communities and face competition from various developers including sport and leisure. Open spaces can also promote community cohesion, encourage community development and stimulate partnerships between the public and private sector.

1.7 Parks and open spaces are more accessible to a wider range of people than some sport and leisure facilities and are better able to realise the aims of social inclusion and equality of opportunity. The provision of open spaces and recreation is key to an ideal, sustainable and thriving community.
1.8 It is widely recognised that the provision of high quality ‘public realm’ facilities such as parks and open spaces can assist in the promotion of an area as an attractive place to live and can result in a number of wider benefits. These are highlighted in Appendix B.

1.9 Kettering Borough Council (the Council) appointed PMP to undertake a local open space, sport and recreation study across the Borough of Kettering (the Borough). The study includes an audit of all open space provision providing a clear vision, priorities for future open space, recreation and sport provision and a direction for the allocation of future resources.

1.10 The aims of the study were:

- to gather evidence on open space and recreational matters in order to formulate policies and proposals for Kettering’s Local Development Framework (LDF)
- to carry out a comprehensive assessment of current and future needs and opportunities for different types of open space, recreational and sporting facility
- to protect existing facilities from loss to other forms of development unless it can be shown that they are genuinely surplus to requirements
- to comply with the requirements of PPG17.

1.11 The main focus of the study is therefore to:

- provide a complete and updated audit of all open spaces in line with PPG17 typologies.
- assess all green spaces, rating the quality, access and wider benefits to sites
- provide an assessment of existing open space, sport and recreational needs of people living, working and visiting the defined areas through a series of consultations
- consider existing national standards and recommend local provision standards (quantity, quality and accessibility) for each type of open space where appropriate, in accordance with local needs
- develop proactive strategies for the development and enhancement of new facilities
- provide a final report that will detail all the analysis and findings and will include proactive strategies for the development and enhancement of new facilities.

1.12 The study is undertaken in accordance with the requirements of the latest Planning Policy Guidance Note 17 (Planning for Open Space Sport and Recreation, July 2002) and its Companion Guide (September 2002).
1.13 Kettering Borough Council is one of the seven local authorities in Northamptonshire. Kettering Borough is spread over 23,000 hectares and has a population of 81,844 (2001 census), which is predicted to increase to 104,200 by 2021. The population represented approximately 13% of the total population of Northamptonshire.

1.14 57% (46,878) of Kettering’s population live in Kettering Town and 27% live in three smaller towns; Rothwell, Desborough and Burton.

1.15 There are 34,442 households (2001 census) in the Borough and this figure is predicted to increase by 13,100 (Northamptonshire Sub Regional Strategy) to 47,544 by 2021.

1.16 The other main towns in the Borough; Desborough, Burton Latimer and Rothwell are known as the ‘A6’ towns. There are also 25 villages and hamlets that make up the rest of the Borough.

1.17 Further details about the demographics of the Borough are provided in Appendix A.


1.18 PPG17 states that local authorities should undertake robust assessments of the existing and future needs of their communities for open space, sports and recreational facilities (paragraph 1).

1.19 The document also states that local authorities should undertake audits of existing open space, sports and recreational facilities, the use made of existing facilities, access in terms of location and costs and opportunities for new open space and facilities (paragraph 2).

1.20 Paragraph 5 states that “The Government expects all local authorities to carry out assessments of needs and audits of open space and recreational facilities” and that “local authorities should use the information gained from their assessments of needs and opportunities to set locally derived standards for the provision of open space, sports and recreational facilities in their areas” (paragraph 7).

1.21 Significant changes in this planning policy document from the previous 1991 version are:

- the definition of open space should be taken to mean all open space of public value
- a greater emphasis is placed on qualitative considerations – this is particularly important as it will allow local authorities to identify potential for increased use through better design, management and/or maintenance of open space
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- It advocates the setting of local standards appropriate to the local area rather than assessment by national standards although these can be used as benchmarks – the Government believes that national standards are inappropriate, as they do not take into account the demographics of an area, the specific needs of residents and the extent of built development.

- It provides further guidance on the constituent elements of open space typologies.

- It clearly acknowledges the multiple functions that open spaces can perform.

1.22 The policy guidance sets out priorities for local authorities in terms of:

- Assessing needs and opportunities – undertaking audits of open space, sport and recreational facilities
- Setting local standards
- Maintaining an adequate supply of open space
- Planning for new open space.

1.23 The companion guide sets out the process for undertaking local assessments of needs and audits of provision. It also:

- Indicates how councils can establish the needs of local communities and apply provision standards
- Promotes a consistent approach across varying types of open space.

1.24 PMP and the Council have followed the recommendations of PPG17 throughout the study. In following these recommendations, this study has the potential to make a significant difference to the quantity, quality and accessibility of open spaces in the Borough of Kettering.

Need for local assessments

1.25 This assessment of open space and local needs will enable the Council to:

- Plan positively, creatively and effectively in identifying priority areas for improvement and to target appropriate types of open space
- Ensure an adequate provision of high quality, accessible open space to meet the needs of the local community
- Ensure any accessible funding is invested in the right places where there is the most need
- Conduct Section 106 negotiations with developers from a position of knowledge with evidence to support.

1.26 Where no assessment exists, developers can undertake their own independent assessment to demonstrate that open space is surplus to requirements. It is therefore desirable for the Council to have robust data to protect open space within the Borough.
Structure of the report

1.27 The report is split into 17 sections. Section 2 sets out the methodology for undertaking the study. Section 3 sets out the strategic context to provide the background and context to the study. Section 4 provides a brief summary of the consultation undertaken, where some of the key themes are drawn out within each typology section.

1.28 Sections 5-13 relate to each of the typologies identified within the scope of the report. Each typology chapter sets out the strategic context to that particular typology, the recommended quantity, quality and accessibility standards and the applications of these standards through the geographical areas and value assessments. These are not applicable to all typologies. Proactive recommendations are made in each section as to future new developments and enhancement of particular existing sites.

1.29 Section 14 provides a summary of potential resources to help to implement the findings of the study. Section 15 sets out the planning context to the study, highlighting how the application of the PPG17 study can assist with planning applications and the provision of open space in new housing developments. Section 16 provides planning examples and Section 17 details conclusions.
SECTION 2

UNDERTAKING THE STUDY
**Introduction**

2.1 As previously mentioned, this study was undertaken in accordance with PPG17 and its companion guide. This companion guide is a guidance process suggesting ways and means of undertaking such a study. It emphasises the importance of undertaking a local needs assessment, as opposed to following national trends and guidelines. The four guiding principles in undertaking a local assessment are:

i) local needs will vary even within local authority areas according to socio-demographic and cultural characteristics

ii) the provision of good quality and effective open space relies on effective planning but also on creative design, landscape management and maintenance

iii) delivering high quality and sustainable open spaces may depend much more on improving and enhancing existing open space rather than new provision

iv) the value of open space depends primarily on meeting identified local needs and the wider benefits they generate for people, wildlife and the environment.

2.2 PPG17 recognises that individual approaches appropriate to each local authority will need to be adopted as each area has different structures and characteristics. The resulting conclusions and recommendations of this study are therefore representative of the local needs of the Borough of Kettering.

**Types of open space**

2.3 The overall definition of open space within the government planning guidance is:

> “all open space of public value, including not just land, but also areas of water such as rivers, canals, lakes and reservoirs which offer important opportunities for sport and recreation and can also act as a visual amenity.”

2.4 PPG17 identifies 10 open space typologies. These categories include nine types of open space and one category of urban open space. This study includes the assessment of the following typologies:

- parks and gardens
- amenity greenspace
- natural and semi natural open space
- provision for children and young people
- outdoor sports facilities
- allotments and community gardens
- green corridors
- churchyards and cemeteries
• civic spaces.

2.5 The study takes into account open spaces provided owned and managed by other organisations illustrating a more accurate picture of current provision. Full details of these typologies, their definitions and primary purpose are outlined in Appendix C.

**PPG17 – 5 step process**

2.6 The PPG17 Companion Guide sets out a five step logical process for undertaking a local assessment of open space. This process was used in undertaking this study to meet the requirements of the Council to plan, monitor and set targets for their existing and future provision of open space within the Borough. Although presented as a linear process below, in reality, many stages were undertaken in parallel.

2.7 The 5 step process is as follows:

• Step 1 – Identifying Local Needs
• Step 2 – Auditing Local Provision
• Step 3 – Setting Provision Standards
• Step 4 – Applying Provision Standards
• Step 5 – Drafting Policies – recommendations and strategic priorities.

**Our process**

2.8 The following steps indicate how the study has been undertaken in accordance with PPG17.

**Step 1 - Identifying local needs**

2.9 In order to identify local needs, a series of consultations, which were agreed with the Council, were carried out, these included:

• 5,000 household questionnaires disseminated across Kettering (users and non users of open space) using analysis areas split according to geographical and demographic boundaries (a copy of the analysis areas can be found in Appendix D)
• sports club surveys to all identified clubs
• young people’s IT survey – sent out to all the schools in the Borough
• ‘drop in’ neighbourhood sessions at three locations in the area inviting local residents and groups
• press releases, a specific email address and text messaging service were set up to allow the general public to provide comments on open space
• internal one-to-one consultations with Council officers
• consultation with external agencies (see Appendix H).

2.10 Specific details on the process adopted for Step 1 can be found in Appendix D.
Step 2 - Auditing local provision

2.11 The Council had already compiled some data in GIS form on the open spaces in the Borough.

2.12 PMP conducted a thorough audit through desk research and site assessments. This included ensuring consistency of categorisation of open space sites into the PPG17 typologies used for this study.

2.13 A total of 431 sites were identified through the audit within settlement boundaries. Where accessible, these sites were assessed on quantity, quality, accessibility and value using a standard matrix and definitions, which can be found in Appendix E.

2.14 Each open space site was then digitised using GIS software and its associated ratings and characteristics were recorded on a Access database. The GIS and database are linked using a site ID reference.

2.15 This report is supplemented by an Access database, which will enable further updates of open spaces and varying forms of analysis to be undertaken. This allows a dynamic reporting and assessment mechanism and enables individual sites or specific geographical locations to be examined in detail where necessary.

Steps 3 and 4 - Setting and applying provision standards

2.16 From the analysis of the significant amount of data collected and site ratings in terms of quality, quantity, accessibility and value of the sites we are able to:

- determine a set of provisional standards for each type of open space
- apply such standards for each type of open space
- identify gaps in provision across the different types of open space and therefore the areas of priority.

2.17 The following inputs impact upon the standard setting process:

- obtaining a base standard, derived usually from the 75th percentile of scores for current sites in the Borough (site assessment matrix scoring process)
- comparison of the current site scores against those for other comparable districts and boroughs
- council member input, based around establishing standards that are feasibly obtainable given the resources available
- PMP’s experience and vision of a realistic standard, supported by experience from other similar projects
- national standards and guidelines that apply to the specific typology
- public consultations, including the themes that emerged from the drop-in sessions and household surveys.

2.18 Further details are provided below in respect to how each open space is assessed and how standards are derived:
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Quantity

2.19 PPG17 advocates that planning policies for open space, including playing fields, should be based upon local standards derived from a robust assessment of local need.

2.20 The overall aim of the quantity assessment is to:

• establish areas of the Borough suffering from deficiency of provision within each type of open space
• areas of significant surplus where it may be possible to investigate changing the type of open space to establish types that are deficient in that area.

2.21 The quantity of provision provided by the audit of open space has assisted in the setting of local provision standards. These standards are included for each open space typology and, as recommended by PPG17, uses population to calculate the quantity of provision per person.

2.22 The quantitative analysis has also taken into account key issues raised from consultation (see Section 4). This provides a more objective view rather than relying solely on statistical calculations. A comparison with the community’s view on the existing level of facilities required and the current level of provision is undertaken to help establish a reasonable level of provision.

2.23 Provision standards are applied to determine whether there is a surplus of provision, the provision is about right or there is a deficiency. All standards are based on 2001 Census data.

2.24 PMP are able to apply the quantity standards (Step 4) through an interactive calculator. This allows the effect of an increased/decreased level of provision to be calculated. It also can help to justify provision based on population trends and identify specific analysis areas.

2.25 An example of the calculator is shown in Figure 2.1 below. As can be seen, the effect of increasing/decreasing provision levels is calculated both in terms of actual hectares needed and the equivalent number of adult football pitches.
### Quality

2.27 Quality and value of open space are fundamentally different and can sometimes be completely unrelated. An example of this could be:

- a high quality open space is provided but is completely inaccessible. Its usage is therefore restricted and its value to the public limited; or
- a low quality open space may be used every day by the public or have some significant wider benefit such as biodiversity or educational use and therefore has a relatively high value to the public.

### Accessibility

2.28 Accessibility is a key assessment of open space sites. Without accessibility for the public the provision of good quality or good quantity of open space sites would be of very limited value. The overall aim of an accessibility assessment should be to identify:

- how accessible sites are
- how far are people are willing to travel to reach open space
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- areas of the Borough deficient in provision
- key accessibility factors that need to be improved.

2.30 Setting accessibility standards for open space should be derived from an analysis of the accessibility issues within the audit and in light of community views.

2.31 Distance thresholds (i.e. the maximum distance that typical users can reasonably be expected to travel to each type of provision using different modes of transport) are a very useful planning tool especially when used in association with a Geographical Information System (GIS).

2.32 Distance thresholds and travel times are based on data from the Household Survey average walking distances and uses a factoring reduction of 40% to account for the fact that people do not walk in a straight line to access their open space facilities. This 40% factoring is based on the NPFA Six Acre Standard (See Table 3, page 25 of NPFA Six Acre Standard), which has been calculated from a trial of 4-14 year olds and the distance they travelled. It is recognised that some of the typologies are not a specific facility for children however the factoring is applied to ensure consistency with all typologies and so that they are accessible to all.

2.33 PPG17 encourages any new open space sites or enhancement of existing sites to be accessible by environmentally friendly forms of transport such as walking, cycling and public transport. There is a real desire to move away from reliability on the car.

Level of usage and value

2.34 The value of an open space site is entirely different to quality and relates mainly to three key factors as described in PPG17 companion guide:

- **Context** – a site that is inaccessible is irrelevant to potential users and therefore is of little value irrespective of its quality. Also, in areas where there is a large amount of high quality open space or more than is actually required, some of it may be of little value. In contrast to this, a site of low quality but in an area of low provision maybe of extremely high value to the public.

- **Level and type of use** – poorly used open space sites may be of little value while highly used sites may be of high value.

- **Wider benefits** – there are many wider benefits of open space sites that should be taken into account when analysing the results of particular sites e.g. visual impact, benefits for biodiversity, education, cultural, economy etc. These benefits are difficult to assess in a systematic way and would require detailed site visits.

2.35 Evaluating value therefore involves attempting to assess these factors, in particular relating the context of the open space site (quality and accessibility) against the level of use of each site.

2.36 From the assessment of the value of sites, it is possible to start to determine policy options in terms of feeding into a specific action plan. This is fundamental to effective planning:

2.37 The figure below provides a simple means of determining the most appropriate policy approach to each existing open space site.
2.38 The analysis has therefore been undertaken by type of open space looking at different areas across the local authority boundary (referred to as analysis areas in this report), which were discussed and agreed by the Council.

2.39 The use of analysis areas allows examination of data at a more detailed local level, and provides a geographical background to the analysis, especially where some areas are sparsely populated and very rural in nature. The six analysis areas have been split into the areas of:

- Welland;
- Buccleuch and Queen Eleanor;
- Desborough and Rothwell;
- Kettering;
- Burton Latimer
- Slade.

2.40 Setting robust local standards based on assessments of need and audits of existing facilities will form the basis for addressing quantitative and qualitative needs through the planning process.
2.41 In setting local standards there is a need to take into account any existing national or local standards, current provision, other local authority standards for comparison, findings from the site assessments and consultation process.

2.42 In order to set the standards for quality, quantity and accessibility a workshop session is undertaken with Council officers to discuss all the available data in terms of the audit, consultation and other relevant material. The process for each standard is summarised in Figure 2.3 below.

**Figure 2.3 Setting standards process diagram**

- National standards
- Current Local standards
- Current provision level
- Local standards set at other authorities
- Consultation results
- PMP recommendation
- Local standard

2.43 Details are expanded upon in Appendix F regarding the process for setting and application of each type of provision standard.

**Step 5 – Drafting policies - recommendations and strategic priorities**

2.44 Application of the standards provide strategic priorities and recommendations which are set out for each typology within the report.

2.45 The report also provides guidance for the application of Section 106 agreements and using best practice formula and costings based on the approach taken by other authorities and best practice which is included in Section 15 of this report.
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STRATEGIC CONTEXT
Strategic context

3.1 This strategic review sets in context the study and analysis of a local needs assessment by reviewing:

- the current situation regarding the provision of open space nationally
- the range of national, regional, sub-regional and local strategic documents and organisations that may have a direct or indirect influence and/or impact upon the provision of open space, sport and recreation within Kettering.

The national situation

Living Places: Cleaner, Safer, Greener – Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (ODPM) October 2002

3.2 The Government stated that parks and green spaces need more visible ‘champions’ and clearer structures for co-ordinating policy and action better at all levels.

3.3 Several existing national bodies have responsibilities or programmes with impact on various aspects of urban green spaces including English Heritage, Sport England, Groundwork, English Nature, the Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment (CABE), the Countryside Agency and the Forestry Commission.

3.4 Instead of setting up a new body, the Government stated it would take action on three levels to improve coordination of policy and action for urban parks and green spaces. It will:

- provide a clearer national policy framework
- invite CABE to set up a new unit for urban spaces (CABE Space)
- encourage a strategic partnership to support the work of the new unit and inform national policy and local delivery.

3.5 CABE Space and its publications now provide this advice on policy frameworks and local delivery.

CABE Space

3.6 CABE Space is part of the Commission for the Architecture and the Built Environment (CABE) and is publicly funded by the Department for Communities and Local Government (formerly Office of the Deputy Prime Minister). CABE Space aims “to bring excellence to the design, management and maintenance of parks and public space in towns and cities.”

3.7 Through their work, they encourage people to think holistically about green space, and what it means for the health and well being of communities, routes to school and work, and recreation through play and sport. Their ultimate goal is to ensure that people in England have easy access to well designed and well looked after public space.
3.8 Lessons learnt for some of CABE Space’s case studies include:

- strategic vision is essential
- political commitment is essential
- think long term
- start by making the case for high quality green spaces in-house (persuading other departments is key – high priority)
- a need to market parks and green spaces
- a need to manage resources more efficiently
- work with others; projects are partnerships
- keep good records: monitor investments and outcomes
- consult widely and get public support for your work.

3.9 CABE Space has published a number of publications in recent years, including:

- Green Space Strategies – a good practice guide CABE Space (May 2004)
- The Value of Public Space, CABE Space (March 2004)

3.10 The summaries of these publications can be found in Appendix G.

Department for Transport, Local Government and the Regions

3.11 The former Department of Transport, Local Government and the Regions (DTLR) has been responsible for the publication of several papers on urban green spaces, including:

- Improving urban parks, play areas and green space, DTLR (May 2002).

3.12 The main findings of Green Spaces, Better Places recognises that parks and green spaces are a popular and precious resource, which can make a valuable contribution to the attractiveness of a neighbourhood, to the health and well being of people and expand educational opportunities of children and adults alike.

3.13 In May 2002 the DTLR produced a linked research report to Green Spaces, Better Places that looked at patterns of use, barriers to open space and the wider role of open space in urban regeneration.
The main messages from these reports can be found in Appendix G.

**Sport England**

Sport England provides the strategic lead for sport in England and is responsible for delivering the Government's sporting objectives.

Sport England draws together the large body of research and good practice on the subject of open space and focuses on the revised PPG 17 and its companion guide.

Sport England has been responsible for several publications relating to open space:

- Planning for Open Space, Sport England (Sept 2002)

The organisation aims to ensure that there is no further reduction of supply of conveniently located, quality playing fields to satisfy the current and likely future demand. Other key messages from these two documents can be found in Appendix G.

**Decent parks? Decent behaviour? – The link between the quality of parks and user behaviour, CABE space (May 2005)**

Based on research, which supports public consultation that poor maintenance of parks, in turn, attracts anti-social behaviour. Encouragingly it provides examples of places where a combination of good design, management and maintenance has transformed no-go areas back into popular community spaces.

There are nine case studies explored in the report. Below are some of the key elements that have made these parks a better place to be:

- take advantage of the potential for buildings within parks for natural surveillance eg from cafes, flats offices
- involve the community early in the process and continually
- involve 'problem' groups as part of the solution where possible and work hard to avoid single group dominance in the park
- provide activities and facilities to ensure young people feel a sense of ownership. Address young peoples fear of crime as well as that of adults.

The evidence in this report suggests that parks were in decline and failing to meet customer expectations long before anti-social behaviour started to become the dominant characteristic. However, investment and creation of good quality parks and green spaces, which are staffed and provide a range of attractive facilities for the local community, can be an effective use of resource.
Regional Policy Documents

Regional Spatial Strategy for the East Midlands (RSS 8)

3.22 The aim of this strategy is to ensure that all development in the area enhances the East Midlands to become a region with a high quality of life and sustainable communities, and where social and economic well-being is evident.

3.23 The document supersedes Regional Planning Guidance 8 (RPG 8) and the policies in this document should inform local structure plans and set the context for the preparation of LDF and LDD policy.

3.24 Policy 1 states the main objectives of the strategy are to:

- address social exclusion through community regeneration
- protect and enhance the environment
- improve the regions’ health
- develop sustainable transport routes to include walking and cycling
- develop habitats and biodiversity by improved management of natural sites
- promote the environmental and social benefits of a ‘green infrastructure’.

3.25 The spatial strategy also states the importance of maintaining and enhancing the rich environment that the region provides.

3.26 Policy 27 explains that sites of natural, cultural and environmental importance should be protected and enhanced.

3.27 Policy 29 states that woodlands of national and regional importance should be protected and the recreational value of these sites should be promoted.

3.28 Policy 34 promotes the development of river corridors for recreational purposes. This links with the maintenance of rights of way, the increasing strategic importance of walking, cycling and bridle routes in the regeneration of urban areas and the creation of green fingers which link areas of open space to relieve pressure on the countryside.

3.29 Policy 38 of RPG 8, which states that playing fields and other recreational open spaces should be protected and that new developments should include provision for children’s play and informal recreation has been refined and condensed into Policy 32 of RSS 8. This policy now ensures that adequate recreational open space and other facilities are provided in both urban and rural areas to serve existing and new populations.

3.30 The strategy suggests that provision should be based on standards derived from assessments carried out in line with PPG 17. This study will develop standards based on local needs and make recommendations in line with all contextual national, regional and local planning documentation.
According to the ‘Change 4 Sport’ in Sport England’s, East Midlands - A Regional Plan for Sport 2004 to 2008 consultation draft document, the planned priorities are:

- to build a more efficient an effective sporting system within the East Midlands
- to increase participation in sport and active recreation to meet national government targets in line with Game Plan
- to make the East Midlands the most successful sporting region in England and to maximise its contribution towards national (England and UK/GB) success
- to tackle inequality by increasing participation in sport and active recreation by under represented groups and communities
- to reduce health inequalities and improve the health and well being of the inhabitants of the East Midlands
- through sport and active recreation make communities in the East Midlands stronger and safer
- maximise the contribution of sport and active recreation to education and lifelong learning
- to benefit the local economy and realise the potential sport and active recreation has to contribute to the development of the Regional and Local Economy, the East Midlands Development Agency has produced a regional economic strategy ‘Destination 2010’ which sits under the Integrated Regional Strategy (IRS)
- the strategy has two high level aspirations of equal weight – to deliver a competitive region and at the same time to ensure that the region has sustainable communities.

The implication the strategy has for the provision of open space in the Borough of Kettering encompasses the wider benefits which sports participation can provide to the local community such as sport and community development and improving health and well being.

**Sub regional documentation**

**Milton Keynes and South Midlands Sub Regional Strategy**

Milton Keynes and the South Midlands was identified as a potential growth area in the UK and this strategy was developed to create specific sub regional planning policy in line with the relevant regional planning guidance as to provide contextual preparation for local development documents.

The main objectives which relate to the provision of open space in the Borough are:

- to ensure that any development contributes to an improved environment by high standards of design, protecting and enhancing environmental assets including landscape and biodiversity and promoting green space
3.35 Policy 3 declares that access to green space has to be improved to promote healthy lifestyles and to increase the use of sites for formal and informal recreation and education purposes.

3.36 This open space study will comment on the strategic location of sites with the primary purpose of providing informal recreation to the local community. It is important that all recommendations are made following a comprehensive consultation process, to which the strategic review will provide context.

Northamptonshire County Structure Plan

3.37 The Northamptonshire Structure Plan is the planning blueprint for the county. It not only sets out the land use strategy for the period up to the year 2016, but also establishes the general basis for how it will develop beyond that date.

3.38 The Structure Plan provides the strategic planning framework for the overall development and use of land in the county. Its main role is:

- to provide a framework of strategic policies and proposals for local planning and development control decisions
- to ensure that the provision for development at the local level is realistic and consistent with national and regional policies
- to secure consistency between local plans for neighbouring authorities.

Open space and recreation policy

3.39 Policy RT2 states that planning permission will not be granted for development that would result in a loss of open space, for which there is a need, unless alternative provision is made elsewhere in the local area. Policy RT2 also defines that development proposals will, where appropriate, be required to make allowance for open spaces for formal and informal recreation.

The environment

3.40 This strategy sets out policies for the protection and enhancement of the environment and promotion of biodiversity and creation of new habitats within open space provision. Policy AR6 states that all registered parks and gardens are to be protected.

Cultural Strategy for Northamptonshire

3.41 The strategy has the following key objectives relating to informal recreation and leisure:

- examine the influence of pricing policies on social exclusion
- work with partners to lobby for sustainable public transport networks linked to cultural facilities
encourage the development of participation of older people in cultural activities and identify and remove the barriers to participation by socially excluded groups and individuals

• make it easier for individuals and communities to participate in cultural activities and actively encourage increased participation

• ensure that public buildings, facilities and spaces are well maintained and sufficient funds set aside for long term maintenance and refurbishment and to encourage other agencies to do likewise

• ensure that maximum benefit is obtained from existing community facilities that could be used to provide cultural activities and opportunities.

3.42 This document outlines the importance of open spaces that provide for the local community that are of good quality and that are accessible to all the community.

**Northamptonshire Biodiversity Action Plan**

3.43 Northamptonshire’s Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) is a way of ensuring conservation efforts are directed towards those areas that need them most. It is run by the Biodiversity Partnership, which consists of a steering group and a series of habitat working groups.

3.44 The Northamptonshire BAP is split into two main sections - habitat and species. Each plan details what needs to be done to halt and reverse the decline for its respective species or habitat. It also outlines how this will be done, by whom and by what date, in the form of a series of actions and targets.

3.45 Action plans are in place for:

• dry grassland and heaths
• farmland
• rivers and wetlands
• towns and villages
• trees and woodlands.

3.46 Northamptonshire is largely a rural county that contains substantial natural areas such as ancient woodland and meadows. The urban environment is also made up of buildings and other structures that are of importance to wildlife, such as churchyards for lichens.

3.47 Wildlife in towns and villages provides an essential link with the countryside as it provides a refuge for some of the species and habitats that are under pressure in rural areas.

3.48 Improvements and developments to open space should consider the action points identified within each action plan.
3.49 The document recognises the value of a ‘bottom-up approach’ being guided by local needs. It stresses the importance of all sports facilities in the county providing for the local population.

3.50 Northamptonshire has a total unmet demand of 1.7 sports hall units. There is a small amount of unmet demand of Swimming Pools over all districts. There is also an expressed deficiency of facilities available for specific sports development. For example the County Badminton Association wish to establish one performance centre.

3.51 This strategy identifies the major population increases, which are expected in the county over the next few years. Obviously the provision of formal and informal sports facilities will have to increase to provide for the increasing population, both in the Borough of Kettering and in the county.

3.52 Northamptonshire Sport has a number of aims and objectives, which relate to sports facility development. The partnership aims to increase the quality and quantity of provision by:

- ensuring the consistency of provision
- providing easily accessible, locally based sport, physical activity and recreational opportunities
- maximise the use of new facilities.

3.53 The strategy states that a greater emphasis is needed on how sport can assist with meeting non sporting agendas, such as crime prevention, health, regeneration and social inclusion. Northamptonshire Sport believe that a strong focus should also be placed on cost, quality and value for money when providing facilities and services.

3.54 Playing pitches have an important role to play in providing facilities for formal recreation and the fields in which the pitches lie also have an informal recreation and amenity value for the local community. Therefore these areas of open space are regarded as vital local facilities.

3.55 This strategy places the provision into a local context reporting on areas of surplus and deficiency and identifying areas of recommended development.

3.56 The strategy revealed that the Borough of Kettering had an overall pitch shortfall of 15 outdoor pitches, as well as a shortfall of 0.8 synthetic turf pitches (STPs). The most severe shortfall was junior football pitches, of which there was a deficiency of 25 pitches across the whole Borough.

**Local context**

**Kettering Local Plan 1995**

3.57 The Local Plan provides the basic land use framework for the enhancement and protection of the environment, and for investment decisions in Kettering Borough.
3.58 The purpose of Kettering’s Local Plan is to:

- set out the Borough’s Council policies for control of development
- make proposals for the use and development of land
- provide a basis for co-ordinating and directing public and private investment decision
- serve as a means of bringing local planning issues before the public.

3.59 The strategy of the Local Plan is to:

- create a sustainable environment; enhance and protect the environment and make considered decisions about the full and beneficial use of land and resources
- create an effective choice of transportation for residents and a reduced reliance on the motor car
- assist in securing, maintaining and enhancing the general well being of the Borough
- make provision for development to be concentrated in a number of settlements, limited in villages and severely restrained in open countryside
- prevent the coalescence of settlements
- provide the legal and planning framework to ensure that the policy objectives of the Borough Council can be achieved with the help of contributions from housing, industrial and commercial developers
- seek community wide involvement and support in achieving the above.

3.60 The Local Plan covers a whole range of issues including some which are particularly relevant to the quantity, quality, accessibility of open spaces, sport and recreation provision in the Borough. These issues are examined in more detail below:

**Environment**

3.61 The Plan recognises the importance of the built and natural environment in the context of all human activities. The policies and proposals of the Plan recognise the need to protect and enhance the character of the Borough within a sustainable framework. The main environmental issues for the Plan are:

- that the pattern of development must be capable of being sustained by future generations
- the recognition that sustainable development depends upon:
  - minimising the use of resources and the reliance on the motor car, through decisions about new development in terms of location, accessibility and form
  - assessing new development to ensure that the state of the environment in overall terms is not diminished
- sustaining and enhancing the Borough’s natural environment
- improving the liveable quality of the Borough’s settlements, especially the towns.

- to maintain the identity of the Borough’s settlements in design and separation terms
- that new development must incorporate higher standards in all respects
- increased accessibility to an enhanced environment for all members of the community so that all can share in the benefits.

3.62 The key policies related to the environment are to:

- minimises the distance between new and established housing areas, new and established places of employment, shopping and leisure whilst ensuring that there is a choice of transportation
- require environmental statements to accompany planning applications for proposals involving major new development
- provide protection for the open countryside, Kettering/Corby Green Wedge, Special Landscape Areas and the Special Landscape Area of Braybrooke
- enhance the open countryside and green wedge by incorporating proposals for new woodland planting, strategic landscaping and the creation of wildlife habitats
- prevent the loss or damage to ancient woodlands or other broad leaved woodlands
- protect sites of geological, landscape or nature conservation importance, especially Sites of Special Scientific Interest
- provide for the interests of nature conservation by making Tree Preservation Orders and encouraging the planting of new woodland
- establishing local nature sites and taking opportunities for enhancing wildlife habitats
- provide protection for the 24 Conservation Areas (Local Plan), 515 Listed Buildings (English Heritage – Sept 07), sites of the archaeological importance and encourage conservation enhancement schemes
- develop a programme of environmental improvements and limit dereliction
- encourage high standards of design for the development of gateway sites.
Housing

3.63 Local Plan plays an important role in ensuring that the best locations for new housing are selected and that there is provision of land for the variety of different needs in the Borough. The Plan also sets a framework for the selective redevelopment of in-town sites and improvement of older housing areas. The key housing policy related to open space is to:

- encourage high standards of design, particularly in relation to layout, density, car parking, open space and landscaping.

Leisure

3.64 The Plan recognises the dynamic nature of people’s leisure activities. The key policies are to:

- protect existing open spaces and outdoor sports facilities in towns and villages and the preparation of management and enhancement schemes for major open spaces
- set criteria for the provision of a new football stadium for Kettering Town Football Club
- set a framework for considering applications for new golf courses and driving ranges
- provide for the protection and enhancement of existing allotment land
- provide for the enhancement of existing rights of way or retain them on their original or acceptable alternative routes
- promote heritage trails including signposting, waymarking, information/interpretation boards, in association with the County Council and other appropriate bodies
- promote rural tourism activities including appropriate accommodation
- encourage the establishment of country parks.

3.65 The Plan looks at the provision of outdoor sports in the Borough and recognises that the provision of outdoor sports facilities is a very important concern. There are a number of outdoor sports facilities within the Plan area and these make a valuable contribution to the community. However, there remains a deficiency of facilities, which will be exacerbated as the Borough grows and if no additional facilities are provided. As such the Plan outlines a number of policies which aim to:

- protect existing facilities from pressures of development
- provide additional facilities to make good the existing and projected shortfall, often in association with housing and employment proposals
- consider the need for and location of, an all seater football stadium
- provide an appropriate number of golf courses
- consider provision for noisy sports.
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3.66 Given the deficiency and the likelihood of increased needs of the community, the Plan states that the local planning authority will seek to protect existing facilities from other forms of development unless suitable replacements are provided or it is shown that there is a reduced long term educational and community need for these facilities.

3.67 The Plan states the need for the preparation of a detailed playing field strategy to be monitored on a regular basis. This will enable accurate assessment of deficiencies. As part of the preparation of this strategy, consideration will be given to ways of achieving greater public use of playing fields not in the ownership of the Borough Council but which are underused in order to meet some of the current deficiency.

3.68 Measures to achieve greater and more effective use of existing sports facilities will be supported, although consideration of such proposals will need to take account of possible amenity problems, particularly if adjacent to residential areas.

3.69 Local Plan states that the provision of other built facilities in the Borough will be welcomed and encouraged especially where they meet identified deficiencies in provision; are complementary to existing facilities and are located convenient to the community they are intended to serve.

3.70 Referring specifically to open spaces in the Borough, the Local Plan recognises the importance of these as a resource for residents and for visitors and the fundamental need to retain and enhance these open spaces except where specific proposals have been made elsewhere in the Plan. Open spaces within towns and villages make an important contribution to environmental quality and the character of settlements and should be protected from development.

3.71 The Plan also refers to the provision of new open space sites within the Borough. It is particularly crucial in settlements experiencing development expansion and growth that open spaces integrate the new development with the existing settlement. Thus providing leisure opportunities and giving psychological and visual relief within the urban framework.

3.72 Proposals for new open space should be evolved in relation to the site location. This is in terms of the site’s existing facilities, natural and topographical features, settlement form and other development constraints as well likely users and patterns of use.

3.73 Developers submitting proposals affecting larger open spaces will be expected to provide details of proposed landscaping, planting, pedestrian/cycle links, lighting, natural play features and equipment.

3.74 The Plan states that allotments are an important leisure facility although there have been changes in the level of demand for their usage. There is scope for rationalisation of allotment uses within the Borough, in order to provide an improved facility and also to make more beneficial use of a valuable land resource, especially in urban areas. Specific proposals for the development of some allotment sites are within the Plan and should be integrated with programmes of allotment and leisure garden enhancement and improved management.

3.75 The Plan states that the provision of pocket parks in urban areas can attract funding from the Countryside Commission (now English Nature), which is now not the case. The pocket parks are managed with community involvement and can create opportunities for casual recreation and education.
3.76 The Plan supported the Countryside Commission’s target of having every public right of way legally defined, properly maintained, signposted and publicised by the year 2000. This requires cooperation, with landowners particularly, but will be beneficial in allowing the countryside to be enjoyed inexpensively by large numbers of people. A number of specific routes are detailed in the Plan:

- a footpath/cycle link along the route of the disused Kettering/Cransley railway line west of Kettering
- exploring the potential for extension of the route above to Rothwell via Orton
- exploring the possibility of utilising the disused section of the old Kettering-Huntingdon railway line between Barton Seagrave and Cranford
- establishing a footpath linking Desborough and Rothwell
- establishing a footpath link along Slade Brook between Rothwell and Kettering
- establish a footpath to the north and the east of Burton Latimer.

3.77 The Local Plan states that large tracts of countryside are inaccessible to the general public and that there would be great benefit in making these areas more accessible. The Plan also acknowledges the need for providing facilities for a wider enjoyment. The Plan anticipates that opportunities will arise for this due to likely changes in agricultural activity.

3.78 The Local Planning Authority supports the establishment of country parks in the Borough. There is a proposal within the Plan for a small country park at Desborough. This has emerged in association with a major new housing and employment proposal.

3.79 The Local Plan also details specific plans for settlements within the Borough. The settlements’ policies relevant to the provision of open space, sport and recreation are set out overleaf:
**Burton Latimer**

3.80 The major development that will take place in Burton Latimer involves the provision of land for housing, employment use and a new district centre. There is a programme of environmental improvements, especially for the town centre and the Conservation Area; plans for extensive tree planting on the edge of the built up area of the town and plans for the provision of leisure facilities in association with the employment areas.

**Desborough**

3.81 The main development in Desborough will involve the building of housing on land to the north of the town as well as selected other sites. There are also specific plans that will impact on the provision of open space, sport and recreation in the town:

- extensive tree planting on the edge of the built up area of town
- a continuation of the programme of environmental improvements, especially for the town centre
- the provision of leisure facilities on land to the north of the railway line
- a proposal for a linear park along the Ise Valley
- a country park of 24 hectares proposed to the north of the town, incorporating the Plens Nature Reserve
- provision of a new network of footpaths and cycleways linking the employment, housing and country park areas together and the town centre.

**Kettering**

3.82 A number of plans and policies for Kettering are detailed in the Local Plan which will affect the provision of open space, sport and recreation:

- extensive tree planting on the edge of built up area of town
- enhancement of amenity, recreation and wildlife value of existing open space in the Ise Valley
- the establishment of a linear park and footpath/cycle track in Slade Valley, linking existing and proposed open space and urban fringe areas
- environmental improvements of major town spaces, including landscaping and signposting.

**Rothwell**

3.83 The major development in Rothwell will include:

- extensive tree planting on the edge of the built up area of the town
- a programme of environmental improvements, especially for the town centre and Conservation Area.
The Rural Area

3.84 There are 25 villages and hamlets situated in the rural area of Kettering Borough. The Local Plan seeks to restrict residential development in Restricted Infill Villages and prevent development in the Restraint and Scattered Villages and the open countryside. The Plan also seeks to restrict employment development to Restricted Infill Villages and prevent employment development in the Restraint and Scattered Villages and the open countryside.

Best Value Review of Leisure, Culture and Sport

3.85 The review looks at two principal strands:

- cultural services including the art gallery and the museum
- leisure services including Council’s overall purpose in providing leisure services and future arrangement of contracts for the supply of leisure services.

3.86 The review gives a number of headline findings:

- the current contract for leisure services should be amended and market tested between now and 2007, with a view to entering into a new 25 year agreement
- there should be a radical overhaul of the Leisure Pass Scheme.

3.87 The report also captures current gaps in leisure provision in localities within the Borough and recommends that these be closed over time by a combination of national, local and developer contributions.

3.88 With regard to leisure provision in the Borough, the review states that the Council’s purpose in funding leisure services is:

- to promote healthy lifestyles for all ages
- divert people from anti-social behaviour
- provide equal access to leisure for all individuals, groups and communities
- enrich people’s lives.

3.89 The review also details the key objectives of the Council’s leisure provision:

- the Council should seek to improve the quality and range of leisure provision within the Borough, in order to cater for a growing population, and to meet higher expectations of leisure provision
- the Council should seek to maximise the resources brought into the area from external funding bodies, and invest in order to reduce the Council’s revenue funding costs
- new sporting provision should be grown by the Council, to a point where it is self-sustaining
facilities provided in the Borough should be accessible and sufficiently local to promote usage

- usage of facilities should be maximised through better promotion and communication.

3.90 Each of these headline objectives and their accompanying specific recommendations and approaches are examined in more detail within the review.

The Community Plan for the Borough of Kettering 2005 - 2008

3.91 The Community Plan states that Kettering Borough is spread over 23,000 hectares and has a population close to 84,000 that is predicted to increase to 91,000 by 2025. The current population represents approximately 13% of the population of Northamptonshire.

3.92 62% of the Borough’s population live in Kettering town. 27% live in three smaller towns; Rothwell, Desborough and Burton. There are 23 villages, mostly with very small populations in the surrounding countryside. The population of these villages represents 11% of the population.

3.93 There are 35,000 households in the Borough and this figure is predicted to increase to 41,000 by 2025.

3.94 Black and minority groups represent 3% of the population; a proportion much lower than the national average of 8%.

3.95 According to the Community Plan, the vision for Kettering is:

- striving for a safe, sustainable and inclusive Borough where people, their beliefs and their environment are valued and respected
- creating a vibrant economy where lifelong learning, leisure and healthy living are nurtured.

3.96 There are a number of key areas of work, which comprise the Community Plan. The headlines for these work areas are:

- coping with the growth agenda
- creating a better environment
- health and well being for all
- safer places to live and work
- thriving culture
- jobs in a strong local economy
- learning for life.


3.97 Kettering Borough Council has set out a number of inter-connected priorities for combating crime and disorder in the Borough. Two over-arching objectives relate to all five of the priorities. These objectives are to:
• reduce crime by targeting those who offend most or otherwise cause most harm to their communities
• reduce crime and reassure the community.

3.98 There are a total of five priorities within the strategy. Three of the priorities are:
• tackling drug, alcohol and substance misuse
• reducing domestic burglary
• tackling violent crime including domestic abuse.

Youth Person’s Strategy

3.99 At the time of the 2001 census, there were 10,223 young people in Kettering between the ages of 10 and 19. This represents 12.5% of the Kettering population. The Youth Person’s Strategy will impact directly upon this group of people.

3.100 The plan is aimed at improving services for young people in the Borough. It was produced with the help of young people.

3.101 The key questions which the strategy sought to answer were:
• what it is like for young people to live in Kettering Borough
• what services are used
• what services are not used
• where services or opportunities are missing.

3.102 Developed in consultation with service providers in Kettering Borough, the heading of the aims of the strategy were:
• health, well being and personal safety
• leisure activities
• participation and citizenship
• access and transport
• information
• inclusion
• training and job opportunities.

3.103 The issues, ideas and aims related to leisure activities are relevant to this study.

3.104 Good services already available are identified as Newlands Centre, Kettering Leisure Village, Wicksteed Park and the swimming pool.

3.105 Young people said that they needed better access to activities and places to go and relax without being watched over. They also helped create a wish list of potential activities. Some of these are listed below:
• more skate ramps and dirt jumps
• replace swimming pool
• provide outdoor activities such as climbing wall
• lower cost of leisure activities eg fitness studio.

3.106 The viability and appropriateness of these suggestions were discussed in the strategy.

**Sports Facilities Strategy**

3.107 The strategy aims to provide a long term vision to assist the Borough Council in its efforts to maximise the available resources for sports provision. It guides the development of built sports facilities over the next 10–15 years.

3.108 The strategy contains the visions, aims and objectives for sports facilities in the Borough. The vision for the future is based around accessibility not being a barrier to participation in locally provided sports venues. The strategy adopts the following guiding principles:

• provide opportunities across the whole range of sporting achievement from participation to excellence
• work towards access for all by considering a variety of factors that help break down barriers created by culture, disability, gender, family, age, geographical location and accessibility issues
• offer variety and choice particularly through identification of unmet demand and working towards solutions to overcome this unmet demand
• consider the whole customer experience including changing areas, childcare provision, opening times and social interaction
• define standards for provision that should be aspired to across the Borough
• recognise the role of the Borough Council as a facilitator to synergise existing resources working in partnership with other key groups and identifying gaps in provision and working towards filling those gaps
• aim to develop a network of local provision where practical to reduce the need for travel and ensure accessibility for those without personal transport
• seize opportunities to develop dual use facilities in conjunction with schools and the County Council in order to maximise use, reduce costs and provide neighbourhood facilities
• support the development of opportunities through the Healthy Living Centre by ensuring sports facilities provide a programme that encourages personal fitness for all
• ensure that the aims and objectives of the Community Safety Strategy are take into account in determining priorities
• ensure that community transport schemes aim to encourage access for leisure activities.

3.109 The whole of the Borough currently falls within the 20 minute travel time parameters set by Sport England. However, facilities are not evenly distributed and with the exception of Kettering Swimming Pool, none of the facilities are centralised and are only accessible by the immediate areas or those with their own transportation. This is a particular issue for the very young and the elderly; two major target groups for increasing sports participation.

3.110 The strategy identifies standards of provision, which the Borough should aim to aspire to achieve. These provision standards should be viewed on a community wide level and not in isolation. The provision standards for some of the key sports and recreational activities are detailed below.

3.111 The Sport England Facility Planning Model suggests that there is a need for at least two swimming pools in Kettering, taking into account future predicted expansion in the areas of Desborough and Roswell.

3.112 The Sport England Facility Planning Model suggests a total deficit of 8.5 badminton courts in the Borough even when school facilities are taken into account. The completion of projects at Montsaye and Montague will meet some of this deficit, provided there is adequate community access.

3.113 There is only one synthetic pitch in the Borough currently and the hockey club has indicated that this level of provision in insufficient and that at least one further pitch is needed to provide a suitable venue for tournaments and other sub-regional events. This is alongside the demand for all weather facilities for football. At least three full size pitches would be required to meet the needs of the growing population, with one of these being sited in the Rothwell/Desborough area and the other sited to serve the north of Kettering.

3.114 In village communities of more than 400, the Sports Facility Strategy recommends provision should include:

• children’s play area to National Playing Fields Association Local Equipped Areas of Play (LEAP) standard
• informal play area, preferably with an all weather surface and floodlighting
• tennis court
• playing field for cricket and football
• pavilion
• community centre ideally able to accommodate a range of activities including crèche/parent and toddler sessions, badminton, aerobics, martial arts, dramatic productions and arts workshops.

3.115 Smaller villages, between 200 and 400 population should aim for the following as a minimum standard of provision:

• children’s play area to National Playing Fields Association LEAP standard
• tennis court/informal ball play area
• playing field for cricket and football and changing accommodation
• community centre ideally able to accommodate a range of activities including crèche/parent and toddler sessions, badminton, aerobics, martial arts, dramatic productions and arts workshops.

North Northamptonshire Green Infrastructure Study

3.116 The North Northamptonshire Joint Working Group have produced a strategic framework for the Green Infrastructure within the sub region. The principal purpose of this project is to provide a framework to meet regional and sub regional aspirations with regard to the provision of green infrastructure within the county, particularly within the areas designated for high growth.

3.117 The resulting framework will link existing and planned communities through a connected and accessible greenspace network. It is the intention that the project will act as an enabler to raise the overall quality of development, identify areas for enhancement and areas where new provision is required.

3.118 The project identifies a number of issues relating to the green infrastructure within the sub region, many of which impact on the Borough of Kettering. These are divided into key areas, specifically issues and opportunities relating to:
• environmental character
• biodiversity
• natural processes and the environment
• heritage and culture
• access and movement
• subregional greenspace
• leisure, recreation and tourism.

3.119 The Green Infrastructure project provides an important framework for the future development of green space in the sub region. It is important that the findings of this Kettering Open Space, Sports and Recreation Study are viewed in the context of the Green Infrastructure Framework, which sets out the key principles for delivery of the green infrastructure network.

Leisure and Recreation: Issues Paper 5

3.120 The vision for leisure and recreation is for a wide range of facilities available for all. The current local plan recognises the importance of the issue and contains policies aimed at creating opportunities to take part in leisure and recreation. A number of initiatives such as ‘Leisure Pass’ have been introduced to encourage greater participation.

3.121 There are to be 6,000 new houses in the Borough in the period to 2016. This will provide the Council with substantial resources towards new provision and upkeep of open space and new leisure facilities. The paper notes that it may be appropriate to seek developer contributions towards other leisure facilities required as a result of new development.
3.122 Current government guidance encourages new leisure and sporting facilities at locations, which are easily accessible by public transport, walking and cycling. The plan makes note therefore, of the importance of the local plan trying to satisfy the reasonable needs of everybody. Encouraging dual use of facilities could improve access to leisure facilities.

3.123 The paper notes the proposal to relocate Kettering Town Football Club to a new stadium and pitches in the countryside to the north west of the town.

3.124 Government encouraged higher density development could result in greater demand for public allotment space. Currently neglected and underused allotments are being identified as suitable for housing development whilst other well used and maintained allotments are protected in the Local Plan. This is in recognition of their natural, health and recreational value.

3.125 Consultation work prior to the issues paper highlighted a demand for more recreational cyclepaths, footpaths and bridleways for people to use in order to access the countryside.

**Kettering Masterplan 2005**

3.126 The purpose of the Masterplan is provide a vision for the development of the town centre over the next fifteen years; a period of time that will see substantial growth in the population and physical size of the town.

3.127 Following a public consultation a number of important issues have been highlighted:

- highway improvements to improve traffic movements and car parking provision in the town centre
- the balance and mix of uses for the office hub and recreation area in the Station Quarter (east and west of the railway line)
- health provision issues at Eskdail and Weavers Medical Centres
- the provision of multi-faith meeting and prayer facilities providing access for all, including religious and minority groups
- the make up and mix of development in the Western Quarter
- need for improved swimming pool facilities in the longer term
- reflecting the future use for the current Council offices and surrounding area
- the need for a theatre in a town of Kettering’s size
- make better use of the Market Place
- restoring high quality design and developing the character in the town centre.

3.128 A number of strategic aims have been identified by the Masterplan:

- to promote the redevelopment of Phase One of the Newlands Centre and provide additional shopping and family based leisure to create a stronger evening economy
to increase the number of people living in Kettering town centre as part of a lively and diverse mix of uses

improve access for pedestrians, cyclists and buses and improve and rationalise parking

to create a new office quarter on land alongside the railway station

to develop a public realm strategy for the improvement of existing streets and squares and creation of new ones

to redevelop the Western Quarter as a housing-led mixed use area

to explore the possibility of relocating the Council Offices and swimming pool.

Desborough Town Centre Urban Design Framework

3.129 The framework is a long term strategy for the improvement of the town centre of Desborough. It aims to tackle the key physical, social and economic issues that affect the town centre and also to build a platform on which to secure sustained improvement for the future. It will also be adopted as supplementary planning guidance and will provide basis for discussions with landowners, bidding for resources and as a framework for planning decisions.

3.130 Desborough is expected to grow and change significantly over the next 15 years and it is crucial that the town centre reacts positively and adapts to these changes.

3.131 The overall purpose of the framework is to identify a series of initiatives that will help reinforce Desborough’s role in serving its population and neighbouring villages. Also it aims to provide Desborough with a character and a range of activities that will prove attractive to visitors.

3.132 The overall aim for the Desborough Urban Design Framework is ‘to help create an attractive and accessible heart to the town’ by enhancing its:

- environmental quality
- range of facilities and shops
- civic pride and sense of community
- accessibility, particularly for pedestrians.

3.133 The framework analyses the main landscape features and public spaces within Desborough town centre. It is noted that the town centre lacks any significant or memorable landscape features, primarily due to the Victorian origins of the town. There is a large open space in the form of the park on Dunkirk Avenue and also the area around the church. There are also a number of smaller areas, which have been created over time within the town centre:

- the paved area at the junction of High Street and Station Road
- the public gardens at the junction of Havelock Street and Station Road
- the memorial gardens opposite Havelock Street and Station Road
• the garden area next to the war memorial on the High Street
• the grassed area in front of Hazelwood House on the High Street
• mounded landscape buffer adjacent to the A6
• the grounds of Havelock Junior School.

3.134 Several analysis and workshop events have identified the following issues that are significant to the town centre in Desborough:

• more green areas/parks
• a new public square and better area for the market
• leisure facilities for the young including café
• development of derelict sites
• creation of a safer and more secure town centre area.

3.135 The framework also details some specific objectives:

• to enhance the town’s gateways with creative new development and townscape improvement to provide a more memorable and attractive entry to the town
• to create a new public main square, most probably at the junction of the High Street and the A6, providing a focus for the town’s civic activities
• to undertake high quality streetscape works, in the first instance in the High Street and Station Road and then in other areas of the town centre
• to provide youth facilities at the Dunkirk Avenue recreation ground.
Burton Latimer Urban Design Framework

3.136 The UBF aims to guide, promote and control change in Burton Latimer although acts as a guideline, offering strategic direction rather than an exact blueprint for the regeneration of the town centre. By focusing on key developments within the centre it is hoped that these will act as a catalyst for further long-term supporting projects.

3.137 The main improvements regarding open space envisaged for the town centre are to manage, and where necessary improve green spaces, centrally and to the north of the town centre, and provide new and improved garden courts. The key catalyst projects are the Town Square and Community Service Centre, the Paddock Garden and Council Car Park Redevelopment, the former surgery and existing library redevelopment, and environmental improvements along the High Street.

3.138 Included in the follow-up regeneration projects are a new sports centre for Burton Latimer, retail and business site refurbishments, improving the perimeter green route and southern and northern gateways.

3.139 It is necessary the UBF gains endorsement from the local and county councils prior to identifying a preferred delivery approach and development brief. It may be necessary to produce a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) in order to assist in financing improvements by funds from housing allocations the increase in land values. It is necessary that guidance is provided for design quality and appropriate design and is weaved into the emerging local development framework. The concepts identified in this strategy all require further soft market testing and consultation with landowners and developers.

North Northamptonshire Local Development Framework

3.140 The area covered by this framework document is not an administrative district in itself but is the name given to the area of the four districts/boroughs of Corby, East Northamptonshire, Kettering and Wellingborough. The Local Development Schemes for North Northamptonshire, incorporating the Joint Committee Local Development Scheme and the four district/borough Local Development Schemes set out the programme for the preparation of the North Northamptonshire Local Development Framework.

3.141 North Northamptonshire falls within the Milton Keynes-South Midlands Growth Area as identified by the Government’s Sustainable Communities Plan (2003). More details on where and how growth should occur is set out in the Milton Keynes and South Midlands Sub-Regional Strategy which forms part of the Spatial Strategy for the East Midlands (RSS 8). This sub-regional strategy encourages the four council boroughs/districts to work together in a complementary way and prepare joint planning documents in order to reflect cross-administrative boundary issues that affect more than one borough/district.

3.142 In the summer of 2004, the four councils resolved to produce a joint Local Development Framework to coordinate the production of the plans needed to deliver sustainable development in North Northamptonshire over the period to 2021. This includes a Core Spatial Strategy, land allocations for development, other policies setting out standards required of new development and Area Action Plans.
Urban Capacity Study, Kettering Borough Urban Areas

3.143 The need for new housing developments puts pressure on greenfield sites and also on land outside of town as urban expansion extends into the country.

3.144 In assessing urban capacity in Kettering Borough, four main stages were undertaken:
- identifying the capacity sources
- surveying the capacity
- assessing the potential housing yield
- discounting the potential to provide an assessment of the capacity that can be realised.

3.145 At the initial stage of the study areas protected as green space in the Local Plan were excluded although it was apparent that allotment gardens adjacent to the potential site at Shotwell Mill Lane, Rothwell were considerably underused and were included as a potential urban capacity site.

3.146 The study indicated that 1,681 new dwelling could be accommodated within the existing four main urban areas and allocated sites.

Kettering Cycling Strategy

3.147 The aim of this strategy is to increase cycling in the town of Kettering.

3.148 Current cycle use in Kettering is limited. Only 0.9% of total urban journeys are made by bicycles. There are 44km of on and off road tracks/shared paths and 13 cycle parking areas.

3.149 Feedback from cyclists indicates that the numbers of utility cyclists (those using for purposes other than recreation or leisure) is declining as a result of increased feelings of intimidation and danger from increasing volumes of traffic.

3.150 There are four main objectives of the strategy:
- to maximise the role of cycling as a transport mode in order to reduce the use of private cars
- to develop a safe, convenient and efficient transport infrastructure which encourages and facilitates the use of walking, cycling and public transport and which minimises the reliance on the private car
- to ensure that policies to increase cycling and meet the needs of cyclists are fully integrated into the Local Development Framework and other travel plans
- to promote cycling as a healthy means of travel and as an effective means of reaching local destinations.

Summary

3.151 In summary, the reviewed documents and strategies identify a number of key themes and considerations, which will inform this study. The key themes from the documents reviewed are displayed in the following table:
### Table 3.1 Strategic Review Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic document</th>
<th>Key themes</th>
<th>Relevance to study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Living Places: Cleaner, Safer, Greener, ODPM (October 2002)</td>
<td>Need for clearer structures and coordination of policies and actions to improve parks and green spaces.</td>
<td>This study will provide the Council with a clear evidence base for planning for all open space types.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Spaces, Better Places, DTLR (2002). Improving Urban Parks, Play Areas and Green Space, DTLR (May 2002)</td>
<td>Both these documents recognise the importance of parks and other green spaces within urban areas and the contribution these can make to the attractiveness of areas; to the health and well being of the population and the educational opportunities for children and adults.</td>
<td>This study will help to identify those sites are most strategically important in the Borough and which should be protected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning for Open Space, Sport England (September 2002). A Sporting Future for the Playing Fields of England, Sport England (2000)</td>
<td>These documents, produced by Sport England, emphasise the importance of open space, and particularly playing fields for leisure and recreation purposes.</td>
<td>This study will help to identify those sites are most strategically important in terms of leisure, recreation and sporting purposes within the Borough and which should be protected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decent Parks? Decent Behaviour? Cabe Space (May 2005)</td>
<td>This document examines the links between quality of parks and the behaviour of users and recommends that maintenance of parks should be prioritised in order for maximum benefits.</td>
<td>The consultations along with site quality and usage assessments conducted as part of this study will help to identify those key parks where maintenance improvement should be prioritised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic document</td>
<td>Key themes</td>
<td>Relevance to study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Spatial Strategy for the East Midlands (RSS 8)</td>
<td>This is the overall policy strategy for the region. Policy 38 of RPG 8 states that playing fields and recreational open spaces should be protected. The strategy also suggests that provision is based on standards derived from local standards.</td>
<td>By following a PPG 17 approach, local standards will be produced which will allow for appropriate protection of open spaces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Midlands Regional Plan for Sport 2004-2008, Sport England</td>
<td>The document identifies a number of key sporting priorities in the region.</td>
<td>This study will allow open spaces used for sport and recreation, including playing fields, to be protected in order that these spaces can be protected and the priorities of the plan can be achieved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milton Keynes and South Midlands Sub Regional Strategy</td>
<td>This document refers to specific sub regional planning policy in line with the relevant regional planning guidance and to provide contextual preparation for Local Development Documents.</td>
<td>The specific policies of the strategy will contribute to the protection of open spaces in the face of large housing development pressures in the Borough.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northamptonshire County Structure Plan</td>
<td>This is the planning blueprint for the county. It contains specific open space and recreation policy which states that planning permission will not be granted when it result in the loss of open space for which there is a need.</td>
<td>This study will identify all the open spaces in the area through the audit and also help to identify where there are deficiencies of specific open spaces across the Borough.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Strategy for Northamptonshire</td>
<td>This document outlines the importance of open spaces that provide for the local community being of good quality and accessible to the whole community.</td>
<td>Through the combined findings of the quality and accessibility assessments this study will identify deficiencies in open space across the Borough.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Strategic Context

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic document</th>
<th>Key themes</th>
<th>Relevance to study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northamptonshire Biodiversity Action Plan</td>
<td>The plan contains specific action plans for various types of habitats.</td>
<td>Improvements to open spaces, recommended on the basis of this study should incorporate the action points from the Northamptonshire Biodiversity Action Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northamptonshire Draft Sports Facilities Strategy 2001</td>
<td>This document stresses the need for existing sports facilities, outdoor, to be protected and for new facilities to be built in order to provide for the local population.</td>
<td>The ‘bottom up’ approach of ensuring that provision is in line with local needs, fits perfectly with the methodology of this study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northamptonshire Playing Pitch Strategy 2002</td>
<td>This study revealed there to be a shortfall of pitches in the Borough of Kettering.</td>
<td>This study will lead to provision standards set for all open space typologies including outdoor sports facilities. This will provide protection to outdoor sports facilities, including formal pitches in the future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kettering Local Plan 1995</td>
<td>This document provides basic land use framework for enhancement and protection of the environment and for investment decisions in Kettering Borough.</td>
<td>The wide range of issues contained within the Local Plan are relevant to the quantity, quality and accessibility of open spaces in the Borough.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Community Plan for Borough of Kettering</td>
<td>There are a number of key areas for work contained within the Community Plan.</td>
<td>This study will help to identify those sites are most strategically important in the Borough in terms of the Community Plan and its key priorities which should be protected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young Person’s Strategy</td>
<td>This strategy identifies a number of priorities related to leisure activities in the Borough for young people. A list of potential new sites, together with reviews of their appropriateness is contained in the strategy.</td>
<td>The consultation process (particularly the IT Young People’s Survey) and the audit of young people’s provision across the whole Borough will contribute to greater understanding and will lead to more informed allocation of resources for improvements.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SECTION 3 – STRATEGIC CONTEXT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic document</th>
<th>Key themes</th>
<th>Relevance to study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sports Facilities Strategy</td>
<td>This strategy guides the development of built sports facilities over the next 10-15 years.</td>
<td>The findings and recommendations of this strategy can inform and be informed by a borough-wide indoor sports strategy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Northamptonshire Green Infrastructure Study</td>
<td>This document provides a strategic framework for Green Infrastructure within the sub region.</td>
<td>The consultation and audit of all open space, particularly green corridors will contribute to understanding of provision in the Borough. The study will also help to identify priority sites and help to protect open space from development through the setting of relevant local provision standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kettering Masterplan 2005</td>
<td>This identifies the vision for the development of the town over the next 15 years.</td>
<td>The focus of the masterplan is on built development within the town area. This study will complement the masterplan through recommendations on open space provision in the town and surrounding parts of the Borough.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desborough Town Centre Urban Design Framework</td>
<td>This is a long term strategy for improving the town centre which identifies a number of long term initiatives.</td>
<td>Specific improvements to open spaces referred to within the Framework will feed into the review of current open space provision in the Desborough Town area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burton Latimer Urban Design Framework</td>
<td>Provides a series of strategic concepts for the regeneration of Burton Latimer Town Centre.</td>
<td>Included in the regeneration are improvements and additional provision of open space in the Town Centre. It also identifies the importance of incorporating provision guidelines into the local development framework to assist in redevelopment projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic document</td>
<td>Key themes</td>
<td>Relevance to study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Capacity Study, Kettering Borough Urban Areas</td>
<td>This study identified potential areas for housing development areas within the Borough’s urban areas. The study excluded areas protected by the Local Plan although the allotments at Shotwell Mill Lane, Rothwell were considerably underused and were considered a potential urban capacity site.</td>
<td>By setting local provision standards, this study will contribute to planning for development and associated open space in the Borough, both now and in the future.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION 4

CONSULTATION
Consultation

Introduction

4.1 As outlined in Section 2, a series of consultations were undertaken as part of the local needs assessment to establish the views on open space provision amongst both users and non users across the Borough.

4.2 Consultations were carried out with many organisations and individuals through various methods such as one-to-one meetings, telephone calls, questionnaires, drop in sessions and by email. These consultation methods included:

- **household survey** – surveys were distributed to 5,000 randomly selected residents across Kettering, calculated using population statistics for the different analysis areas
- **sports club surveys** to all sports clubs (contacts provided by the Council)
- **young peoples IT survey** – a letter and information pack was sent out to all the primary and secondary schools in the Borough
- **drop in sessions** – drop in sessions were held at three different locations across the Borough including Gold Street, Kettering; Tesco Extra Store, Rothwell; and Desborough Library
- **consultations with external agencies** such as local allotment groups, English Heritage, the Environmental Agency, and the Countryside Agency
- **internal consultations** with Council officers (across a range of Council departments including planning, leisure and sports development)
- a survey distributed to all parish councils in the Borough to ascertain their views on open space and outdoor facilities in the Borough.

4.3 The information gained from these consultations has been used to inform the study and to help understand:

- the key issues/problems facing different Council departments and agencies
- the needs and requirements of local residents
- the attitudes and expectations for open space
- good and bad points about the existing provision
- existing open space, sport and recreation provision at a strategic level.

Consultation

4.4 The information collected through the consultation is invaluable to this report and forms the basis of the recommended local standards.

4.5 Below is a summary of how the consultations have been used to inform the study and where the information and statistics can be found relevant to quality, quantity and accessibility.
Household survey

4.6 The household survey is one of the most important features of the consultation, providing a number of randomly selected households to comment on provision, quality and accessibility of open space, sport and recreation facilities specifically relating to their analysis area of residence (allows geographic and distributional analysis) as well as being given the opportunity to comment on any site specific issues within their locality.

4.7 The household survey was sent to households in each of the six analysis areas:
- analysis area 1 – Welland (rural north)
- analysis area 2 – Slade (rural west)
- analysis area 3 – Loatland, St Giles, Tresham, Trinity (Rothwell/DesBorough)
- analysis area 4 – Brambleside, All Saints, Avondale, St Andrew’s Warkton, Millbrook, Spinney, St Mary’s, Piper’s Hill, St Michael’s, St Peter’s, Barton, Wicksteed (Kettering)
- analysis area 5 – Latimer, Plessy (Burton Latimer)
- analysis area 6 – Buccleuch, Queen Eleanor (rural east).

4.8 670 postal surveys were returned, providing a statistically sound sample that can be used to assume responses for the remaining population within the Borough. 3% of respondents were from analysis area 1, 4% from area 2, 21% from area 3, 61% from area 4, 8% from area 5 and 3% from area 6. 43% of all respondents were male. 2% of all responses were from individuals aged under 16, 5% between 16-24, 21% between 25-39, 39% between 40-59, 25% 60-75, and 7% over 75. 30% of those questioned had children under 16 in the household. The largest demographic group of respondents (12%) were female, aged 40-59 from analysis area 4.

4.9 There are specific questions in the household questionnaire which directly input into the standard setting process, for example, asking respondents whether they consider there to be enough of each typology of open space and requesting a reason for this answer. This provides a sound statistical basis for the quantity standards and can be further analysed to assess for example whether people feel there is not enough due to the need for better quality facilities or a need for additional facilities.

4.10 Detailed analysis of the household survey can be found in the specific typology sections (Sections 5-13), as well as the justification of standards in the appendices I, J and K.

Sports club survey

4.11 The sports club surveys form part of the information collected to inform standards and recommendations on outdoor sports facilities. Surveys were sent to a large number of sports clubs in Kettering, as well as reminder cards the week before the survey return date. Surveys were returned from the following 33 clubs:
- Burton Latimer Tennis Club
- Ise Bowling Club
- Valley Park Rangers FC
- Kiddy Capers Pre-School Gymnastics
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• Kettering Town Table Tennis Club
• Kettering Athletics Mixed Bowling Club
• Kettering Ladies Bowling Club
• Burton Grange United Football Club
• Desborough Squash Club
• Barton Seagrave Cricket Club
• Kettering Badminton Club and Kettering Junior
• Badminton Club
• Kettering Global Taekwondo Club
• Kettering Hockey Club
• Kettering Disabled Swimming Club
• Weekley and Warkton Cricket Club
• Kettering and Corby Squash Club
• Kettering Olympic Gymnastics Club

• Kettering Weekley Vale United Football Club
• Kettering Town Football Club
• FC Unit
• Kettering Tennis Club
• Pytchley Golf Lodge
• Geddington Cricket Club
• Kettering Stirrupcup FC
• Leathercraftsman Football Club
• RothBorough Table Tennis Club
• Kettering Rugby Football Club
• Rothwell Manor Park Bowling Club
• Alfa Netball Club
• Kettering Park Rovers Football Club
• DesBorough Football Club.
• Desborough Striders
• Desborough Tennis Club
• Desborough Town Cricket Club
• F.C Leisure Force
• FC Harris
• Geddington Tennis Club
• Geddington WMC FC
• Greenbank FC
• Harlequin Sunday FC
• Highfield FC
• Howdenbeath FC
• Ise Lodge Girls FC
• Ise Lodge Hearts FC
• Ise Lodge Mini Soccer FC
• Ise Lodge Youths FC
• Isham Cricket Club
• Kettering & District Table Tennis League
• Kettering Amateur Boxing Club
• Kettering Amateur Swimming Club
• Kettering Archers
• Kettering Cycling Club
• Kettering General’s Youth FC
• Kettering General’s Youth Girls FC
• Kettering General’s Youth Mini Soccer FC
• Kettering Golf Club
• Kettering Grange United Football Club FC
• Kettering Grange United Mini Soccer FC
• Kettering Grange United Youth FC
• Kettering Integrated Disability Sports and Social Club
• Kettering Ladies Hockey Club
• Kettering Lodge Bowling Club Limited
• Kettering Men’s Hockey Club
• Kettering Pike Angling Club
• Kettering Premier Judo Club
• Kettering Rugby Squash Club
• Kettering School of Boxing
• Kettering Town Cricket & Sports Club
• Kettering Town Cricket Club
• Kettering Town Girls Mini Soccer FC
• Kettering Town Girls Youth FC
• Kettering Town Harriers
• Kettering Town Ladies & Girls FC
• Kettering Town Ladies FC
• Kettering Town Social Club FC
• Kettering Town Womens FC
4.12 The following points summarise the main issues which arose from the sport club surveys:

- Kettering Town Youth FC
- Kettering Trampolining Club
- Kettering United Girls FC
- Kettering United Girls Mini Soccer FC
- Kettering United Ladies FC
- Ketton FC
- Ketton Juniors FC
- KLV Lawn Tennis Club
- Loddington Cricket Club
- McAlpine Bowling Club
- Mercenaries FC
- Midland Band Bowling Club
- Montagu Sports FC
- Nene Bowmen
- Nene Valley Hybrids
- Netball Club
- Nomads FC
- Northants Inline Skating Club
- Old Cricket Club
- Orchard Park FC
- Orchard Park Girls FC
- Orchard Park Youth FC
- Park House FC
- Park Rovers FC
- Prince Of Wales FC
- Punjab United FC
- Rising Sun FC
- Rothwell and Desborough Angling Club
- Rothwell Town Cricket Club
- Rothwell Town FC
- Satra Storm FC
- School of Wrestling
- Shotokan Karate
- Spinney Tennis Club
- T James United FC
- Tavern FC
- Tyetune FC
- Ventura Vikings FC
- Weekley Rover Youth FC
- Weekley Rovers Mini Soccer FC
- Wilbarston Wanderers Youth FC
- William Knibb Disabled Bowls Club
- Woolcomber FC
- Xtra FC
the overall provision of facilities in terms of quantity was considered to be average to poor, with 36% of clubs perceiving quantity in the Borough to be poor or very poor, 46% average and 18% good.

key issues regarding the deficiency in quantity of facilities were:

- shortage of grass pitches and perception of increasing demand coupled with decreasing supply
- shortage of synthetic turf pitches (STPs) facilities or alternative and equivalent indoor facilities
- shortage of public tennis courts.

the quality of facilities in the Borough was considered to be average to good, with 33% of clubs perceiving quality of provision to be good and 49% average and only 18% suggesting facilities were poor or very poor.

the accessibility of facilities within the Borough was considered to be average to good with 39% of sports clubs considering accessibility to facilities to be good or very good and 45% average. This demonstrates that although a shortfall in provision may currently exist that the geographic distribution and availability of facilities and perceived ease of access via various modes of transport is at a satisfactory level.

sports clubs were asked to identify additional new facilities they would like to see in the Borough:

- floodlit STP facility
- sports halls
- changing rooms and ancillary accommodation for football teams (particularly those using Weekley Glebe).

Sports clubs were asked to rate the facilities they had used, on a scale from 1 (poor) to 5 (very good). Both the location and the appearance of these facilities had good scores. However, a number of clubs felt that the accessibility by public transport was poor.

Table 4.1 below, illustrates how clubs rate the overall provision of leisure facilities within Kettering. 55% of sports clubs rated current provision as good or very good for their specific main facility in terms of location, range of facilities, appearance, ease of booking, access to public transport, and helpfulness of staff.

However, the same percentage think that existing facilities do not meet the full or future needs of their club/organisation, possibility due to size of facility and current or potential demand amongst members. It was also found that although an overall score may indicate satisfaction there are specific particulars, such as pricing or availability of pitches that place restrictions on the club and their activities. This indicates that while facilities may be rated as adequate there is scope for improvements.
Table 4.1 Leisure facilities provision within Kettering Borough

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating for provision of leisure facilities</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No reply</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.17 Some specific comments were made regarding the poor quality and the high cost of provision at Kettering Leisure Village. Also, a large number of the football clubs using Weekley Glebe commented upon the inadequacy of changing facilities.

4.18 Overall, the major theme running through the sports club consultation was the perception of a general shortage of many types of sports facilities in the Borough.

**Young people’s IT survey**

4.19 The young people’s IT survey is perhaps one of the more exciting consultation methods, where young people are given the opportunity to comment on open space and sports facilities within the Borough through their IT or Geography lessons at school. Alternatively it could be set as a homework exercise (for children with internet access at home). The aim was to ascertain the views of young people throughout the Borough as the household survey generally has an older person bias. As questionnaires were distributed at the school and most schools generally have a reasonably wide catchment area it is felt that opinions expressed by the children provide a justifiable borough-wide sample, especially as respondents are commenting on all open space sites that they visit.

4.20 The questionnaire was set up as an online exercise and this enabled as many children as possible to complete the questionnaire simultaneously. A guidance pack and letter were sent to all the secondary and primary schools in the Borough, enabling children to complete the questionnaires over the Internet.

4.21 539 responses were received from pupils attending the following schools:

- St. Edwards Primary Catholic School
- Pytchley Church of England Primary School
- Havelock Junior School
- Meadowside Junior School
- Bishop Storford School
- Southfield School for Girls.
Respondee background

4.22 There was a broad range of respondees, however the majority (57%) were of junior/primary school age, whilst the remaining 43% were secondary or above age. The gender split was 24% male and 76% female.

Open spaces used

4.23 Respondees were asked which types of open space they had visited in the last year. The most popular open space type was parks (used by 86% of children). Play areas and footpaths/cycleways have also been well used by 68% of respondents in the last year. Only 3% of children had not used any open spaces in the last year. Full results are shown in the table below:

Table 4.2 Open space use of respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Open space type</th>
<th>% of children using in the last year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodland, meadows, grassland</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grassy area within a housing development, village greens</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Play areas</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teenage facility / Youth shelter</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footpaths, cycleways</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor sport facilities</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allotments</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Churchyards and cemeteries</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.24 Of those aged over 12 (at senior school) the most popular type of open space again was parks (84% using this typology at least once a year) followed by footpaths and cycleways (63%). Within this demographic group play areas (56%) were used considerably more than teenage facilities (24%).

4.25 For the very few children who had reported not visiting any open space sites in the past year, the reasons cited included lack of time, lack of interest and the sites being too great a distance from home.
Site usage

4.26 Children were asked which open space site they used most regularly and how frequently they used it. The sites were various. Nearly half of respondents (43%) indicated that they used their particular site only occasionally. 8% indicated that they used the site monthly, 32% weekly and 17% that they used the site daily. Of those that visited their most frequented open space site most often (daily and weekly) the most used typologies were parks (28%) and outdoor sports facilities (19%). Play areas or youth shelters were only used by 4% and churches and cemeteries 1%. Wicksteed Park was most commonly sighted as a specific site visited most frequently.

4.27 The most popular transport method was by car (51%), followed by walking (34%) and cycling (9%). 4% used the bus, 2% skated and 1% caught the train. Of those that used car, train or bus, the site identified as most frequented was mainly visited less than once a month (55%), demonstrating that those who rely on transportation tend to use open space least. The most popular sites amongst this transportation group were still parks and outdoor sports facilities. A large proportion of this group were aged 8-12 (69%).

4.28 The vast majority of children (85%) were able to get to their most used open space in 15 minutes or less via a variety of modes of transport. Of those that walked 50% would reach their destination in under 5 minutes, 30% between 5-10 minutes and only 2% over 30 minutes. Of the children who suggested it took them over 15 minutes to reach their open space site, 22% walked, 59% took the car, 5% skated and 12% the bus; the most noted destinations that took over 15 minutes to reach were footpaths and cycleways (22%) and parks (18%). The breakdown for transport times to most used open spaces is shown in the table below:

Table 4.3 Travel time of respondents to open spaces

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Travel time to most frequented open space (via normal mode of transport)</th>
<th>% of children travelling this amount of time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 5 minutes</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 – 10 minutes</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 – 15 minutes</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 – 20 minutes</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 – 30 minutes</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 30 minutes</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.29 Also examined were the reasons why children choose to use open spaces. The most popular reason was to meet friends (43%). Other popular reasons were “to get some exercise” (34%) and “to get some fresh air” (24%). Table 4.4 shows the breakdown of reasons given for using open spaces:
Table 4.4 Reason for open space usage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason for using open space</th>
<th>% of children stating this reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To use playground/play equipment</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To play on the sports pitches</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for a kickabout/informal play</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To meet friends</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To go for a walk</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To take the dog for a walk</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To get some fresh air</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To get some exercise</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To picnic/eat</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To sit and relax</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To read</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To look at scenery</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.30 We asked the children to comment specifically on what it is that they like most about the open space that they had chosen. The most popular themes were:

- they can take their dog for a walk there
- the site is located close to home
- facilities that are provided at the site (eg play equipment)
- accessibility (eg they are open all day and are free to use)
- the opportunity to exercise or do ‘sporty things’.

4.31 Children were asked what they like least about the open space in question. The most popular theme for this response was the general appearance of the site in terms of litter, dog fouling and vandalism. Of the 377 responses to this particular question, 55% referred to this issue as the thing they least liked about the open space. Emphasising this point; when asked specifically if they thought that open spaces in the Borough were well maintained (definition examples given), 27% replied “no” and 53% replied, “some are but others are not.” The remaining 20% thought that they were well maintained. Of those that believed sites were not generally well maintained the most common issues were regarding the general appearance of the site such as dog fouling, litter and vandalism. Of those that indicated that supply of open space was ‘poor’ or ‘very poor’, it took 28% over 15 minutes to reached their most frequented destination, 43% by walking, 35% by car and 13% cycling.

4.32 Children were asked what they felt about the overall quantity and quality of open space in the Borough. These scores indicated that children felt that there was a good amount of open space:
• 89% of children felt that there was fair, good or very good amount of open space
• 80% of children rated the quality of open space as fair, good or very good
• 15% felt quality was poor or very poor (5% didn’t express an opinion).

4.33 Children were also asked if they felt safe using open spaces in the Borough. 68% replied that they did feel safe while the remaining 32% did not feel safe. The main reason for those that do not feel safe is being threatened and frightened of older people that are also using the open spaces. Of those that did not feel safe only 5% sighted play areas and 10% outdoor sports facilities as sites they visit most often; two typologies that are considerably lower than the average spread.

4.34 The detailed results and analysis from this consultation can be found in the specific typology sections (Sections 5-13), particularly in Section 8: Provision for Children and Young People, as well as the justification of standards in the appendices (Appendices I, J and K).

**Drop in sessions**

4.35 The drop in sessions provide the chance for any member of the public within Kettering to comment informally on open space within their local area. The sessions were advertised in the local press and held across three different locations, providing an opportunity for everyone to comment.

4.36 A number of people attended the drop ins and provided comments on quality, accessibility, site specific issues and general examples of good and bad practice within the Borough. These comments have been fed into the individual typology sections (5-13) and used to inform the recommended local standards (Appendices I, J and K).

4.37 A total of three drop in sessions were held on the 5th and 6th December. The locations were:

- Gold Street, Kettering
- Desborough Library
- Rothwell Tesco Extra.

4.38 These locations were chosen, in conjunction with the Council, for two reasons. Firstly due to the potential of a high footfall and, secondly, to ensure that views from residents based in different areas were ascertained.

4.39 These sessions tended to generate site specific comments. Positive comments were received regarding:

- Weekley Glebe as a frequently used site, especially for youth football
- good provision for young children up to 10 years of age in Rothwell
- the churchyard near Kettering Swimming Pool is a good site, particularly popular in the summer for sitting outside and eating lunch
- Desborough Leisure Centre is a well used site that is very well maintained
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- Park Road/Pleasure Park is an example of a ‘good’ park of high quality and is easily accessible to the public and popular for dog walking
- Millennium Green is popular for events with good provision of cricket pitches by the Leisure Centre.

4.40 Negative comments included:

- There is a notably poor amenity green space along London Road
- the loss of Brambleside allotments to development is a concern for residents
- there are problems with noise, graffiti and loitering of youths at the Rockingham Road Pleasure Park
- there are too many gangs in parks, hence parks need ‘park keepers’
- need more facilities for older children, such as good quality youth/hang out shelters
- there is widespread concern over the gradual loss of countryside to industrial development, particularly in Barton Seagrave, and the loss of the “rural nature and distinctiveness” of the Borough
- allotments perceived to be poorly maintained throughout the Borough
- common perception of misuse of play areas by older children and drug users, a particularly bad site is the skateboard park in Mill Road
- civic spaces need improvement, the clock in the town centre is an “eye sore”
- skateboards parks are poorly maintained and designed, examples include Highfield Road Recreation Ground, Kettering
- the Greening Road Park site in Rothwell should contain equipment which can be used by disabled children
- Well Lane Recreation Ground is poorly used and damaged by vandals,
- dog fouling and litter are common issues at recreation grounds throughout the Borough
- generally, natural and semi-natural wild spaces are not accessible by public transport
- many pocket parks, such as Hall Farm Pocket Park, are unsafe and overgrown, lacking natural surveillance and lighting
- amenity greenspace at Edinburgh Close is poorly maintained.

Internal consultation

4.41 The internal consultation is another important and key feature of the study, as it provides an overview of Council plans, roles of officers and expectations from another perspective. A number of key individuals within different Council departments were met through this consultation phase.
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4.42 Face to face interviews were conducted with each of the internal officers and these consultations were used to inform the setting of local standards for the various types of open space in the Borough.

4.43 This also feeds into the separate sections of the report (Sections 5-13) and setting of local standards and subsequent analysis of current provision (Appendices I, J and K).

4.44 The main points that were derived from this phase of the consultation process were (Full details available in Appendix D):

- the level of open space usage across Kettering Borough is high. Not many complaints regarding quality have been received although vandalism is an issue, in particular at play areas
- people in Kettering Town are generally inclined to pay less for leisure facilities. Many residents, especially in rural areas use sites outside of the Borough such as at Corby, Market Harborough and Leicester
- open space will be an important factor within currently planned urban extensions in Kettering (to the east of the town), Desborough and Rothwell. On a strategic level there is a concern regarding provision of major sporting facilities in North Northants
- the realisation that new developments need to offer significant open space to cater for higher population densities, especially in Kettering, and a reduction in private garden sizes. Money from section 106 must be prioritised for open space and the projects monitored right through the process of adoption and maintenance
- the need for more sports pitches (including informal kick-about areas) and reorganising of playing times to alleviate current pressure on changing facilities. Demand for more tennis courts exists due to a considerable undersupply
- in regard to children’s play areas and in particular youth facilities it is felt that larger facilities that offer a wider catchment area and financially and practically more viable as they are easier to manage and therefore offer greater quality and target specific age groups. Play areas are inspected daily
- it is difficult to protect smaller amenity greenspaces that have little recreational function and exist only for visual purposes. There is limited access to natural and semi-natural sites in rural areas due to a limited footpath network and a large amount of land that is private or arable.

External consultation

4.45 A contact list of external agencies and neighbouring local authorities was provided by the Council and a questionnaire was sent out asking them to complete any relevant sections on ownership and management, quality, quantity, accessibility and general comments relating to open space within the Borough.

4.46 Some key external consultees that did not respond to the questionnaire were consulted via telephone.
4.47 This information is fed through into the individual sections (5-13) and provides a broad overview of strategic issues relating to open space.

4.48 A summary of several of the more prominent views is shown below (Full details available in Appendix D):

- importance of protection of sites against development and promotion of good management, especially areas offering biodiversity (The Wildlife Trust)
- the building on green field sites, primarily threatening villages east of Kettering (Rockingham Forest Trust)
- design of parks directly causes much of the anti-social behaviour (focus was on Mill Road Park) and subsequent low level of use from residents. Need for better provision of open spaces in populated urban areas that offer good signage, basic amenities and are well promoted (Groundwork UK)
- need for a greater promotion of green corridors in order to achieve greater usage levels (Ramblers Association).

Parish Council consultation

4.49 The Parish Councils within Kettering own and manage a significant amount of open spaces within the Borough. As important land stakeholders, consultations were carried out with the clerk of each parish.

4.50 Table 4.5 below provides a summary of comments from each parish survey:

Table 4.5 Parish Council consultation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish Council</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stoke Albany</td>
<td>Allotments, footpaths, pocket parks and the village green are all sites that are valued and well used by the local community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Braybrooke</td>
<td>There is no public open space in the village apart from a cemetery and a small number of footpaths and bridleways.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weston-by-Welland</td>
<td>The churchyard at St Mary’s the Virgin Church is well maintained with grass being regularly mown and good care taken of the pathways around the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutton Basset</td>
<td>The only open space in the village is the small green surrounding the churchyard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pytchley</td>
<td>The Borough Council has assisted with providing maintenance and equipment of Pytchley Recreation Ground. However, they have not yet provided fencing for the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilbarston</td>
<td>There are a large number of sites in Wilbarston, many of which are of high quality and well used. The sites thought to be examples of particularly good practice include the churchyard, the village green, the children’s play area, the football pitch, and the allotment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish Council</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loddington</td>
<td>Loddington Playing Field is a high quality and well used outdoor sports facility as well as a children's play area. Loddington Glebe Field, Harrington Road Field and Loddington Hall Avenue all serve as well used public rights of way. Mawsley Lane Nature Park provides educational benefit to the school classes who use this site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barton Seagrave Parish Council</td>
<td>Castle Field County Wildlife Site and Southfield Farm Marsh (SSSI) were identified as sites of good practice, which are well used by the local population. There is an issue with the lack of sports pitches in the parish, since the only pitches in the area are privately owned by Latimer Arts College.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dingley Parish Council</td>
<td>There are no open spaces within the parish according to returned survey.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary**

4.51 A variety of consultation methods have been undertaken within the Borough of Kettering to inform the assessment of local needs. This has resulted in an excellent response ensuring confidence in the statistical information analysed.

4.52 The findings of the consultation feed directly into the standard setting process, which can be found within the explanation for each of the quantity, quality and accessibility standards within Sections 5 -13 and Appendices I, J and K.
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PARKS AND GARDENS
SECTION 5 – PARKS AND GARDENS

Parks and gardens

Definition

5.1 This type of open space includes urban parks and formal gardens that provide opportunities for various informal recreation and community events, within settlement boundaries. A further green infrastructure study will identify country park requirements.

5.2 This typology also has many wider benefits as supported by the site assessments. Parks provide a sense of place for the local community, help to address any social inclusion issues within wider society and also provide some form of structural and landscaping benefits to the surrounding local area. They also frequently offer ecological benefits, particularly in more urban areas.

Figure 5.1 – Wicksteed Park

Strategic context and consultation

Strategic context

5.3 The Green Flag Award is the National Standard for parks and greenspaces, therefore creating a benchmark of excellence in recreational green areas. There are annual applications and successful parks and green spaces retain their status for one year, after which they have to reapply to retain the award. Although a large number of sites are parks and gardens, the criteria for an award extends across recreational greenspaces including nature reserves, millennium greens and allotments.

5.4 The Green Flag Award criterion is incorporated into the site assessments undertaken across all open spaces for the purposes of this study.

5.5 Kettering Local Plan (1995) encourages the establishment of a country park in the Borough, with a site in Desborough identified for this use.
Consultation

5.6 Consultation specific to parks and garden sites highlights some meaningful statistics and provides a justification for setting local standards against local needs. Some of the general issues are detailed below.

Importance and usage

- 97% of people responding to the household survey felt that parks and gardens were important in Kettering, the highest response rate across the typologies. 64% of all respondents to the household survey use parks and gardens either daily, weekly or monthly (the highest level of usage across weekly – monthly usage)

- of those that used the park on a weekly basis the most popular reason amongst residents for their visit was for fresh air (sighted by 86% of residents), for walking (85%), to take children out (59%) and to observe wildlife (54%). The most popular reason of fresh air equates to 12% of all suggestions made overall for visiting parks and gardens. The least popular reasons for visiting parks and gardens were for educational reasons (only sighted by 9% of residents), to walk the dog (28%) and as a meeting place (28%). The least popular reason of using parks and gardens for educational reason equates to 1% of all suggestions made. (Results based on the household survey)

- this is reflected in the young people’s IT survey where 86% of respondents used parks and gardens in the last year (the highest response across the typologies)

- Wicksteed Park was the most frequently used park and garden by respondents to the household survey followed by:
  - Rockingham Road Pleasure Park (considered of high value at the drop in sessions)
  - Desborough Recreation Ground.

- high usage rates of parks and gardens were also supported through the internal consultations and drop in sessions.

Key quality issues

- internal consultations identified Rockingham Road Pleasure Park for its good quality and previous Green Flag Award status. Gray’s Fields will be submitted for a Green Flag Award in the near future

- from the household survey responses, the highest rated aspiration is for sites to be clean and litter free. Adequate lighting was the highest rated safety factor

- vandalism and graffiti (44% of responses regarding this specific problem), litter (47%) and dog fouling (40%) were considered to be minor problems, and anti-social behaviour was found to be of no problem (45%) by the largest number of respondents to the household survey. Across all problem issues considered to be significant most respondents (31%) identified litter as the greatest concern
issues identified in the drop in sessions covered a range of problems including noise, graffiti, groups loitering, dog fouling and litter

• drop in sessions also identified a need for park keepers

• internal consultations identified Mill Road and Meadow Road Park as the sites causing the largest problems in terms of anti social behaviour and vandalism.

Current position

5.7 There are currently 22 park and garden sites in the Borough, a relatively high number for the size of the Borough, although these range from parks providing a range of facilities to formal garden facilities.

5.8 Rockingham Road Pleasure Park has repeatedly been awarded the Green Flag Award. Information on the Green Flag Award website (www.greenflagaward.org.uk) indicates that this site does not currently hold this status, although this is due to the council not applying for the renewal. Gray’s Fields will be submitted for the award in the near future.

5.9 Wicksteed Park differs from other facilities in the area in that it is a commercial facility with rides and attractions. The attractions at the park are split into four areas; playground area, arcade area, lakeside area and arena area including the larger rides.

Figure 5.2 Selection of facilities available at Wicksteed Park (www.wicksteedpark.co.uk)

5.10 Rushton Hall, Wicksteed Park and at Harrington, which are included in the register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest in England. These areas are of national importance and are protected in the Local Plan (policy 26) from development which would affect the site or its setting. With exception of Wicksteed Park these sites have been excluded from the analysis stage, as their main purpose is not to offer local amenity open space provision.

5.11 Parks are open spaces that contain a variety of amenities, including provision for children, young people and outdoor sports facilities, fulfilling a variety of functions and providing a valuable asset to the community. In terms of the open space audit, sites with other facilities within them are broken down to the different components (eg play areas, sports facilities) with these contained areas calculated separately and excluded from the remaining land, which is then included in the audit as a park and garden.
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Setting provision standards

5.12 In setting local standards for parks and gardens there is a need to take into account any national or local standards, current provision, other local authority standards for appropriate comparison, site assessments and consultation on local needs. Full justifications for the recommended local standards are provided within Appendices I, J, K and L and the methodology for standard setting in Section 2. A country park standard is something that may be considered as part of a future green infrastructure study.

Quantity Standard (see Appendix I – standards and justification, worksheet and calculator)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing level of provision</th>
<th>Recommended standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban (areas 3,4,5) 0.22ha per 1000 population (excluding Wicksteed Park)</td>
<td>0.3 ha per 1000 population</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PMP Justification

There is a general emphasis on the level of provision being enough and a good level of satisfaction with the quality of existing parks and gardens.

Parks and gardens are located only within the urban analysis areas of Burton Latimer, Desborough and Rothwell. Despite this consultations from the rural analysis areas shown a similar level of satisfaction to the urban areas, suggesting that there is an acceptance that traditional parks and gardens provision is not appropriate within the rural villages.

However when both the overall provision (0.2ha) and the provision in the urban area only (0.22ha) are benchmarked against other local authorities, the level of provision is very low. The level of provision in other authorities ranges from 0.51 to 2.85ha per 1000 population, with a number around 0.5ha/1000 population. This does however exclude Wicksteed Park which is noted in the consultations as ensuring that the borough has sufficient provision as it is a large and varied facility. This also excludes sites which are included under other open space typologies but which provide multi-functional open spaces helping to alleviate deficiencies in certain areas, e.g. Ise Valley (Valley Walk) and Pocket Parks.

In light of the relatively low level of provision, the standard should be raised higher than the existing level of provision. However due to the general levels of satisfaction, it is recommended that this be a slight increase to 0.3ha. This will ensure that the existing level of provision is protected, that locational deficiencies can be prioritised through the application of the accessibility standards (potentially in Burton Latimer where levels of satisfaction were lower) and to ensure there is sufficient park provision to meet increasing demands.

The need for a naturalised area of open space/country park will be addressed through the natural and semi-natural open space standard and other sites that provide multi-functional open spaces will be addressed in other typologies but may be referred to within the parks and gardens analysis.
SECTION 5 – PARKS AND GARTENS

5.13 The average level of total provision in analysis areas 3 and 4 is above the existing and recommended standard although this standard is based on a strategic borough-wide provision and therefore takes into account all areas and their population.

**Quality Standard (see Appendices J and L)**

| A welcoming, clean and litter free site providing a one-stop community facility with a wide range of leisure, recreational and enriched play opportunities for all ages. Parks and gardens should be well maintained, providing varied vegetation, clear pathways, appropriate lighting and ancillary accommodation (including seating and litter bins) and well-signed to and within the site. Sites should have a written management plan and measures should be taken to address identified issues at these sites. |
| Quality benchmark: 83% |
| PMP Justification |

*With an existing aim of improving the quality of Parks and Gardens in Kettering and emphasis placed on retaining Green Flag status and achieving this accreditation at other sites it is essential that the Council implement a quality standard so as to improve provision across the whole borough. The recommended standard incorporates the National Green Flag Award criteria for quality, safety, recreation benefit and facility mix. However, owing to the nature of our methodology in line with PPG17 it is important that local community aspirations form the basis of the local standards. Therefore, it is suggested that parks should be clean and litter free and provide a mix of appropriate recreational and ancillary facilities. The standard has been formulated to ensure that park provision is sustainable, balanced and ultimately achievable. The improvement of quality and accessibility to parks, the addressing of key issues restricting usage and the promotion of best practice sites such as Rockingham Road Pleasure Park should increase local aspirations and encourage usage of Parks.*

**Accessibility Standard (see Section 2.31 and Appendix K)**

| 10 minutes walk (480 metres) |
| PMP Justification |

*There is a large majority in favour of walking to parks and gardens facilities both in terms of current travel patterns and expectations. The standard is set at 10 minutes walking to parks and gardens, based on the 75% threshold level borough-wide (PPG17 compliant). The median and average support the 75% threshold as they are close at 8.8 and 10.4 minutes. This is also supported on the whole through the responses at an analysis area level which range from 5 – 10 minutes.

This standard is in line with the standard set for other authorities in the area as these range from 10 – 15 minutes. There is therefore a slightly higher expectation than in some authorities with the emphasis being on 10 minutes (and even 5 minutes) rather than 15 minutes. This may be due to the importance placed on parks and gardens by residents and the council alike increasing local expectations.*
Applying provision standards – identifying geographical areas

5.14 In order to identify geographical areas of importance and those areas with required local needs we apply both the quantitative provision of parks and gardens with the local standard for accessibility. The quantity standards enable the identification of areas that do not meet the minimum provision standards, while the accessibility standards will help determine where those deficiencies are of high importance. Applying the standards together is a much more meaningful method of analysis than applying the standards separately and therefore helps with the prioritisation of sites.

The current supply of parks and gardens in the Borough of Kettering is below the recommended local standard of 0.3ha per 1,000 population for this typology. This current level of supply can be broken down by analysis areas, the following table highlights where there are quantitative shortfalls or surpluses in the relevant analysis areas:

Table 5.1 – Analysis area breakdown for provision of parks and gardens

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analysis area</th>
<th>Current Level of Provision</th>
<th>Shortfall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>no existing sites</td>
<td>-0.3ha per 1,000 population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>no existing sites</td>
<td>-0.3ha per 1,000 population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.47ha per 1,000 population</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.13ha per 1,000 population</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.05ha per 1,000 population</td>
<td>-0.25ha per 1,000 population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>no existing sites</td>
<td>-0.3ha per 1,000 population</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.15 The breakdown of analysis areas shows that there is currently no provision in half of the analysis areas – these are Welland, Buccleuch and Queen Eleanor; and Slade. Of the three areas that do have provision, two are significantly above the minimum standard whilst the third (Burton Latimer) is significantly below.

5.16 The household survey indicated that the highest demand for additional parks and gardens is from residents in analysis area 5 (43% of residents in this area). This supports the quantity analysis that demonstrates a significant shortfall in this urban area of 0.25ha deficit per 1,000 population. The least demand for additional sites was from areas 2 (14% of residents from this area suggesting there isn’t enough), area 1 (16%) and area 6 (22%). These three areas with least demand are also where no parks or gardens currently exist, however they do contain significantly more amenity greenspace and natural and semi-natural sites. Respondents from the household survey were asked to base their responses directly on provision with their analysis area.

5.17 Projecting this forward to 2021 (justification in Section 2.26) and assuming no further parks and gardens are provided it is predicted that the current level of provision falls to 0.16 hectares per 1,000 population for the whole Borough (excluding Wicksteed Park) and 0.18 hectares per 1,000 population in the urban analysis areas. Appendix I shows the full calculations for the quantitative supply of open spaces in the Borough. As the provision analysis is currently skewed due to the large area provisions in analysis areas 3 and 4 this estimate should only be used as a descriptive basis. Future recommendations will be based primarily on localised demand and strategically enhancing distribution of new developments of this typology.
SECTION 5 – PARKS AND GARDENS

5.18 Map 5.1 overleaf represents the spatial distribution of parks across the Borough. This map illustrates the lack of provision in analysis areas one, two and six. This is explored in greater detail on the subsequent pages.

Map 5.1 – Spatial distribution of parks and gardens in Kettering Borough
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5.19 Map 5.1 demonstrates the lack of provision in rural areas. Towns/villages without access to a park and garden include Wilbarston, Geddington and Broughton. However it is often unjustifiable for the Council to provide such facilities for these populations especially as the household survey indicates that demand is relatively low. In such areas it is important that other open spaces are available that replicate the functions of a park and garden. Typical examples of these would be large village greens or playing fields that meet much of the most popular criteria sited for use by residents in the household survey such as for fresh air, dog walking and observing wildlife.

5.20 People living in the more urban settlements should be able to access a park and garden within the accessibility catchment area, especially when other open space typologies aren’t as readily accessible. The following maps focus upon these urban areas and illustrate the areas without access.

Map 5.2 Desborough area

5.21 It can be seen from Map 5.2 that parks and garden provision in Desborough is focused upon the centre of the area with a lack of provision to the east and west. However it is notable that the east and west areas are covered well through the provision of amenity green space areas (see section seven), especially with Desborough Green Space, a large open amenity space, planned for the north east of the town. This offers the Council three different opportunities to improving the future provision of parks and gardens in this area.

- either new provision can be sought, although as an oversupply already exists in the area a possibility of redistributing the current parks and gardens should be considered following further local consultation
- optimise current amenity greenspace areas by upgrading to serve as a park and garden function. This may include increasing size, improving access and vegetation and considering reorientation within the locality. While there still exists a shortfall of amenity greenspace in the area (Table 6.1) a strategic vision should look to capitalise on the good distribution and current accessibility of these sites and aim to develop the larger sites into parks while identifying new potential smaller amenity greenspaces (possibly in collaboration with housing developments)
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- A strong recommendation would be to consider rectifying this deficiency with the provision of pocket parks in the east and west of the town. There also exists a current deficiency of natural and semi-natural areas (section 6.16) in similar strategic areas of the town. If a pocket park can be developed to provide many functions of a park or garden (planted areas, bins and benches, good accessibility/paths) then this idea should be promoted in collaboration with local demand and future management.

| P&G1 | Council to investigate upgrading amenity green spaces in the east and west of Desborough to park or garden status or consider developing two further pocket parks that offer dual use as natural and semi-natural areas as well as providing residents with many park and garden functions. Alternatively Council to aim to provide a new park or garden in both the east and west of Desborough. |

Map 5.3 Rothwell area

5.22 The Rothwell area is well covered by parks and garden provision but there are three areas on the edge of the settled area without provision. The first of these areas is the north-east edge however there is an amenity green space that provides local residents with access to open space. This site could be upgraded so that while it still offers amenity open space, elements relating to size and accessibility features are enhanced. The second site is in the north of the area but it is considered too small an area for a new park and garden to be provided for, therefore a new amenity green space would be a suitable alternative. The third area encompasses the western edge of Rothwell. Due to its size and lack of amenity green space it is recommended that it is an aim for the Council to create new park or garden provision in this area. There are also significant shortages of natural and semi-natural area in this western location, therefore if a pocket park can be developed offering many functions of a park this should be considered in relation to local demand and interest.

| P&G2 | The Council should aim to make new park and garden provision in the west of Rothwell and consider the possibility of incorporating this with a pocket park that offers natural and semi-natural features. |
5.23 Provision in Burton Latimer is based around the two sites in the centre of the town, leaving areas to the north east, west and south without provision. There is amenity green space provision in the north east and western areas, therefore the Council should concentrate on new open space provision in the south of Burton Latimer, especially as this is the only urban area currently with an undersupply of parks and gardens (0.25ha per 1,000 population). Despite there being only a small shortfall in terms of natural and semi-natural sites in the area (Table 6.1), and oversupply of amenity green space, there are still accessibility and distribution problems in the south with both typologies. It is believed that a park or garden would be most justifiable to offer local residents at least one type of open space with a variety of functions. Developments should be made following further analysis of specific localised demand.

**P&G3**
The Council to make new park and garden provision in the south of Burton Latimer.

Map 5.5 Kettering area
5.24 Map 5.5 shows that there is plentiful park and garden provision in the Kettering analysis area but there are also significant areas without provision. It should be a long-term aim for the Council that all residents in this area can reach a park or garden within a 10 minute walk-time but it is recognised that this has significant financial ramifications so it is vital to recognise areas of highest priority.

5.25 Viewing map 5.5 in conjunction with the amenity green space map shows there are two major areas without access to either type of open space. The first area (Area A) is in the northwest of Kettering and is a sparsely populated area so the Council may decide that a new amenity green space may be more appropriate.

5.26 The second area in the south of the analysis area (Area B) is again within a sparsely populated, commercial area and is close to the Wicksteed Park facility. Due to these factors the Council may again consider that the introduction of a new amenity green space would be more applicable than a new park and garden, supported by the PPG17 document (Section 15). While it is difficult to justify further park development in this analysis area due to a significant existing oversupply there is a considerable deficit of amenity green space (Table 7.1). If additional amenity green space was to be developed with the consideration of offering park and garden functions (bins, benches, paths) then thought should be given to locating this in the northern edges of the town where residents are most isolated from major existing sites.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Percentage range</th>
<th>Sample of Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>90% to 100%</td>
<td>Churchill Way Gardens (Site 871) – 92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>70% to 89%</td>
<td>Grafton Street Recreation Ground (Site 74) – 70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jubilee Gardens South (Site 114) – 80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Garden of Rest (Site 849) – 89%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Quality benchmarking

5.27 The application of the quality benchmarking standard (set at a score of 83%) provides an indication of the desired level of quality for sites and enables a comparison to be made across the Borough. It highlights sites that currently meet the visionary standard, and those sites falling significantly below, consequently suggesting where improvement is required. Table 5.2 demonstrates the quality spectrum of sites across the Borough.

5.28 Scores are based upon assessment criteria, which are set out in Appendix Ei and where determined during site visits.

Table 5.2 – example of sites above and below the benchmark quality indicator
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Percentage range</th>
<th>Sample of Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Average        | 50% to 69%       | Mill Road Park (Site 101) – 54%  
Rockingham Road Park (Site 81) – 64%  
North Park Recreation Ground (Site 79) – 68% |
| Poor           | 30% to 49%       | Westfield Gardens (Site 103) – 48% |
| Very poor      | Below 30%        | (none)          |

5.29 As can be seen by the examples in Table 5.2, the quality of parks in the Borough is high, with no sites scoring in the ‘very poor’ range and only one (Westfield Gardens) scoring poorly. Six sites (not all shown in table above) scored in the ‘average’ range, with the majority of these in the high 60’s. The largest number of sites (12) were rated ‘good’ with three sites scoring ‘very good’.

5.30 The value assessment suggests sites that have a high level of use would normally have a good or very good quality and accessibility rating. Most sites with a low level of use would have an average or poor quality and accessibility rating. This is because the factors are related and interlinked.

5.31 The average score for accessibility was 73%. These site access scores are based on site assessments, see appendix Ei for criteria. Contributing factors to this low rating included poor entrances to the site, lack of proper paths and disabled access, not served well by public transport or lack of information and signage. Sites that scored below average for accessibility were:

- Rockingham Road Pleasure Ground (Site ID 79)
- Mill Road Park (Site ID 101)
- Jubilee Gardens North (Site ID 112)
- Diana Memorial Rose Gardens Memorial, Desborough (Site ID 482)
- Well Lane Recreation Ground (Site ID 854).

5.32 The sites that scored highest for accessibility were:

- Wicksteed Park (Site ID 654)
- The Paddocks Churchill Way (Site ID 26).

5.33 The sites scoring below average for accessibility should be prioritised for improvements to ensure there is suitable access for all users and that there is informative signage in place. Issues such as disabled access, entrance points, paths and cycleways throughout a site and being close to public transport are all directly applicable to improving park access. Wicksteed Park and The Paddocks Churchill Way should be used as benchmark sites for accessibility for all other park and garden sites across the Borough.

5.34 The average score for quality was 74%. Sites that scored below the average for quality were:
• Rockingham Road Pleasure Ground (Site ID 79)
• Rockingham Road Park (Site ID 81)
• North Park Recreation Ground (Site ID 88)
• Mill Park Road (Site ID 101)
• Westfield Gardens (Site ID 103)
• Welbeck Court (Site ID 426)
• Diana Memorial Rose Gardens Memorial, Desborough (Site ID 482)
• Well Lane Recreation Ground (Site ID 854).

5.35 The highest scoring sites for quality were:
• Churchill Way Gardens (Site ID 871)
• Garden of Rest (Site ID 849)
• Beech Close NSN and Millennium Green, Desborough (Site ID 485).

5.36 The sites scoring below average for quality should be prioritised for improvements in order to maintain the usage levels and user satisfaction. Parks that are frequented most such as Rockingham Road Park may need to address management issues in order to sustain a high volume of visitors while ensuring good quality levels are maintained. The high scoring sites should set the standard in terms of achieving various elements of the assessment criteria, a basis for the other park and garden sites across the Borough to develop from. These high quality sites must be protected.

| P&G5 | Protection of all parks and gardens as they are all of high value. |
| P&G6 | Prioritise improvements for sites identified. |

Summary and recommendations

5.37 In an ideal situation all residents would be able to access a high quality park or garden site within a 10 minute walk time but it is recognised that the financial obligations incurred by the creation and maintenance of new parks and gardens required would be considerable. To this end a number of solutions are believed to be suitable for the Borough.

5.38 It is important to recognise that amenity green spaces have an important secondary function as parks and/or gardens. New and existing amenity green spaces can be used where there are only small gaps in provision or the size of the population does not warrant a new park or garden. This solution is used for the small gap in the northeast of Rothwell. It should be recognised that such an approach can place additional strain on the quality of sites and careful observation is needed to ensure quality levels do not drop.
5.39 New provision is recommended in a number of areas and this takes two forms. The first form is to redesignate existing open spaces to parks and gardens – in that case amenity green spaces. The second method is to create completely new public open space provision. It is recognised this is often a difficult route because of financial constraints and being able to find appropriate land to develop.

5.40 Due to the limited number of parks and garden sites in the Borough the importance of protection and enhancement of existing sites is amplified. Consultations demonstrated that rural demand is not sufficient to consider relocating existing parks and gardens as other open space currently suffices for resident’s needs. All current sites need to be protected from development unless improved new provision is identified. The quality of current sites is not a major issue for the Borough but the quality benchmarking has shown there is still room for improvement. The provision of a few large sized sites means that these parks and gardens will experience high user volumes. This will subsequently impact upon maintenance and management strategies, to ensure quality standards are upheld. New Comprehensive Performance Assessments will measure the public’s contentment with the quality of parks and gardens and this can be used as a helpful indicator towards quality standards.

Summary of recommendations for parks and gardens in Kettering Borough

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P&amp;G1</th>
<th>Council to investigate upgrading amenity green spaces in the east and west of Desborough to park or garden status or consider developing two further pocket parks that offer dual use as natural and semi-natural areas as well as providing residents with many park and garden functions. Alternatively Council to aim to provide a new park or garden in both the east and west of Desborough.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P&amp;G2</td>
<td>The Council should aim to make new park and garden provision in the west of Rothwell and consider the possibility of incorporating this with a pocket park that offers natural and semi-natural features.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P&amp;G3</td>
<td>The Council to make new park and garden provision in the south of Burton Latimer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P&amp;G4</td>
<td>Council to create two green spaces in the south and northwest of Kettering. Following further local consultation development of amenity greenspaces in the north of the town should consider park and garden functions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P&amp;G5</td>
<td>Protection of all parks and gardens as they are all of high value.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P&amp;G6</td>
<td>Prioritise improvements for sites identified.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION 6

NATURAL AND SEMI NATURAL OPEN SPACE
Natural and semi-natural open space

Definition

6.1 This type of open space includes woodlands, urban forestry, scrubland, grasslands (eg downlands, commons, and meadows), wetlands, nature reserves and wastelands. Its primary purpose is of wildlife conservation and bio-diversity within the settlement boundaries. Some sites have also been identified outside of settlement boundaries where public access is provided.

Figure 6.1 – Kettering Leisure Village Lake

Strategic context and consultation

Strategic context

6.2 The Local Plan recognises “the importance of the built and natural environment in the context of all human activities. The policies and proposals of the Plan recognise the need to protect and enhance the character of the Borough within a sustainable framework”. The Local Plan also refers to ‘pocket parks’ (which can be considered natural semi natural areas) in terms of the opportunity that they create for casual recreation and education.
6.3 Northamptonshire has a distinctive scheme of pocket parks, started in the 1980’s by Northamptonshire County Council. They are open areas of land that are owned and managed by local people, providing free, open access for all at all times and help to protect and conserve local wildlife, heritage and landscape. Pocket parks serve many purposes. They make a valuable contribution to the protection and conservation of Northamptonshire’s landscape, heritage and wildlife, as well as giving local people the opportunity to enhance the place in which they live or work. In addition, pocket parks can assist in the regeneration of areas as well as help to maintain existing features.

6.4 Consultation specific to natural and semi natural sites highlights some meaningful statistics and provides a justification for setting local standards against local needs:

- 94% of people responding to the household survey felt that natural and semi-natural open spaces were important in the Borough, however only 20% of people use them as the most frequently visited type of open space

- provision was considered ‘more than enough/about right’ by 43% of respondents from the household survey, whilst 53% said otherwise (nearly enough/not enough). This figure was particularly high in analysis area 5 (Burton Latimer) where 67% of people felt provision was insufficient (although levels of satisfaction were generally lower in Burton Latimer across the typologies). Of those that used this typology on a regular basis (daily, weekly, monthly) in analysis area 6, 48% indicated that there was a significant shortfall

- a large proportion of people (37%) replied to the household questionnaire stating that they used natural and semi-natural open spaces once a week or more while only a small percentage (11%) stated that they don’t use them at all

- through the Parish Council consultation, Barton Seagrave Parish Council identified both Castle Field Wildlife Site and Southfield Farm Marsh (SSSI) as sites of good practice which are well used by the local population

- general comments from the drop in sessions included the need to maintain or increase the level of provision within the Borough. Comments were made regarding some high quality sites in the borough, including Gray’s Field

- internal consultations emphasised the strategic importance of the Ise Valley site. It was considered to be a borough wide facility, which was widely used for a number of functions. Plans exist to improve the site further by increasing the level of biodiversity at the site and level of community involvement. In the future, improvements could create a country park type of facility
external consultations indicated that the emphasis at NSN sites around the borough is on protection from development and on the promotion of good management (Wildlife Trust). It was considered that there were a number of good quality sites of high biodiversity value and that these sites should be maintained and improved upon. Knowing the value of these sites is crucial in the process of environment protection and enhancement. The Wildlife Trust are currently surveying County Wildlife, SSSI and nature reserve sites to identify those sites under threat of being lost or of losing their value. They also plan to identify County Wildlife sites, which could contribute to green infrastructure.

Current position

6.5 There are 33 sites of natural and semi-natural open space across the Borough. The total area of sites is 333.32ha, which equates to 4.07ha per 1000 population. This includes three sites of above 50ha in size (Pipe Well Wood – ID 506, the disused airfield – ID 508, and Boroughton Woods – ID 519). Excluding these sites, the level of provision is 64.54ha and 0.79ha per 1000 population. This figure is much more applicable to the standard as it places focus on natural and semi-natural areas that are more centrally orientated to the majority of the population and raises the relative significance of smaller sites, situated in more urban areas that may have lost their importance if such disproportionately large sites are included.

6.6 There are 11 pocket parks across the Borough. These have all been categorised within the natural and semi natural typology due to the nature of the sites and for consistency. The pocket parks in Kettering are:

- Barton Seagrave Pocket Park (site ID 860)
- Broughton Pocket Park (site ID 660)
- Burton Latimer Pocket Park (site ID 20)
- Cranford Pocket Park (site ID 999)
- Desborough Pocket Park (site ID 457)
- Dog Kennel Spinney Pocket Park (site ID 858)
- Kettering General Hospital Pocket Park (site ID 11)
- Rothwell Pocket Park (site ID 998)
- Rushton Pocket Park (site ID 578)
- Stoke Albany Pocket Park (site ID 433)
- The Grange Pocket Park (site ID 681).

6.7 Within the context of natural and semi-natural sites, green corridors or wildlife corridors provide an important function in linking together areas of open space, often associated with woodland sites.
Setting provision standards

6.8 In setting local standards for natural and semi-natural open space there is a need to take into account any national or local standards, current provision, other local authority standards for appropriate comparison, site assessments and consultation on local needs. Full justifications for the local standards are provided within Appendices I, J, K and L.

Quantity standard (see Appendix I and Section 2.18 – standards and justification, worksheet and calculator)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing level of provision</th>
<th>Recommended standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.79ha per 1000 population</td>
<td>0.9ha per 1000 population</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Justification**

There is a slight emphasis on the level of provision not being enough which may be due to the limited public access to some sites. In terms of benchmarking against other authorities, the level of provision is lower than a number of authorities with provision ranging from 0.59ha to 3.11, with a number around 1.8ha. In terms of standards set for other authorities, this ranges from 0.5 to 8.79ha, again with a number around 1.8. The level of provision excludes sites above 250 ha – this involves 3 sites which are actually all above 50ha in size and are located within the rural area. Across the analysis areas, the level of provision is much higher in rural west and rural east than in the remaining analysis areas, which is reflected in the level of satisfaction in the rural area. As such, it is considered appropriate to raise the standard to 0.9ha per 1000 population to reflect the consultation responses and to move the level of provision toward other authorities in the area and across the analysis areas. This slight increase should also encourage a focus on existing sites to improve public access and would support the development of a country style park, which the authority is currently working towards.

Quality standard (see Appendices J and L)

A clean, well vegetated, litter free site with clear pathways and natural features that encourages wildlife conservation, biodiversity and environmental awareness. Management of local sites should involve the community/stakeholder if at all possible and there should be a clear focus on maintaining and increasing the conservation and biodiversity value of these sites and ensuring public access where appropriate. Sites should have a written management plan and measures should be taken to address identified issues at these sites.

**Quality benchmark: 80%**

**Justification**

It is clear that natural and semi-natural open space provides an important community function. The standard suggests that by increasing functionality and overall quality of such open spaces where appropriate then the community will benefit. By introducing this quality standard and quality benchmarking the Council will be able to assess the value of sites and identify those sites which need improvements.
Accessibility standard (see Section 2.31 and Appendix K)

15 minutes walk (720 metres)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Justification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The large majority of respondents currently walk to natural and semi-natural open spaces. However in terms of expectations, although the emphasis is still on walking at 54%, 33% would expect to drive. In line with existing travel patterns and the promotion of sustainable transport patterns a walking distance standard has been set. There is a large gap between the median/average (9.7 minutes/8.0 minutes) and the 75% threshold level borough-wide of 20 minutes. As such, the standard is recommended at 15 minutes walk between these two discrepancies. This is also in line with the individual responses across the analysis areas which ranges from 10 to 20 minutes. This is also in line with standards set for other authorities in the area, ranging from 10 to 20 minutes, with a number set at 15 minutes.

The lack of public access to natural and semi-natural sites in the rural area both through transport and through sites being publicly available limit the appropriateness of setting standards in the rural area. In addition, a number of sites have been identified in the audit within the rural area, but walking to these sites will be difficult as they are outside of settlements. As such, it is not considered appropriate to set an access standard within the rural area but to undertake a spatial analysis focusing on sites with public access and improving transport links.

Applying provision standards – identifying geographical areas

6.9 In order to identify geographical areas of importance and those areas with required local needs we apply both the provision of natural and semi natural sites in Kettering Borough together with the local standard for accessibility. The quantity standards enable the identification of areas that do not meet the minimum provision standards, while the accessibility standards will help determine where those deficiencies are of high importance, this is extremely important in the urban areas, however it is less meaningful in the rural area. Applying the standards together is a much more meaningful method of analysis than applying the standards separately and therefore helps with the prioritisation of sites.

6.10 The current supply of natural and semi natural in the Borough of Kettering is currently 0.79ha per 1,000 population and is slightly below the recommended local standard of 0.9ha per 1,000 population for this typology. This current level of supply can be broken down by analysis areas, the following table highlights where there are shortfalls or surpluses in the relevant analysis areas:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analysis area</th>
<th>Current Level of Provision</th>
<th>Shortfall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.44ha per 1,000 population</td>
<td>0.46ha per 1,000 population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.2ha per 1,000 population</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.37ha per 1,000 population</td>
<td>0.53 ha per 1,000 population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.64ha per 1,000 population</td>
<td>0.26 ha per 1,000 population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis area</td>
<td>Current Level of Provision</td>
<td>Shortfall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.84ha per 1,000 population</td>
<td>0.06ha per 1,000 population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.44ha per 1,000 population</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.11 The breakdown of analysis areas excludes the three sites of over 50 hectares. In total there are four analysis areas that fall short of the recommended minimum standard but analysis area 1 (Welland) would be considerably over if the additional large sites were included. The deficiency in analysis area 5 is negligible but the deficiencies in analysis areas 3 and 4 (Desborough/Rothwell and Kettering) are more considerable.

6.12 Projecting this forward to 2021 (justification in Section 2.26) and assuming no further natural or semi natural areas are provided it is predicted that the current level of provision will fall to 0.63 hectares per 1,000 population (excluding the sites over 50 hectares). Appendix liii shows the full calculations for the quantitative supply of open spaces in the Borough.

6.13 Map 6.1 overleaf illustrates the spatial distribution of natural and semi natural across the Borough of Kettering. This map indicates a high level of provision that is fairly equally spread across the Borough.
6.14 It can be seen from Map 6.1 that there are few major rural areas without access to a natural or semi natural area within the agreed accessibility area. The major rural settlements without access are, Pytchley, Geddington, Wilbarston and Ashley. It should be an aim for the Council to provide an accessible natural or semi natural site in all these areas.

**NSN1**
The Council should aim to provide an accessible natural or semi natural site in Pytchley, Geddington and Wilbarston.
6.15 Map 6.1 – Spatial distribution of natural and semi natural sites in Kettering. The following sections focus upon the urban areas of the Borough of Kettering and the areas without provision.

Map 6.2 Desborough area

6.16 The provision of natural and semi natural sites in Desborough is very similar to provision for parks and gardens in that all the provision is located around the central area leaving deficiencies in the east and west areas. In order to fill these gaps in provision it is suggested that two new pocket parks could be created. The advantage of this approach is that the long term cost to the Council would be minimal as community ownership of the sites means the amount of maintenance from the Council is small. These sites should also be designed to offer many functions of a park or garden (Section 5.22). Creating a pocket park that relies heavily upon local resident management should involve localised consultation prior to any developments to ensure sustainability of the proposed site.

| NSN2 | Council to create two new pocket parks in Desborough. |

Map 6.3 Rothwell area
6.17 Focusing on the Rothwell area shows there is only one site for the area but it covers the majority of the town. There is a very small area to the north and north east without access but it is felt these areas are too inconsequential to warrant new natural or semi natural areas. The area to the west and north west is far more substantial, however, and it is recommended that it is an aim for the Council to provide a new natural or semi natural site for this area. Again, a pocket park that offers several functions of a park or garden (Section 5.23) may prove the best vehicle for this new provision.

| NSN3 | Council to create two new pocket parks in Rothwell. |

Map 6.4 Burton Latimer area

6.18 Provision in Burton Latimer is focused upon one site (ID 20 - Burton Latimer Pocket Park) on the western edge and two sites in the northeast. These two sites provide a good level of provision for the majority of the area but it does leave a significant section to the south without access. This area is served particularly well by a large amenity green space site (section 7) so rather than new provision being created, it is recommended that part of this site is modified to a semi natural basis (providing there is community support for such a change), this may be in the form of a pocket park if demand indicates such a site would be sustainable.

| NSN4 | Council to investigate changing an amenity green space to natural/semi natural provision in the south of Burton Latimer. |
6.19 Focusing on the Kettering area shows that the large number of sites around the edge of the built up areas, provide good levels of accessibility except for a middle corridor running from north to south. It is recognised that due to the level of urbanisation it would be very difficult to provide new open space in the centre of this area so it is recommended that new provision be focused upon sites on the edge of the urbanised areas. To the north it is recommended that the Council focus upon new provision in the area marked ‘Area A’ on Map 6.6 as this would provide coverage to as many residents as possible. There is a significant shortfall of publicly accessible open space (including amenity greenspace and parks and gardens) in the south-west of the town (area C) that would benefit from a multi-functional area that offered a degree of natural or semi-natural landscaping.

6.20 To the south of Kettering Town Centre it is recommended that two new natural or semi natural sites be created in order to improve accessibility to as many residents as possible. A new site within the vicinity of ‘Area B’ should be the priority of these two due to the number of residents it would provide coverage for. A balance in this area should be drawn between size of proposed sites and quantity of sites provided. While an additional site would be beneficial in Area C it may be the case that localised demand supports a larger scale site solely at Area B, especially if access (cycleway network, footpaths) are of a sufficiently high standard in this area. The scale of these sites should be developed in consideration of population density and potential demand in the locality (720m radius of the site) and address the overall shortfall of 0.26ha per 1,000 population, equating to an overall provision requirement of 3.06 hectares.

| NSN5 | The Council should aim to provide three new natural and semi natural sites on the outskirts of Kettering. |
Quality benchmarking

6.21 The application of the quality benchmarking standard (set at a score of 80%) provides an indication of the desired level of quality for sites and enables a comparison to be made of sites across the Borough. It highlights sites that currently meet the visionary standard, and those sites falling significantly below and consequently suggests where improvement is required. Table 6.3 demonstrates the quality spectrum of sites across the Borough.

6.22 Scores are based upon assessment criteria, which are set out in Appendix E: and where determined during site visits.

Table 6.3 – Example of sites above and below the benchmark quality indicator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Percentage range</th>
<th>Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>90% to 100%</td>
<td>(none)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>70% to 89%</td>
<td>Cranford Hall NSN (Site 812) – 83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Valley Walk (Site 158) – 79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cransley Wood (Site 598) – 70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>50% to 69%</td>
<td>Kettering General Hospital Pocket Park (Site 11) – 67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Barton Seagrave Pocket Park (860) – 63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pendle Avenue NSN (Site 992) – 51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>30% to 49%</td>
<td>The Rectory Plantation (Site 39) – 49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cranford Pocket Park (Site 999) – 49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dog Kennel Spinney Pocket Park (Site 858) – 45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>Below 30%</td>
<td>(none)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.23 As can be seen from Table 6.3 the overall quality of natural areas in the Borough of Kettering is average with no sites rated as ‘very poor’ or ‘very good’. There are a number of pocket park sites that were rated as poor or average and only one was rated ‘good’ – Burton Latimer Pocket Park (Site 20). The Council’s immediate concern should be for the five sites across the Borough rated as ‘poor’ to be improved. Of the 30 natural and semi-natural sites identified, 17% of sites were poor, 57% average and 27% good.

Value assessment

6.24 Most sites that have a high level of use would normally have a good or very good quality and accessibility rating. Most sites with a low level of use would have an average or poor quality and accessibility rating. This is because the factors are related and interlinked.

6.25 The majority of sites were rated as having high usage levels. The average score for accessibility was 57% and only three sites scored 80% or higher. These were:

- Valley Walk (Site ID 158)
• Deeble Road South NSN (Site ID 416)
• Polwell Lane NSN (Site ID 474).

6.26 The average score for quality was 63%, with the following sites scoring above 80%:
• Stoke Albany War Memorial and Stoke Albany Pocket Park (Site ID 433)
• Cranford Hall NSN (Site ID 812).

6.27 The sites that scored low for accessibility and quality were:
• The Rectory Plantation (Site ID 39)
• Desborough (Hall Farm) Pocket Park (Site ID 457)
• Three Corner Spinney (Site ID 651)
• Broughton Pocket Park (Site ID 660)
• Pendle Avenue NSN (Site ID 992)
• Cranford Pocket Park (Site ID 999).

6.28 The sites that scored lower than average should receive improvement works where appropriate, with the lowest scoring sites being prioritised. The higher scoring sites should set the standard for those that need improvements, in order to meet the quality vision.

| NSN6 | Carry out improvements at identified sites where appropriate. |

6.29 The following sites scored above average for quality and accessibility and are therefore of high value. They should set the standard for other sites in the Borough and must be protected:
• Burton Latimer Pocket Park (Site ID 20)
• Valley Walk (Site ID 158)
• Deeble Road South NSN (Site ID 416)
• Stoke Albany War Memorial and Stoke Albany Pocket Park (Site ID 433)
• Barton Road NSN (Site ID 478)
• Rushton Pocket Park (Site ID 578).

6.30 All natural and semi natural sites are of high value, as even where there may be heavy overgrowth and little access, the site will be a valuable natural habitat. It is for these reasons that these sites must be protected and improved if necessary. Any improvements should consider the function of the site, as the sustainability of natural and semi-natural areas is highly dependent on user volume management and it is often the case that certain areas within sites, especially within nature reserves, where direct public access should be proactively limited.
NSN7 Protect all natural semi natural sites and use high scoring sites as benchmarks for other sites in the Borough.

Summary and recommendations

6.31 The natural and semi natural (NSN) typology is a particular strength for the Borough of Kettering due to the quantity and accessibility of the current provision. The advent of pocket parks has realised a large amount of community led sites that have brought access to residents whom would not normally met such facilities. The advent of the future country park further builds on the excellent work in this area. Where as the pocket parks have brought semi natural areas close to residents doorsteps the country park will create a destination NSN area for all residents to enjoy. It will perform a different role to the majority of the pre existing NSN sites.

6.32 Whilst the coverage of NSN sites is good throughout the Borough there are still some notable accessibility gaps that the Council should aim to fill in the long term. The most prominent of these is the north/south corridor through central Kettering.

6.33 The one issue for NSN sites is quality. Whilst the pocket parks have had a positive role in increasing accessibility it was observed that they generally scored poorly in terms of quality. It may be that the Council needs to reappraise its role in maintaining its sites and assess the management structure for these pocket parks. Ways to increase residents awareness and maintenance of the sites could be encouraged, such as the ‘green gym’ concept.

Summary of recommendations for natural and semi natural in Kettering Borough

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NSN1</th>
<th>The Council should aim to provide an accessible natural or semi natural site in Pytchley, Geddington and Wilbarston.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NSN2</td>
<td>Long term aim for the Council to provide an accessible natural or semi natural site in Walgrave, Pytchley, Geddington and Wilbarston.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSN3</td>
<td>Council to create two new pocket parks in Desborough.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSN4</td>
<td>Council to investigate changing an amenity green space to natural/semi natural provision in the south of Burton Latimer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSN5</td>
<td>The Council should aim to provide three new natural and semi natural sites on the outskirts of Kettering.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSN6</td>
<td>Carry out improvements at identified sites where appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSN7</td>
<td>Protect all natural semi natural sites and use high scoring sites as benchmarks for other sites in the Borough.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION 7

AMENITY GREENSPACE
SECTION 7 – AMENITY GREEN SPACE

Amenity green space

Definition

7.1 This type of open space is most commonly found in housing areas. It includes informal recreation spaces and green spaces in and around housing, with a primary purpose of providing opportunities for informal activities close to home or work or enhancing the appearance of residential or other areas.

Figure 7.1 Amenity Green space

Strategic context and consultation

Strategic context

7.2 The Local Plan refers to the need to “protect and enhance the character of the Borough within a sustainable framework.” There is an emphasis on sustainable development which is thought to depend on:

- assessing new development to ensure that the state of the environment in overall terms is not diminished
- sustaining and enhancing the Borough’s natural environment
- improving the liveable quality of the Borough’s settlements, especially the towns.

7.3 Due to its multi functional role as both a recreational open space and as a visual amenity with particular importance in the urban area, amenity green space (AGS) can play an important role in addressing all these issues of sustainable development.

Consultation

7.4 Consultation undertaken as part of the study highlighted the following key issues:

- 90% of people responding to the household survey felt that amenity green spaces were an important type of open space, however only 3% of respondents stated that they use them as the most frequently visited type of open space
there were divided opinions with regard to the amount of amenity green space areas, including 39% of residents stating that there was more than enough/about right, whilst a slightly higher percentage of people (51%) stated that provision was nearly enough/not enough. The highest level of dissatisfaction was in sub area 5 (Burton Latimer) where 66% of residents felt there was nearly enough/not enough AGS

15% of people visit them on a daily basis, while 32% do not use them at all, although the value of these sites in terms of aesthetics cannot be determined from these results and will be assessed separately within the usage assessment. 16% of residents in analysis area 4 (Kettering Town) visit this typology on a daily basis; this is the highest proportion within all analysis areas. The lowest usage levels are in area 1 with only 5% visiting an AGS daily. Of those users in analysis area 1, the most popular reasons for visiting AGS sites were to take exercise (sighted by 87% of respondents), to walk (84%) and for fresh air (78%) and to observe wildlife (68%)

concerns and key issues from the drop in sessions included the primary misuse of these some sites where young people tend to be a nuisance. A small number of sites were felt by residents to be poorly maintained such as Edinburgh Close AGS and London Road AGS

various comments emerging from internal consultation highlighted the large numbers of small amenity green space areas that were considered difficult to maintain and of limited value. It was noted that providing larger more significant areas of green space holds more value than small sporadic pieces of land, particularly for informal play.

**Current position**

7.5 There are 157 amenity green space sites across the Borough, equating to a total of 52.75ha. Excluding the four largest sites, the site areas range from 0.01ha to 1.21ha. The four largest sites range from 4.13ha to 10.07ha.

7.6 They provide an important urban function, visually breaking up the urban area and providing informal recreation opportunities. They also provide important recreational spaces within the rural areas as a village green or as part of a local recreation ground. This may be the only open space available within the village.

7.7 It is also important to recognise the secondary functions of amenity green space, specifically the visual benefits. Amenity green space sites may also provide a resource to meet deficiencies in other typologies e.g. play provision or outdoor sports facilities.

**Setting provision standards**

7.8 In setting local standards for natural and semi natural open space there is a need to take into account any national or local standards, current provision, other local authority standards for appropriate comparison, site assessments and consultation on local needs. Full justifications for the local standards are provided within Appendices I, J, K and L.
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Quantity standard (see Appendix I – standards and justification, worksheet and calculator)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing level of provision</th>
<th>Recommended standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.74ha per 1,000 population</td>
<td>0.8ha per 1,000 population</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PMP Justification**

Comparing against other local authorities, the level of provision is slightly less with the range from 0.72ha to 1.37ha, with the majority over 1ha. In terms of standards set, they range from 0.5ha to 1.6ha. The consultation responses indicate a mixed message in terms of whether there is enough and there is some concern from a quality perspective about the provision of small areas of functionless open space. In addition to this however, the visual amenity of amenity green space sites is also important.

The level of provision across the analysis areas varies slightly with a good level of provision in the urban areas of Kettering and Burton Latimer. The level of satisfaction with the level of provision was highest in the rural areas.

As such, the standard is set higher than the existing level of provision to align the borough more with other authorities and in response to the slightly higher proportion of people who felt there is not enough of this type of open space. This will protect the existing level of provision and will ensure that an appropriate level of provision will be provided in future developments.

**Quality standard (see Appendices J and L)**

**Local quality standard**

“A clean and well-maintained green space site. Sites should have appropriate ancillary accommodation (dog and litter bins etc), pathways and landscaping in the right places providing a spacious outlook and overall enhancing the appearance of the local environment. Larger sites should be suitable for informal play opportunities and should be enhanced to encourage the site to become a community focus. Smaller sites should adopt a design led approach to discourage inappropriate informal play.”

**Quality benchmark: 74%**

**PMP Justification**

It is recommended that amenity green space provides an important community function. The standard suggests that by increasing functionality of such open space then the community will benefit. The standard incorporates both public and council aspirations and has been designed to promote best practice encouraging informal play where sites are large enough.

By introducing this quality standard and quality benchmarking the Council will be able to assess the value of sites and identify the poorest quality sites which could potentially be disposed of in areas with provision above the minimum standard and in turn help improve the overall quality of open space.

In conjunction with this standard it may be appropriate to set a minimum size standard to avoid smaller sites that create maintenance issues and ensure informal play is possible.
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Accessibility standard (see Section 2.31 and Appendix K)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10 minutes walk (480 metres)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PMP Justification</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A walking standard has been set in line with the consultation responses and the fact that this is a local type of open space that should be easy for residents to access.

The 75% threshold level borough-wide is 10 minutes. The median and average are lower than this (5 and 6 minutes), however not significantly so. Across the analysis areas, the 75% threshold ranges from 5 to 10 minutes (with only two out of the six analysis areas). Standards set for other authorities also ranges between 5 and 10 minutes but are generally set around 5 minutes walk.

It is therefore a mixed picture with the general emphasis from the consultations on a 10 minute walk time standard. Although benchmarking is important, PPG17 stipulates that the standard should reflect local needs. The standard is set at 10 minutes in line with the 75% level.

Applying provision standards – identifying geographical areas

7.9 In order to identify geographical areas of importance and those areas with required local needs we apply both the quantitative provision of amenity green space in the Borough of Kettering together with the local standard for accessibility. The quantity standards enables the identification of areas that do not meet the minimum provision standard, while the accessibility standards will help determine where those deficiencies are of high importance. Applying the standards together is a much more meaningful method of analysis than applying the standards separately and therefore helps with the prioritisation of sites.

7.10 The current supply of amenity green space in the Borough of Kettering is below the recommended local standard of 0.8ha per 1,000 population for this typology. This current level of supply is broken down by analysis area in the table overleaf and highlights where there are shortfalls or surpluses.

Table 7.1 – Analysis area breakdown for provision of amenity green space

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analysis area</th>
<th>Current Level of Provision per 1000 population</th>
<th>Shortfall (ha)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.18ha per 1,000 population</td>
<td>0.62ha per 1,000 population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.62ha per 1,000 population</td>
<td>0.18ha per 1,000 population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.18ha per 1,000 population</td>
<td>0.62ha per 1,000 population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.78ha per 1,000 population</td>
<td>0.02ha per 1,000 population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.89ha per 1,000 population</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.58ha per 1,000 population</td>
<td>0.22ha per 1,000 population</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.11 The breakdown of analysis areas shows that there is a shortfall in five of the six analysis areas. The only area without a shortfall is Burton Latimer whilst the shortfall in Kettering is negligible. The largest shortfalls are seen in areas 1 (Welland) and 3 (Desborough/Rothwell).

7.12 Projecting forward to 2021 (justification in Section 2.26), the level of existing provision across the study area falls to 0.59ha per 1,000 population. This increase in population will not increase the number of areas that have a shortfall. Appendix I shows the full calculations for the quantitative supply of open spaces in the Borough.

7.13 Map 7.1 overleaf represents the spatial distribution of amenity green space across the Borough. This map indicates very few deficiencies, especially around urban areas, compared to the quantitative shortfalls identified above. While increasing the overall quantity of sites is important in areas where shortfalls exist, ensuring that as many residents as possible have access to amenity green space or at least one form of open space is paramount.
7.14 Map 7.1 shows there are no major rural settlements completely without provision of amenity green spaces. In regards to function, all AGS sites are comparable with only fifteen sites marginally under 0.02ha, which is still large enough to adequately serve local residents as a form of useable open space. There is however one rural area with only partial access, Broughton. The council should aim to provide a new amenity green space in each area to meet the gap in provision.

| AGS1  | Council to provide a new amenity green space in Broughton |
7.15 The following maps focus upon the main urban areas and any areas within that have deficiencies of amenity green space.

Map 7.2 Desborough area

It can be seen from Map 7.2 that the area of Desborough is very well covered in terms of amenity green space. The only areas without access are along the bottom edge of the town but the majority of this is covered by park and garden provision with an amenity function, therefore there is no pressing need for new provision without new developments occurring. In addition is Dunkirk Recreation Ground (OSF due to the sports facilities) located in the centre of the town that also offers an amenity function to residents.

Map 7.3 Rothwell area

The Rothwell area has only two areas without access to amenity green space however it is the same areas that have been highlighted in sections five and six – the north and west. As recognised in the park and garden section, the Council should look to provide a new amenity green space area to the north of Rothwell where there exists a smaller population. It is felt that a new park or garden would better suffice for the area to the west in order to offer an enhanced balance of typology variation across the area and more effective use of any newly available open space.

AGS2 Council to provide a new amenity green space in the north of Rothwell.
7.18 The Burton Latimer area is well covered by amenity green space and there is only one major gap to the south. This gap was also present in the parks and garden typology and a new park and garden is recommended for this area due to the substantial population. Parks and gardens generally offer functions that make them more suited to a higher volume of visitors. Assuming the new park and/or garden comes to fruition and there are no new developments, there is no need for the Council to take any action in this area.

7.19 Map 7.5, overleaf, illustrates the availability of parks and gardens in the Kettering analysis area. There are three main areas without access. If housing developments emerge in the north west then a new amenity green space is needed for ‘Area A’ and this is reinforced by the lack of park or garden provision in this area. Ideally there would also be a new amenity green space created in ‘Area B’ but due to the level of urbanisation here it is recognised that this is unlikely to occur without major new developments.

7.20 ‘Area C’ also needs new amenity green space provision and ideally two new spaces would be provided if they can be located towards residential areas and local demand supports such development. If a substantially sized site is sourced then this the Council may consider amalgamating an amenity green space and a pocket park or natural and semi-natural area, where a shortfall also exists (Section 6.19). The possibility of two sites may be beneficial in offering access to a wider community by being located north and south of the railway line.

| AGS3 | Three new amenity green spaces to be provided for the Kettering analysis area – one in the northwest and two in the south. |
7.21 The application of the quality benchmarking standard (set at a score of 74%) provides an indication of the desired level of quality for sites and enables a comparison to be made across the Borough. It highlights sites that currently meet the visionary standard, and those sites falling significantly below and consequently suggests where improvement is required. Table 7.3 demonstrates the quality spectrum of sites across the Borough.

7.22 Scores are based upon assessment criteria, which are set out in Appendix Ei and where determined during site visits.
7.23 The quality of amenity green spaces in the Borough of Kettering is fairly high. No sites were rated as ‘very poor’ however no sites were rated as ‘very good’ either. Only five sites were rated ‘poor’, with lowest being Desborough AGS (Site 574). The vast majority of sites were rated as average and 28 sites were rated as ‘good’ – the highest being Dalkeith Place (Site 108).

**AGS4**

> Improve all amenity green space sites to meet the expected benchmarking score of 74%, aspiring to the quality vision for this type of open space.

**Value assessment**

7.24 Sites that generally have a high quality score and high accessibility score frequently have a high level of usage, as there is a direct correlation between these factors.

7.25 Amenity green space sites offer a recreational value, aesthetic value and natural buffer between roads and houses.
7.26 The average score for quality was 63% and for accessibility 64% (scores based on site assessments, criteria in Appendix Ei). The following sites scored above average for both quality and accessibility, indicating high value:

- Legion Close AGS (Site ID 10)
- Sloe Lane AGS, Mawsley (Site ID 17)
- The Crescent AGS (Site ID 40)
- Thorn Close AGS (Site ID 66)
- Cleveland Avenue AGS (Site ID 67)
- Regal Drive AGS (Site ID 68)
- Rockingham Road Public Gardens (Site ID 73)
- Dalkeith Place (Site ID 108)
- Kettering Sports Ground (Site ID 119)
- Rydalside AGS (Site ID 131)
- Avenue Terrace AGS (Site ID 410)
- St Catherines Road AGS (Site ID 441)
- Neville Way AGS, Desborough (Site ID 454)
- St Botolph's Road AGS (Site ID 468)
- Delamere Drive AGS (Site ID 475)
- Top Green (Site ID 490)
- Havelock Street/Station Road Corner, Desborough (Site ID 499)
- Gladstone Street AGS, Desborough (Site ID 501)
- Podmore Way AGS, Broughton (Site ID 534)
- The Meadows (Site ID 542)
- Copelands Road AGS, Desborough (Site ID 572)
- Village Hall AGS, Great Cransley (Site ID 601)
- SW Kettering NSN (Site ID 616)
- Slade Crescent AGS (Site ID 637)
- The Green (Site ID 667)
- War Memorial (Site ID 688)
- Chapel Lane (Site ID 701)
- Road AGS, Wilbarston (Site ID 703)
- Queens Harrington Road AGS, Loddington (Site ID 707)
- Main Street AGS, Harrington (Site ID 714)
- Braybrooke Griffen Road AGS, Braybrooke (Site ID 800)
- Havelock Junior School AGS (Site ID 804)
- Top Dysons AGS (Site ID 810)
- Village Hall AGS (Site ID 811)
- Malham Drive AGS (Site ID 813)
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- Community Centre AGS (Site ID 818)
- Stamford Road AGS a (Site ID 819)
- Stamford Road AGS B (Site ID 820)
- Eskdail Street AGS (Site ID 824)
- Windmill Avenue AGS e (Site ID 834)
- Northampton Road AGS (Site ID 846)
- Carriage Drive AGS (Site ID 848)
- Thorpe Malsor Village Green (Site ID 852)
- Eagle Lane AGS (Site ID 853)
- Hanover Close AGS (Site ID 857)
- Community Centre AGS (Site ID 868)
- St Nicholas’ Close AGS (Site ID 869)
- Lilford Place Gardens (Site ID 902)
- Lawrence Close AGS (Site ID 917)
- Burton War Memorial (Site ID 950)
- Lower Encl (Site ID 955)
- Buttermere Close (Site ID 980)
- Heath Way AGSa (Site ID 995)
- Heath Way AGSb (Site ID 996)
- Cornfield AGS (Site ID 997).

7.27 All of these sites must be protected as they are of high value to the local community and should also set the standard for the sites that currently fall below the average scores for quality and accessibility.

| AGS5 | Protect identified sites and use as examples for improvements to lower scoring sites. |

7.28 The following sites scored below average for quality and accessibility:

- Sharman Way AGS (Site ID 51)
- Orchard Crescent AGS C (Site ID 152)
- Orchard Crescent AGS D (Site ID 153)
- Debble Road South AGS (Site ID 159)
- Gleneagles Close AGS (Site ID 421)
- Beauly Court AGS (Site ID 422)
- Tintern Court AGS (Site ID 427)
- Richmond Avenue AGS (Site ID 428)
7.29 These sites should be prioritised for improvements in order to increase the opportunity for residents to use these sites but also enhance their visual amenity value and therefore user satisfaction. Accessibility directly onto or across sites (path/cycleway provision) is less of an issue for this typology as they also provide a visual function by breaking up large residential areas and require fewer access factors compared to a large functional open space such as a country park. Amenity green spaces assist in creating a more aesthetically appealing landscape, especially in areas with high population densities.

| AGS6 | Prioritise sites identified for improvements to increase scores above the average, and strive to reach the quality benchmark score. |

7.30 From the application of the quantity standard it appears that there is a lack of amenity green space (AGS) in most of the analysis areas. While most urban areas have amenity green spaces directly available with catchment areas covering most major residential sites (good accessibility) there is demand for an increase in supply. It is important that the geographic distribution of new developments continues to provide a balanced level of distribution across the main settlements within the Borough. Good accessibility should not inhibit an increase in supply; it is paramount though that local demand is investigated further in collaboration with population density.

7.31 The reality is that there are few pressing gaps in the provision (accessibility) of AGS for the Borough. In the rural areas all major settlements have some level of provision but there is a need for additional sites in Broughton. In the urban areas the need for amenity green spaces needs to be examined in relation to parks and gardens sites as there is little point in creating new AGS provision if a resident has a park or garden within close proximity to their property. Therefore only three new AGS spaces are recommended; one in Rothwell and the rest in urban Kettering.
7.32 As there are quantitative deficiencies for most of the analysis areas in terms of AGS it is important that current sites are protected from non-green space development. There are some recommendations that would see AGS sites redesignated (both partially and fully) into park, garden or play area sites. Such moves may place strain on the quality of existing sites and the Council should be prepared to adjust maintenance and management strategies where relevant.

Summary of recommendations for amenity green space in Kettering

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGS1</th>
<th>Council to provide a new amenity green space in Broughton.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AGS2</td>
<td>Council to provide a new amenity green space in the north of Rothwell.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGS3</td>
<td>Three new amenity green spaces to be provided for the Kettering analysis area; one in the north west and two in the south.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGS4</td>
<td>Improve all amenity green space sites to meet the expected benchmarking score of 74%, aspiring to the quality vision for this type of open space.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGS5</td>
<td>Protect identified sites and use as examples for improvements to lower scoring sites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGS6</td>
<td>Prioritise sites identified for improvements to increase scores above the average, and strive to reach the quality benchmark score.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION 8

PROVISION FOR CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE
Provision for children and young people

Definition

8.1 This type of open space includes areas such as equipped play areas, ball courts, skateboard areas and teenage shelters with the primary purpose of providing opportunities for play and social interaction involving both children and young people. Facilities for children are primarily based upon children under 10 years of age and facilities for young people are based upon children between the ages of 10 to 19.

Figure 8.1 – Playground off Thurston Drive and Skate ramp off Thurston Drive

Strategic context

8.2 The Community Plan for the Borough of Kettering identifies some recent successful initiatives that have been undertaken in the Borough including play areas and play schemes for young children.
8.3 In addition, youth shelters have been installed in a number of key parks in the Borough to move young people away from gathering points where they have caused a nuisance in the past.

8.4 A Young Person’s Strategy has also been developed. This identifies that from the 2001 census figures 12.5% of the population were between the ages of 10 and 19. This strategy states that good services are already available for young residents at Newlands Shopping Centre, Kettering Leisure Village, Wicksteed Park, the swimming pool and pleasure parks.

8.5 Young people consulted as part of the study said they needed better access to activities and places to go and relax without being watched over. They also helped to create a wish list of potential activities, including:

- more skate ramps and dirt jumps
- replace swimming pool
- provide outdoor facilities such as a climbing wall
- lower cost of leisure activities eg fitness studio.

8.6 The viability and appropriateness of these suggestions were discussed in the strategy.

Consultation

8.7 Consultation specific to children and young peoples highlights some meaningful statistics and provides a justification for setting local standards against local needs:

- 88% of people responding to the household survey felt that areas for children were important and 78% of people responding felt that areas for young people were important, only a small percentage of those people responding actually use these types of spaces, however they are still perceived as important by the majority of respondents

- 54% of respondents indicated that there was an insufficient level of provision of play spaces for children and 63% indicated that there was insufficient spaces for those young people/teenagers

- respondents to the IT Young People survey however indicated play areas as their third most frequently used open space/recreation facility after parks and gardens.

- only a relatively low percentage of respondents used teenage facilities/youth shelters in the last year (14%) (57% of respondents were junior/primary school age and 43% were secondary or above)

- internal consultations identified that vandalism can be an issue at sites across the Borough. Play areas are particularly prone to vandalism and broken glass tends to be a problem after the weekend

- internal consultations also identified conflicts between younger and older users of play areas can also be a major problem which was supported through the drop in sessions
there is a refurbishment programme for play areas underway rolling over a three year period

there is a relatively large number of skate ramps provided at sites across the Borough. It was however considered in the internal consultations that there is a need for additional multi use games areas (MUGAs). An attendee at the drop in session considered that these skate ramps were poorly designed and maintained

Ise Skate Park is a very well used facility and has a borough wide and beyond significance

Kettering Borough Council will start work on a Play Strategy, planned for completion in November 2006.

Current position

8.8 The total number of children and young persons facilities within the Borough of Kettering is 50 of which 34 are for children and 16 for young people. This equates to a current provision level 0.41 facilities per 1,000 population for children and 0.20 facilities per 1,000 population for young people.

Setting provision standards

8.9 In setting local standards for provision for children and young persons there is a need to take into account any national or local standards, current provision, other local authority standards for appropriate comparison, site assessments and consultation on local needs. Full justifications for the local standards are provided within Appendices I, J, K and L.

Quantity standard (see Appendix I – standards and justification, worksheet and calculator)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Existing level of provision</th>
<th>Recommended standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td>0.41 facilities per 1,000 population</td>
<td>0.45 facilities per 1,000 population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young people</td>
<td>0.20 facilities per 1,000 population</td>
<td>0.25 facilities per 1,000 population</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Justification

**Children:** There is a slight emphasis on the level of provision not being enough but a number of the qualitative comments suggest site specific issues with particular sites. In terms of benchmarking against other authorities, the level of provision varies considerably and varies between hectare and number of facilities standards. It is considered that the level of provision in Kettering is around the same level of provision as other authorities.

Due to the small size of play areas it is recommended that the standard be set by number of play areas to ensure the standard is meaningful and can be implemented effectively. Design guidelines should be put in place to ensure that a varied and imaginative facility is provided rather than ticking off the number of facilities to be provided.

The standard is set slightly higher than the existing level of provision at 0.4 play facilities per 1000 population. This reflects the emphasis on the level of provision not being enough, but is only a slight increase to account for the majority of comments being around the quality of provision and area specific deficiencies. The application of the accessibility standards will identify locational deficiencies.

**Young People:** There is a relatively strong emphasis on the level of provision of young people facilities not being enough. There is limited information available for other authorities in terms of comparing provision, but this is considered to be a relatively good level of provision which is supported through consultations that identify a number of skate ramps etc. at recreation grounds across the borough. Young people and anti social behaviour is considered to be an issue in Kettering, although in a number of cases this is site specific rather than across the board and it may be that additional youth facilities would alleviate this issue. As such, the standard is increased slightly to reflect the higher levels of dissatisfaction with the existing level of provision and to provide the flexibility to combat specific areas where youths hanging around and creating a nuisance is a particularly issue due to a lack of alternative facilities. As with children facilities, the standard is set at number of facilities rather than hectares. This is due to the variety in site sizes (e.g. youth shelter versus MUGA) and the lack of meaning of setting a hectare standard.
### Quality standard (see Appendices J and L)

#### Local quality standard for children:

“A site providing a mix of well-maintained formal equipment and enriched play environment in a safe and secure convenient location overlooked by housing and footpaths or located within a larger park facility. The site should have clear boundaries; be clean; be litter, dog, vandalism and graffiti free; and be lit. Sites should also comply with appropriate national guidelines for design and safety.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality benchmark: 81%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Justification**

In order to address security issues at play areas, the standard states that play areas should be located close to housing or footpaths or within larger park sites as an additional level of security to be provided through natural policing e.g. overlooking houses. Lighting should be provided where appropriate. The standard encompasses the need for play areas to be both sustainable in management terms but also to provide a mix of facilities and an enriched play environment and also for the site to be clean and safe to use. This is reflected in the aspirations for play areas and within this standard. In addition sites should include NPFA (Fields In Trust) design guidelines where appropriate.

#### Local quality standard for young people:

“A site providing a robust yet imaginative play environment for older children in a safe and secure location, with clear separation from younger children facilities, that promotes a sense of ownership. The site should include clean, litter and dog free areas for more informal play and areas of shelter (with seating) and where appropriate sites should be well lit. Sites should also comply with appropriate national guidelines for design and safety.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality benchmark: 78%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Justification**

Although based on the consultation responses, the standard also incorporates elements of standards set for other authorities due to the limited response rate. Vandalism and security are issues for young people’s play areas and as such the focus of this standard is on the issue requiring robust and varied equipment and shelter. Promoting a sense of ownership with the sites may also help to reduce the level of vandalism. It is important that these sites are clean, safe and secure to use which was reflected in the drop in consultation and the consultation with council officers. National design guidelines provided by NPFA (Fields In Trust).
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Accessibility standard (see Section 2.31 and Appendix K)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Children</th>
<th>10 minute walk time (480 metres)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Young people</td>
<td>URBAN - 10 minute walk time - (480 metres)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RURAL – no standard</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Justification

The majority of respondents to the household questionnaire indicate that they would expect to walk to a children or young people facility. This also reflects the fact that young people and children with parents should be able to access play sites easily. The 75% threshold level for both children and young people facilities is 10 minutes. The emphasis with the median and average for children was less than 10 minutes and for young people, greater than 10 minutes. However in line with the 75% threshold level and benchmarking against nearby local authorities, the standard for children and young people is set at 10 minutes.

Young People:

Youth facilities can however range from a smaller facility such as a youth shelter and basketball hoop to a floodlit MUGA. However, it may be onerous to have a youth facility within ten minutes of every resident, particularly in the rural areas and in light of comments regarding the support of a smaller number of larger facilities. This is also supported by the expectations of travel to a MUGA (included within the outdoor sports questions) where the emphasis was on driving and the travel time was 15 minutes. As such, the standard for young people is set for the urban area only, although an assessment of provision in the rural area will be made.

Children:

Again, it is considered onerous to expect every village to have a play area. This standard will be applied to the rural area, however the analysis will identify those villages without access to a play facility and it will be for the council to determine the appropriateness of providing facilities subject to detailed consultation.

Applying provision standards – identifying geographical areas

8.10 In order to identify geographical areas of importance and those areas with required local needs we apply both the quantity standard for children’s play areas in Kettering Borough together with the local standard for accessibility. This is also applied for the provision of young people’s facilities. The quantity standards enable the identification of areas that do not meet the minimum provision standards, while the accessibility standards will help determine where those deficiencies are of high importance. Applying the standards together is a much more meaningful method of analysis than applying the standards separately and therefore helps with the prioritisation of sites.

8.11 The current supply of children’s play facilities in Kettering Borough is 0.04 below the recommended 0.45 standard for play facilities per 1,000 population for this typology.

8.12 The supply of young people’s facilities is currently 0.20 per 1,000 population, which is lower than the recommended local standard of 0.25 facilities per 1,000 population.
8.13 This current level of supply for both children and young people can be broken down by analysis areas, the following table highlights where there are shortfalls or surpluses in the relevant analysis areas:

**Table 8.1 – Analysis area breakdown for provision of children’s facilities in Kettering Borough (facilities per 1,000 population)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analysis area</th>
<th>2001 Population</th>
<th>Current Level of Provision per 1000 population</th>
<th>Facilities Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,149</td>
<td>1.86 (4 facilities)</td>
<td>N/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3,675</td>
<td>2.18 (8 facilities)</td>
<td>N/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>15,181</td>
<td>0.32 (5 facilities)</td>
<td>0.13 (2 facilities)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>51,063</td>
<td>0.25 (13 facilities)</td>
<td>0.20 (10 facilities)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6,740</td>
<td>0.29 (2 facilities)</td>
<td>0.16 (1 facility)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3,036</td>
<td>0.66 (2 facility)</td>
<td>N/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 8.2 – Analysis area breakdown for provision of young peoples facilities in Kettering Borough (facilities per 1,000 population)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analysis area</th>
<th>2001 Population</th>
<th>Current Level of Provision per 1000 population</th>
<th>Facilities Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,149</td>
<td>(none)</td>
<td>0.25 (under 1 facility)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3,675</td>
<td>0.54 (2 facilities)</td>
<td>N/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>15,181</td>
<td>0.13 (2 facilities)</td>
<td>0.12 (2 facilities)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>51,063</td>
<td>0.22 (11 facilities)</td>
<td>0.03 (1 facility)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6,740</td>
<td>0.15 (1 facility)</td>
<td>0.10 (under 1 facility)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3,036</td>
<td>(none)</td>
<td>0.25 (under 1 facility)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.14 The breakdown of analysis areas shows that there are shortfalls in provision for both children and young people, although the highest total levels of deficiency are for provision for children. Analysis areas 3, 4, 5 are deficient for both children’s and young persons facilities, and area 1 and 6 for young people facilities.

8.15 Projecting forward to 2021 (justification in Section 2.26), the level of existing provision across the study area falls to 0.33 facilities for children and provision for young people falls to 0.16 facilities per 1,000 population due to the projected increase in population. This increase in population will not increase the number of analysis areas that have a current shortfall in facilities, however, any further increase in population will increase the shortfall in provision in those areas that currently show a shortfall.
8.16 Map 8.1 overleaf represents the spatial distribution of children’s facilities across the Borough. This map indicates there are some areas of deficiency, however the general spread of facilities is good and covers a number of populated areas in both rural and urban settlements. The only notable rural settlements without provision are Braybrooke (analysis area 1), Cranford and Grafton Underwood (analysis area 6). It should be an aim for the Council to provide facilities in these areas. Guidance on play area size, content and orientation is provided by the National Playing Field Association under their Six Acre Standard.

| CYP1 | Council to work towards providing childrens play facilities in Braybrooke, Cranford and Grafton Underwood. |

8.17 Following from the children’s play area map, Map 8.2 shows the spatial distribution of young persons facilities across the Borough. The spread of such facilities is not as comprehensive as children’s play areas and the only major rural settlements with provision are Broughton and Loddington. It is recognised that not all major rural settlements are of a population level that needs such a facility but the most pressing areas for new provision should be Ashley or Wilbarston (one facility due to the collocation), and Geddington. While a greater additional provision is required in the urban analysis areas there is a need to address accessibility issues in the rural analysis areas 1 and 6, thus justifying provision in the rural settlements.

| CYP2 | Council to work towards providing young persons facilities in Wilbarston or Ashley, and Geddington, |

8.18 Following Map 8.2 are a series of maps focusing upon each of the urban areas.
Map 8.1 - Spatial distribution of children's facilities across Kettering Borough

Open Space Type Catchment, Children

Reproduced from the Ordnance Survey with the permission of the Controller of Her Majesty’s Stationery Office (C) Crown Copyright. Kettering Borough Council Licensed No. 10002479/7 Map Scale 1:10000m
Map 8.2 – Spatial distribution of young persons play areas in Kettering Borough

Open Space Type Catchment: Young People/Teenagers

Reproduced from the Ordnance Survey with the permission of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationary Office
(C) Crown Copyright, Kettering Borough Council License No. 100017047 Map Scale 1 cm = 0.7449 km
8.19 It can be seen from Maps 8.3 and 8.4 that the distribution of play equipment in Desborough is skewed towards the east of the town. The young persons facility is particularly poorly located which results in most young people being outside of the allotted catchment area. The Council should consider relocating the facility further north, in order to expand its catchment area and provide a second young persons facility towards the west of Desborough. A third children’s play area is needed and this should also be sited towards the west of Desborough. This accords with the recommended standards for the population as set out in Table 8.1 and 8.2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CYP3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Council to consider relocating the existing young persons area and provide an additional childrens and young persons play area towards the west of Desborough.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8.20 As seen in Map 8.5 the provision of childrens play facilities in Rothwell is good with three sites fairly equalled spaced out from east to west. There is only one area without good coverage and this is to the north east. This gap could be filled with either new provision or the relocation of the existing provision to a more central area in the east. The only young persons facility is centrally located but leaves large areas to the north, east and west without provision. The Council should look to acquire additional young persons facilities to meet the shortfall as set out in the Table 8.2

| CYP4 | Council to consider relocating one existing play area or provide new provision in the northeast of Rothwell. It should also be an aim aim to provide additional young persons facilities. |
8.21 The two children’s play areas in Burton Latimer are centrally located and provide good coverage to the majority of residents however there are areas to the south and northeast where the Council should consider new provision. The only young persons facility is also centrally located and the Council should seek additional facilities for Burton Latimer in accordance with Table 8.2.

| CYP5 | The aim for Council to provide additional childrens play facilities in the north east and south of Burton Latimer. Consideration should be given for an additional young persons facility when demand dictates. |
8.22 Map 8.9 shows the distribution of childrens play facilities in Kettering and is notable that there are a large number of gaps. The Council should aim for all areas to be within an accessibility catchment area but priority should be for three new play areas to achieve the maximum increase in coverage. These areas are labelled A through to C.

8.23 The Council should examine the option of strategically placing the required childrens play areas (including the three above) on the new amenity green space areas that are recommended in section 7. This is a way of utilising already existing open space to meet immediate demand as set out in Table 8.1 above.

CYP6

The Council should aim to provide additional play areas so all residents are within a catchment. Priority should be for three new additional play areas to be provided with consideration for these to be placed upon the additional amenity green space sites recommended.
8.24 From the gaps evident in Map 8.10 it is recommended that three new young persons facilities, in accordance with Table 8.2, be a priority for the Council. Ideally they would be located at the sites labelled A through to C where high population density exists. Consideration should also be given to placing young persons facilities on the additional amenity green space sites recommended in section 7.

| CYP7 | The aim for the Council is to place three additional young persons facilities within the area with consideration for these to be placed on the additional amenity green space sites recommended. |

**Quality Benchmarking**

8.25 The application of the quality benchmarking standard (set at a score of 81% for children and 78% for young people) provides an indication of the desired level of quality for sites and enables a comparison to be made across the Borough. It highlights sites that currently meet the visionary standard, and those sites falling significantly below and consequently suggests where improvement is required. Table 8.3 for children and 8.4 for young people demonstrates the quality spectrum of sites across the Borough.

8.26 Scores are based upon assessment criteria, which are set out in Appendix Ei and where determined during site visits.
Table 8.3 – example sites above and below the benchmark quality indicator for children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Percentage range</th>
<th>Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>90% to 100%</td>
<td>The Square play area (Site 851) 93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>70% to 89%</td>
<td>The Paddocks playground (Site 28) 79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Springfield Road playground (Site 719) 74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Blythe Close play area (Site 911) 70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spring Garden play area (Site 855) 63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>50% to 69%</td>
<td>Rushton Road play area – Desborough (Site 571) 57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Charlotte Place play area (Site 809) 53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>30% to 49%</td>
<td>(none)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>Below 30%</td>
<td>(none)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.27 It is encouraging to note that not a single site scored ‘poor’ or ‘very poor’ for children’s play areas. Only one site scored as ‘very good’ which was The Square play area (Site 851). There were only two sites, which scored as ‘average’ and it should be the Council’s priority to improve these.

8.28 In Table 8.4 for young persons benchmarking there is one site again classified as ‘very good’. Encouragingly there are no ‘poor’ or ‘very poor’ sites and only five sites are rated as ‘average’. It should be the Council’s priority to improve these sites.

Table 8.4 – examples sites above and below the benchmark quality indicator for young persons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Percentage range</th>
<th>Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>90% to 100%</td>
<td>Wicksteed Park playground (Site 658) 97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>70% to 89%</td>
<td>Desborough Leisure Centre Skate Park (Site 706) 81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ise Valley Skate Park (Site 921) 75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pennine Way playarea (Site 65) 70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>50% to 69%</td>
<td>Highfield Road Park playarea (Site 718) 68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Well Lane Recreation Ground Skate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Percentage range</th>
<th>Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>30% to 49%</td>
<td>(none)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>Below 30%</td>
<td>(none)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Value assessment

8.29 Sites that generally have a high quality score and high accessibility score frequently have a high level of usage, as there is a direct correlation between these factors.

8.30 Sites providing facilities for children and young people are particularly important (see paragraph 8.7) within the context of open space. For this reason, all provision for young people must be protected and improvements should be carried out where highlighted.

8.31 The average score for quality for children's play areas was 71%, the average accessibility score was 68% (based upon site assessments – Appendix Ei).

8.32 The following sites scored below average for quality and accessibility:

- Playground within Geddington OSF (Site ID 12)
- Stoke Albany Recreation Ground Play Area (Site ID 58)
- Main Street Play Area (Site ID 417)
- Charlotte Place Play Area (Site ID 809)
- Spring Gardens Play Area (Site ID 855)
- Rothwell Play Area (Site ID 910)
- Junior Play Area 'Ise Valley' (Site ID 922).

| CYP8       | These sites must be prioritised for improvements to ensure user safety and satisfaction. |

8.33 The following children's sites scored above the average score for quality and accessibility and must be protected:

- The Paddocks Churchill Way Playground 2 (Site ID 28)
- Carlton Road Playground, Wilbarson (Site ID 439)
- Podmore Way YPC (Young Person and Children), Broughton (Site ID 535)
- Lodddington YPC, Lodddington (Site ID 559)
- Broughton YPC (Site ID 613)
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- Play Area, Broughton (Site ID 711)
- Highfield Road Parks (Site ID 717)
- Playground Off Thurston Drive (Site ID 721)
- Dunkirk Avenue Play Area, Desborough (Site ID 803)
- Brambleside Play Area 1 (Site ID 814)
- King George V Rec Play Area (Site ID 951)
- Pytchley Playing Field Playground (Site ID 956)
- Meadow Road Play Area (Site ID 956).

8.34 The average score for quality at sites for young people was 67%, the average accessibility score was 74%. The only site that scored below the average score for accessibility.

| CYP9 | Site 912 must be prioritised for improvements to ensure user safety, satisfaction and to maintain usage levels. |

8.35 The following sites scored above average for quality and accessibility:

- Pennine Way Play Area (Site ID 65)
- Garfton Street Recreation playground basketball (Site ID 157)
- Wicksteed Park Playground (Site ID 658)
- Skate Park, Desborough Leisure Centre, Desborough (Site ID 706)
- Basketball Court, Broughton (Site ID 712)
- Highfield Road Park Playground (Site ID 718)
- Skate Ramp Off Thurston Drive (Site ID 722)
- Brambleside Play Area 2 (Site ID 815)
- Laburnum Crescent MUGA (Site ID 817)
- Grange Skate Park (Ise Valley) (Site ID 921)
- King George V Recreation Ball Play Area (Site ID 952).

| CYP10 | The identified sites for young people that scored above average for accessibility and quality must be protected and should set the standard for the lower scoring sites in the Borough. |
Summary and recommendations

8.36 The quality scores attributed to facilities for children and young people in the Borough are very positive and maintaining and improving this quality benchmark should be a key aspiration for the Council. There are a large number of deficiencies around quantity for both childrens and young persons facilities in the Borough.

8.37 For childrens facilities the level of provision in the rural areas is positive with only a few shortfalls in isolated areas. For the built up areas a more disjointed picture emerges. In the smaller urban areas the level of provision is generally adequate with some areas on the outskirts being outside catchment areas. In the main urban area of Kettering the provision gaps are considerable and three new play areas are recommended as a minimum to reduce the gaps in provision.

8.38 For young persons facilities it will be inappropriate for every rural area to have such a facility due to the demographics of each rural area. The Council should aim to have provision in the larger rural areas and the first places to review such possibilities should be Geddington, and either Wilbarston or Ashley. As a priority there are significant gaps in the main urban area of Kettering that the Council should look to fill immediately with the addition of a minimum of three new facilities. These should be located where there is a current undersupply and where they can be accessed by the majority of young persons and children within a 10 minute walk-time.

8.39 It is acknowledged that there are significant economic pressures with the introduction of new play areas. It is important that the Council maximises the lottery monies for play that will be available later in 2006.

Summary of recommendations for children and young people’s facilities in Kettering Borough

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CYP1</th>
<th>Council to work towards providing childrens play facilities in Braybrooke, Cranford and Grafton Underwood.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CYP2</td>
<td>Council to work towards providing young persons facilities in Wilbarston or Ashley, and Geddington,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYP3</td>
<td>Council to consider relocating the existing young persons area and provide an additional childrens and young persons play area towards the west of Desborough.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYP4</td>
<td>Council to consider relocating one existing play area or provide new provision in the northeast of Rothwell. It should also be an aim aim to provide additional young persons facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYP5</td>
<td>The aim for Council to provide additional childrens play facilities in the north east and south of Burton Latimer. Consideration should be given for an additional young persons facility when demand dictates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYP6</td>
<td>The Council should aim to provide additional play areas so all residents are within a catchment. Priority should be for three new additional play areas to be provided with consideration for these to be placed upon the additional amenity green space sites recommended.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYP7</td>
<td>The aim for the Council is to place three additional young persons facilities within the area with consideration for these to be placed on the additional amenity green space sites recommended.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYP8</td>
<td>These sites must be prioritised for improvements to ensure user safety and satisfaction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYP9</td>
<td>Site 912 must be prioritised for improvements to ensure user safety, satisfaction and to maintain usage levels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYP10</td>
<td>The identified sites for young people that scored above average for accessibility and quality must be protected and should set the standard for the lower scoring sites in the Borough.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION 9

OUTDOOR SPORTS FACILITIES
Outdoor sports facilities

Definition

9.1 The assessment of sports facilities covers outdoor sports facilities as per the recommended PPG 17 guidance.

9.2 Outdoor Sports Facilities is a wide-ranging category of open space, which includes both natural and artificial surfaces for sport and recreation, which are either publicly or privately owned. Examples include playing pitches, athletics tracks, bowling greens and golf courses with the primary purpose of participation in outdoor sports.

Figure 9.1 – Northampton Road Recreation Ground

Strategic context and consultation

9.3 At this current time there are no specific standards for outdoor sports facilities, supported by a lack of evidence about teams and pitches in the Borough. However, there are some strategic documents that make reference to the provision of outdoor sports facilities in the Borough.

9.4 The Local Plan recognises the deficiency of facilities in terms of outdoor sports facilities and the possibility of this deficiency being exacerbated as the Borough grows.

9.5 The Local Plan states with regard to outdoor sports facilities, the key policies to:

- protect existing open spaces and outdoor sports facilities in towns and villages
- set criteria for the provision of a new football stadium for Kettering Town Football Club
- set a framework for considering applications for new golf courses and driving ranges.
9.6 As well as the Local Plan, the Sports Facilities Strategy also refers to the provision of outdoor sports facilities in the Borough. There is a standard for village communities contained within this document which states that for communities of more than 400 residents, provision should include the following sports facilities:

- informal play area (preferably with an all weather surface and floodlighting)
- tennis court
- playing field for cricket and football
- pavilion
- community centre (ideally capable of accommodating a range of sporting activities including badminton, aerobics and martial arts).

9.7 Smaller villages (200–400 residents) should aim for the following as a minimum standard of provision:

- tennis court/informal ball play area
- playing field for cricket and football with changing accommodation
- community centre (ideally capable of accommodating a range of sporting activities including badminton, aerobics and martial arts).

9.8 The Playing Pitch Strategy for Northamptonshire undertaken in 2002 indicated a shortfall of 24.8 junior football pitches, a surplus of 11.2 adult football pitches, a shortfall of 1.5 rugby pitches and a shortfall of 0.47 synthetic turf pitches. Demand equalled supply for cricket pitches. These results are based upon a countywide assessment.

Consultation

9.9 Consultation specific to outdoor sports facilities highlights some meaningful statistics and assists in the setting local standards against local needs:

- 82% of people responding to the household survey felt that outdoor sports facilities were important in Kettering, although responses from the household survey suggested that only 6% use them as the most frequently visited open space type
- they have also been identified by young people from the IT Young People Survey as an important open space with 53% of children using them in the last year
- there was a fairly even split between residents who felt that provision of open space was adequate (40% stating too much or about right) and those who felt provision was inadequate (49% stating nearly enough or not enough)
- respondents from the household survey responded to the current supply of specific sports facilities, including
  - grass pitches – 40% about right, 35% nearly enough/not enough
  - STP's – 22% about right, 36% nearly enough/not enough
- tennis courts – 28% about right, 45% nearly enough/not enough
- bowling greens – 40% about right, 24% nearly enough/not enough
- golf courses – 26% about right, 27% nearly enough/not enough.

- overall provision of outdoor sports facilities was considered to be average by 39% of respondents to the household questionnaire
- people from the drop in sessions highlighted a general lack of pitches in the area. The good quality and high usage of the pitches at Kettering Leisure Village was also emphasised. Many comments were made by residents regarding the outdoor sports facilities at Weekley Glebe. Whilst many of the comments were positive, negative comments were also received regarding the drainage of the pitches and the lack of suitable changing facilities
- the Sports Club Survey provided feedback from 33 sports clubs active in the Borough
- 36% of these perceived the overall quality of provision to be poor or very poor
- key issues from the Sports Club survey related to quantity were:
  - shortage of grass pitches and perception of increasing demand and decreasing supply
  - shortage of STP facilities
  - shortage of public tennis courts.
- when these clubs were asked what additional new facilities they would like to see built in Kettering, the top answers were:
  - floodlit STP facility
  - sports halls
  - changing rooms and ancillary accommodation for football teams (particularly those using Weekley Glebe).
- consultation with Council officers highlighted the strategic importance of Weekley Glebe as the main football facility in the Borough. Recent expenditure (circa £48,000) on the drainage has dramatically improved the quality of the site. It is considered that the changing facilities, although recently improved, require further enhancement
- Council officers felt that there was not enough provision of sports pitches compared to senior and junior teams. This was putting pressure on the pitches at the weekends as well as the changing facilities. It was felt that this may be addressed through a reorganisation of current pitch supply. The pavilions across the Borough are generally out of date and do not allow for simultaneous adult and youth changing
- other issues raised by internal officers at consultation were:
  - cricket is reducing in popularity in the Borough
- there is good provision of bowling greens and these greens are well used in the summer
- there are only four public tennis courts in the Borough and there is public demand for additional provision.

**Current position**

9.10 There are a good range of sporting facilities within the Borough, including grass pitches, synthetic pitches, bowling greens, tennis courts and golf courses. The total area of sports facilities in the Borough equates to 253.11 hectares. This equates to a current level of provision of 3.09 hectares per 1,000 population, or 1.72 hectares excluding golf courses. In relation to other local authorities this is a relatively low figure due to the comparatively small number of golf courses in the Borough.

9.11 In line with other local authority areas, there are a number of private facilities, namely golf courses and tennis clubs where provision is limited to those paying a membership fee. There are also a range of education sites where facilities are limited to pupils only – though some do have a dual use agreement allowing access to the community outside of curriculum hours. Lastly there are a large number of public sites and these sites often have an important secondary function as a park or amenity green space.

**Setting provision standards**

9.12 When setting local standards for outdoor sports facilities there is a need to take into account any national or local standards, current provision, other local authority standards for appropriate comparison, site assessments and consultation on local needs. Full justifications for the local standards are referenced in Appendices I, J, K and L. The recommended local standards have been summarised below in context with the outdoor sports facilities in Kettering Borough.

**Quantity standard**

9.13 Existing provision of outdoor sports facilities in the Borough of Kettering is currently 1.72ha per 1,000 population (excluding the provision of golf courses).

9.14 It is evident from consultation that there are concerns regarding the number of outdoor sporting facilities. Grass pitches are a concern for the Council and the public and this is compounded by poor quality changing facilities.

9.15 Consultation with the public through the sports club survey and household survey showed that the number of public tennis courts and synthetic turf pitches is also felt to be inadequate.

9.16 The inclusion of all schools outdoor sports facilities within this typology is important in order to ensure that these sites are protected.

9.17 In order to address the deficit, it is recommended that the local quantity standard for outdoor sports facilities is set at 1.8ha per 1,000 population.

9.18 The full context and justification for this standard is outlined in Appendix I.

**LOCAL QUANTITY STANDARD**

1.8ha per 1,000 population
The standard for sports pitches is set for broad planning need only. The level of provision compared to other authorities (excluding golf but including all schools) is relatively similar with the provision ranging from 1.69 to 2.69 ha per 1000 population. Standards are also set around this range with a higher number around 2ha per 1000 population.

In terms of consultations, there is an emphasis on the level of provision not being enough, although other consultations suggest that a re-organisation of pitches and management of pitches may alleviate this deficiency considerably.

Providing adequate pitches for the growth of the borough was however a particular concern. When removing schools that do not offer dual use the provision drops to 1.49ha per 1000 population.

As such, the standard is set slightly higher than the existing level of provision (including all schools but excluding golf). This protects the existing level of provision and allows a greater level of provision in future developments due to the existing level of dissatisfaction with provision. In addition, this provides greater flexibility in terms of meeting the standard either through new provision or through increased public use of school sites.

Quality standard

9.19 The National Playing Fields Association (NPFA) recommended guidance on outdoor sports facilities, where quality of provision includes gradients, orientation, ancillary accommodation, planting and community safety.

9.20 User aspirations from the household survey for outdoor sports facilities in the Borough of Kettering were clean and litter free, toilets, well kept grass and ancillary facilities. Adequate lighting, provision of CCTV and car parking were the highest rated safety factors. These key quality factors alongside other consultations have been the basis of the quality standard recommendation for outdoor sports facilities. Further evidence for this recommendation can be found in Appendix J.

9.21 Appendix L highlights the links between the quality vision and the site assessments that have been undertaken for outdoor sports facilities, converting the key factors of the vision into an expected score against the site assessment matrix used and consequently providing a minimum quality benchmark. It is important to set a benchmark indicator against which the comparative quality of outdoor sports facilities within Kettering Borough can be assessed. This standard can also serve to guide improvement programmes by striving to attain the quality threshold rating at each site.
SECTION 9 – OUTDOOR SPORTS FACILITIES

LOCAL QUALITY STANDARD

“A well-planned, clean, litter and dog fouling free sports facility site, with level and well-drained good quality surfaces, appropriate good quality ancillary accommodation including changing accommodation, toilets and car parking. The site should have appropriate management ensuring community safety and include lighting and the use of mobile CCTV where appropriate to address anti-social behaviour.”

Quality benchmark: 80%

PMP Justification

The public consultation responses to the quality of outdoor sports facilities tend to centre around poor changing facilities, safety issues anti-social behaviour problems. These are therefore reflected in the quality standards. Importantly, ancillary facilities such as changing facilities, car parking and toilets were also highly rated aspirations. The consultations also indicated that Sports Clubs and users had issues with poor ancillary accommodation.

The standard incorporates "appropriate management" to ensure that where appropriate, management issues are addressed and also increase the usage of sites to continue to combat anti-social behaviour. Community safety is also incorporated to reflect NPFA design guidelines.

9.22 This quality vision percentage calculated for outdoor sports facilities in Kettering Borough, determined from site assessments and users aspirations, is 80%, which is intended as an aspirational benchmark for the outdoor sports facility sites in the Borough.

Accessibility standard

9.23 The accessibility of sites is paramount in maximising usage as well as providing an opportunity for all people to use the site. It is particularly important in the context of sports facilities where a number are located at school sites, or are in private ownership. The local standard provides a realistic travel time/distance threshold, based on local needs that can assist in highlighting areas of deficiency, as well as ensuring that any new provision is placed in priority areas that are outside the recommended local accessibility catchment.

9.24 There are several factors to consider in setting a standard for outdoor sports facilities. In particular, the range of facilities that lie within this typology makes it difficult to set a meaningful standard that can be applied across the board. The results from the household survey suggested that two standards should be set, one for local facilities and a separate standard for golf courses and bowling greens.

9.25 Results from the Household Survey identified that walking was the most preferred method of transport indicated by users and potential users for grass pitches, with the calculated travel time being 20 minutes, applied to the whole of the Borough. (see Section 2.31 and Appendix K)
9.26 The standard set for borough wide provision of bowling greens and golf courses was calculated at 20 minutes, with driving as the preferred method of transport to these facilities, again indicated by current and potential users. Full justification for both these standards can be found in Appendix K.

**LOCAL ACCESSIBILITY STANDARD**

**LOCAL OUTDOOR SPORTS**
(excluding golf courses and bowling greens)

20 minute walk time - (960 metres)

**PMP Justification**

There is a relatively even split between walking and driving overall although a slight emphasis on walking for grass pitches and an emphasis on driving for bowling and golf. In line with ensuring sustainable transport choices, to account for the wide mix of outdoor sports facilities within the standard and to meet all expectations (driving expectations will be covered by a walk time standard), a walk time standard has therefore been set.

The 75% threshold level overall for outdoor sports facilities is 15 minutes and with the exception of golf and bowls, is 15 minutes for the sub-categories. This is further supported by the median and average which are above 10 minutes at 11 and 12.7 minutes. However as there is an even split between driving and walking, a walk time standard of 20 minutes is set (above the 75% level on account of the high proportion of people who would travel by car, a 15 minute walk time is considered unrealistic).

This should exclude golf and bowls. If required, a 20 minute drive time is appropriate for this sub-category, reflecting the 75% threshold for these sub-categories.

**Applying provision standards – identifying geographical areas**

9.27 In order to identify geographical areas of importance and those areas with required local needs we apply both the provision of outdoor sports facilities in the Borough of Kettering together with the local standards for accessibility. The quantity standards enable the identification of areas that do not meet the minimum provision standards, whilst the accessibility standards will help determine where those deficiencies are of high importance across the Borough. Applying the standards together is a much more meaningful method of analysis than applying the standards separately and therefore helps with the prioritisation of sites.
9.28 Due to all outdoor facilities being assessed under one typology no area breakdown of supply is given although individual site areas can be sourced from the database which accompanies this report.

9.29 Map 9.1 overleaf represents the spatial distribution of local outdoor sports facilities across the Borough, excluding golf courses and bowling greens, applying the accessibility standard of a 20 minute walk time. Map 9.2 illustrates the Borough wide provision of golf courses and bowling greens with a 20 minute drive time catchment used.

9.30 It can be seen from Map 9.1 that there is a healthy spread of outdoor sports facilities throughout the Borough. All urban areas are completely covered by the accessibility standard with the exception of the east of Rothwell. In terms of rural accessibility, there are areas without access, these are Ashley, Weston by Welland, Sutton Bassett, Cransley Lodge and Grafton Underwood. The Council should work towards having some outdoor sporting facility in each of these areas provided demand can be established.

**OSF1**

| Council to investigate the possibility of supplying sporting facilities in rural areas where no facilities are currently present, with consideration to the Sports Facility Strategy in terms of the facilities that should be provided. |

9.31 However, the accessibility catchments should be treated with caution as facilities are not broken down by specific sports and are treated as ‘general’ outdoor sports facilities. It is recommended that the playing pitch strategy be updated in order to inform the current level of pitch provision needed.

**OSF2**

| Council to work with the County Council to ensure playing pitch strategy findings are still up to date. |

9.32 Borough wide provision of bowling greens and golf courses are highlighted on Map 9.2 on the subsequent page. This map shows that all areas of the Borough are within a 20 minute drive of either a bowling green or golf course.
Map 9.1 – Spatial distribution of all outdoor sporting facilities except golf and bowling greens in Kettering Borough
Map 9.2 – Spatial distribution for golf and bowling greens in Kettering Borough

Open Space Type Catchment: Outdoor Sports Facilities - Bowls and Golf

Catchment - Bowls and Golf Facilities (20 minute drivetime)

Outdoor Sports Facilities - Bowls and Golf

District

Landline

Analysis Areas

Reproduced from the Ordnance Survey with the permission of the Controller of Her Majesty’s Stationary Office

(C) Crown Copyright, Kettering Borough Council License No. 100017647 Map Scale 1 cm = 0.6829 km
Quality benchmarking

9.33 The application of the quality benchmarking standard (set at a score of 80%) provides an indication of the desired level of quality for sites and enables a comparison to be made across the Borough. It highlights sites that currently meet the visionary standard, and those sites falling significantly below and consequently suggests where improvement is required. Table 9.1. demonstrates the quality spectrum of sites across the Borough.

9.34 Scores are based upon assessment criteria, which are set out in Appendix Ei and where determined during site visits.

9.35 The quality of outdoor sports facilities in Kettering Borough is comparatively high with no sites scoring as ‘poor’ or ‘very poor’. The majority of sites were rated as either ‘good’ or ‘average’ with the poorest site being Springfield Basketball Court (Site 720). Two golf course sites were classified as ‘very good’. It is important to note that this benchmarking is predominantly focused on the green space aspects of the site rather than any ancillary accommodation.

| OSF3 | Improve all outdoor sports facilities below the quality benchmarking score. All facilities should aspire to the quality benchmark standard of 80%. |

Value assessment

9.36 Most sites that have a high level of use would normally have a good or very good quality and accessibility rating. Most sites with a low level of use would have an average or poor quality and accessibility rating. This is because the factors are related and interlinked.

9.37 A high percentage of sites (35%) scored above the quality benchmarking score of 78%. Highest scoring sites that scored highly (80%) on both quality and accessibility, these include:

- Wickstead Park Putting Greens (657)
- Pytchley Driving Range (847)
- Braybooke Primary School OSF (118)
- The Paddocks, Churchill Way, Bowling Green (27)
- Geddington C of E Playing Pitches (548)
- Kettering Miniature Golf Course (659)
- Hall Meadow Primary School Playing Pitches (631).

| OSF4 | Private facilities should be protected, particularly high scoring outdoor sports facilities similar to those listed above |

9.38 School facilities are an important source of outdoor sports provision within Kettering Borough. The accessibility and community use of these facilities is unknown, however they are particularly important sites within the rural areas, eastern and western parishes.
Current community-usage of school facilities should be investigated. Where there are opportunities to develop dual use agreements, particularly in the rural parishes, this should be supported by the Council and maximised to alleviate any deficiencies or access issues to outdoor sports within settlements.

Accessibility and quality of outdoor sports facilities is vital in their utilisation. As mentioned previously this is often an issue with rural parishes. School facilities can help alleviate these problems. Identifying sites with poor accessibility and quality is essential so that utilisation can be improved. Sites scoring poorly on access and quality (60% and below) include:

- Charlotte Place Kick About Area (808)
- Basketball Court Springfield Road (720).

The majority of problems at these two sites include general access (including entrance to sites, footpaths, disabled access), transport links (by public transport, cycleways and footpaths) and quality issues (including seats, rubbish, lighting, equipment and maintenance).

Sites scoring poorly on access and quality should be a priority for improvements by the Council in relation to the provision of outdoor sports facilities.

Summary

The recommended local standard for quantity of outdoor sports facilities has been set at 1.8ha per 1,000 population borough wide (excluding golf courses). Current provision, excluding golf courses, falls below this standard, however there are very few deficiencies when this is applied with the recommended accessibility standard. The recommended local quantity standard is set for broad planning need only. Any additional facilities should be based on established need.

Two accessibility standards have been set for outdoor sports, one for local sports including grass pitches and tennis courts. This has been recommended at a 20 minute walk time. Golf courses and bowling greens have been set at a higher standard of a 20 minute drive time. The difference in standards highlights the difference in facilities, particularly the mode of transport.

The quality benchmark for outdoor sports facilities is 78%, with only 35% of sites scoring above this standard.

Summary of recommendations for parks and gardens in Kettering Borough

Council to investigate the possibility of supplying sporting facilities in rural areas where no facilities are currently present, with consideration to the Sports Facility Strategy in terms of the facilities that should be provided.

Council to work with the County Council to ensure playing pitch strategy findings are still up to date.
| **OSF3** | Improve all outdoor sports facilities below the quality benchmarking score. All facilities should aspire to the quality benchmark standard of 80%. |
| **OSF4** | Private facilities should be protected, particularly high scoring outdoor sports facilities similar to those listed above. |
| **OSF5** | Current community use of school facilities should be investigated. Where there are opportunities to develop dual use agreements, particularly in the rural parishes, this should be supported by the Council and maximised to alleviate any deficiencies or access issues to outdoor sports within settlements. |
| **OSF6** | Sites scoring poorly on access and quality should be a priority for improvements by the Council in relation to the provision of outdoor sports facilities. |
SECTION 10

ALLOTMENTS AND COMMUNITY GARDENS
Allotments

Definition

10.1 This includes all forms of allotments with a primary purpose to provide opportunities for people to grow their own produce as part of the long term promotion of sustainability, health and social inclusion. This type of open space may also include urban farms.

Picture 10.1 Meadow Road Allotments, Rothwell

Strategic context

10.2 Like other open space types, allotments can provide a number of wider benefits to the community as well as the primary use of growing produce. These include:

- bringing together different cultural backgrounds
- improving physical and mental health
- providing a source of recreation
- wider contribution to green and open space.

10.3 An allotment strategy would help provide specific guidelines for the management and development of these sites. At this present time there is no strategy for Kettering.

10.4 The Local Plan has as a policy; “to provide for the protection and enhancement of existing allotment land.”
10.5 The North Northamptonshire Green Infrastructure Study also refers to the potential for demand for allotments to increase as the population grows. Currently neglected and underused allotments may be identified by developers as suitable for development without full consideration of current and future requirements. Others that are well used and maintained should be protected.

**Consultation**

10.6 Consultation specific to allotments and community gardens highlights some meaningful statistics and provides a justification for setting local standards against local needs:

- the 678 residents responded to the household survey and 57% indicated that allotments were important, and 28% stating that they were not important
- an analysis of the results indicated that residents felt provision was:
  - 5% more than enough
  - 34% was about right
  - 9% nearly enough
  - 17% not enough
  - 36% no opinion.
- out of 94 respondents that indicated that there was not enough allotments in the Borough, 11% were regular users.
- comments at the drop in sessions revealed a perception of significant losses of allotments in the Borough in recent times. It also highlighted the problems with vandalism of allotment sites
- consultation with allotment societies in Kettering revealed that demand for allotments had grown significantly in recent years. Plots at sites all around the Borough are full and waiting lists exist at a number of these sites
- internal officers referred to the function of allotments in terms of improving the health of the users. Currently there is a scheme at the Grange Estate (Green Patch) that is holistic in providing healthier lifestyles through both exercise at the allotments and improved diet consumption of vegetables produced at the site.

**Current position**

10.7 There are 18 allotment sites across the Borough. Nearly half of these (seven sites) are located in or around Kettering town centre (analysis area 4). Consultation with allotment societies around the Borough indicated that the occupancy levels at all of these sites are at capacity.

10.8 The management of these sites is by town or parish councils, or allotment societies formed by allotment holders.
**The Green Patch**

10.9 The Green Patch project is a recent, small scale community supported agriculture (CSA) project which was run by the Council and the Kettering Community Supported Agriculture Limited. One of the key tasks of this company was to transform an under used and unattractive allotment site in Warkton Ward. This site was used for fly-tipping and had issues with anti social behaviour towards allotment holders and suffered from nuisance behaviour problems from local young people.

10.10 The project has transformed the site so that it is now an excellent allotment, growing food for the local community and also providing much needed ancillary functions such as education and social inclusion.

**Setting provision standards**

10.11 In setting local standards for allotments there is a need to take into account any national or local standards, current provision, other local authority standards for appropriate comparison, site assessments and consultation on local needs. Full justifications for the local standards are provided within Appendices I, J, K and L. The recommended local standards have been summarised below in context with the allotment sites in Kettering.

**Quantity standard**

10.12 The total amount of open space relating to this typology is 32.67 hectares across the Borough, distributed amongst 19 sites. Based upon this information, the existing provision of allotments in Kettering is currently 0.40ha per 1,000 population. Appendix I provides a breakdown of these sites by analysis area.

10.13 Allotment sites are very much a demand led typology and need to be quantified in the context of existing provision, waiting lists and local demand. Consultation from the household survey suggest that out of 386 (57%) respondents who thought allotments are important, 138 (36%) of these believe that there is a deficiency in supply.

10.14 Consultations with existing allotment managers indicate a recent rapid increase in the interest in allotment plots and take up rate. The majority of sites are fully used and have a waiting list, although it was indicated that some of the sites are not at capacity due to their current state.

10.15 In light of the consultation responses, the standard should be set at the existing standard to protect existing facilities and to ensure that new allotments can be provided in new developments. It is recommended that the local quantity standards for allotments is set at 0.40ha per 1,000 population.

10.16 Further consultation into the demand for allotments should be provided to assist in the application of this standard, whilst all provision should be kept at the minimum of the current level of provision, supported in the recommended local standard.

10.17 The full context and justification for this standard is outlined in Appendix I.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCAL QUANTITY STANDARD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.40ha per 1,000 population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Allotments are very much a demand led-typology.**
Consultations indicate that there is a slight emphasis on the level of provision being about right. More importantly, consultations with allotment managers show a good level of interest in allotments which is increasing rapidly. There is a mixed response in terms of sites that are used to capacity and sites that have some plots currently un-used. The level of provision compared to other authorities is high, although when looking specifically at Northamptonshire, the level of provision is similar to some of the other authority areas. This may be a county/regional specific trend.

In light of the consultation responses and the need to support allotments as a holistic approach to healthier lifestyles through exercise on the site and the production of health food, the standard is set at the existing level of provision. This may provide some flexibility in terms of a re-organisation of allotments plots but essentially protects the existing level of provision and ensures that where required, new allotment plots can be provided in new developments. |

### Quality standard

10.18 There are no existing national or local standards for the quality of allotments although the National Society of Allotments and Leisure Gardeners recommend the following; 250m² recto-linear plot shapes, ideally 14 x 10 pole plots to an acre, one water source per four plots. Ideally water should be metered to each plot with a dip tank for watering cans. Each gardener should ideally have a shed or glasshouse for each plot with sufficient access to get barrows to plot.

10.19 From the household survey responses, the most common aspirations for allotment sites were for them to be clean and litter free, have quality soils, well kept grass and good access to the site. The major problems reported at allotment sites were dog fouling, vandalism and graffiti. The full context and justification for this standard is outlined in Appendix J.

### LOCAL QUALITY STANDARD

“A clean, secure and well-kept site that encourages sustainable development, bio-diversity, healthy living and education objectives with appropriate ancillary facilities (eg litter bins and water supply) to meet local needs, well kept grass and good quality soils. The site should be spacious providing appropriate access and clear boundaries and conform to current best practice and local policy for allotment management.”

**Quality benchmark: 76%**

### Justification

Provision of allotments is demand driven. However, in times when the wider health agenda is important such sites need to be promoted. Good quality allotments with appropriate ancillary facilities which promote sustainable development will help attract more people to allotment sites in Kettering.
10.20 Appendix L highlights the links between the quality vision and the site assessments that have been undertaken for allotments, converting the key factors of the vision into an expected score against the site assessment matrix used and consequently providing a minimum quality benchmark. It is important to set a benchmark indicator against which the comparative quality of allotments within the Borough can be assessed. This standard can also serve to guide improvement programmes by striving to attain the quality threshold rating at each site.

10.21 This quality vision percentage calculated for allotment sites in the Borough of Kettering, determined from site assessments and users aspirations, is 76%, which is intended as an aspirational benchmark for the allotments in the Borough. The application of this benchmark score is covered later in this section.

**Accessibility standard**

10.22 The accessibility of sites is paramount in maximising usage as well as providing an opportunity for all people to use the site. The local standard provides a realistic travel time/distance threshold, based on local needs that can assist in highlighting areas of deficiency, as well as ensuring that any new provision is placed in priority areas that are outside the recommended local accessibility catchment.

10.23 Walking was the most preferred method of transport by users and potential users, with the calculated travel time being 15 minutes, applied to the whole of the Borough. The full justification can be found in Appendix K and Section 2.31.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCAL ACCESSIBILITY STANDARD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15 minute walk time – (720m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Justification</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is a mixed response in terms of walking versus driving to allotment facilities. In line with creating sustainable transport patterns a walk time standard has been set. However this should be applied as a guide only as it is a demand led typology and will not be appropriate to always have allotments within this catchment. The 75% threshold for walking was 15 minutes and although the median and average are slightly lower at 10 and 11.3 minutes there is not a major discrepancy. In addition, benchmarking across other authorities shows standards set between 10 and 15 minutes.

The application of this standard will identify key areas of deficiency, which should be the focus for further investigation into the demand for allotments in that area.
Applying provision standards – identifying geographical areas

10.24 In order to identify geographical areas of importance and those areas with required local needs we apply both the quantitative provision of allotments in the Borough together with the local standard for accessibility. The quantity standards enable the identification of areas that do not meet the minimum provision standards, while the accessibility standards will help determine where those deficiencies are of high importance. Applying the standards together is a much more meaningful method of analysis than applying the standards separately and therefore helps with the prioritisation of sites.

10.25 The current supply of allotments in Kettering matches the recommended local standard of 0.38ha per 1,000 population for this typology. This current level of supply can be broken down by the analysis areas, the following table highlights where there are quantitative shortfalls or surpluses in the relevant analysis areas:

Table 10.1 Analysis area breakdown for provision of allotments (ha per 1,000 population)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analysis area</th>
<th>Current Level of Provision</th>
<th>Shortfall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.09ha per 1,000 population</td>
<td>-0.29ha per 1,000 population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.19ha per 1,000 population</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.24ha per 1,000 population</td>
<td>-0.14ha per 1,000 population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.25ha per 1,000 population</td>
<td>-0.13ha per 1,000 population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.27ha per 1,000 population</td>
<td>-0.11ha per 1,000 population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.83ha per 1,000 population</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10.26 The breakdown of analysis areas shows that there is a significant shortfall in allotments in most of the analysis areas, excluding analysis areas 2 and 6. However as a borough wide accumulated quantity, current provision does meet the recommended standard but geographic distribution means that localised accessibility deficiencies exist.

10.27 Projecting this forward to 2021 (justification provided in Section 2.26), the level of existing provision across the Borough falls marginally to 0.32 ha per 1,000 population. This is due to the circa 20,000 increase in population that is predicted in the Borough. At this time, there will be shortfalls of allotment provision in all of the analysis areas except for analysis areas 2 and 6. Appendix I shows the full calculations for the quantitative supply of open spaces in the Borough.

The Council should consider future population trends in the Borough when reviewing allotment provision. The increased level of housing and greater population will lead to a greater demand for allotments, particularly if the development is of housing which does not include gardens.
10.28 Map 10.1 below represents the spatial distribution of allotments across the Borough.

**Map 10.1 Spatial distribution of allotments in Kettering**

---

*Open Space Type Catchment, Allotments*

Allows you to visualize the spatial distribution of allotments within the Borough.
10.29 As mentioned previously allotments are very much a demand-led typology and there is little merit in providing this type of open space if there is no demand. Household surveys indicate that those who believe there is currently insufficient supply to meet demand are mainly located in analysis areas 3, around Desborough and Rothwell (21%) and area 4, Kettering town (58%). Urban areas represent a greater need for this type of open space, particularly where there are limited opportunities in dense neighbourhoods.

| ALLOT2 | Further investigate the demand for allotments in Burton Latimer, Kettering and Desborough analysis areas. |

10.30 As mentioned previously, the importance of allotments is paramount in urban areas, however there are still opportunities and potential demand to provide allotments in rural areas. The high level of demand for allotments across the Borough is demonstrated by the fact that all allotment managers contacted as part of the consultation process indicated that plots on the allotments were full and that several had waiting lists of people waiting to obtain a plot.

10.31 In the event that there is an unmet demand for allotments, there is the potential to develop areas of amenity green space for the provision of new allotments. Only sites of poor quality or low importance should be considered to accommodate any allotment development and the development of the site should not be to the detriment of other typologies.

| ALLOT3 | Investigate the demand for allotments in rural areas in the Borough and where necessary investigate potential to redesignate other open space sites for allotment use. |

Quality benchmarking

10.32 The application of the quality benchmarking standard (set at a score of 76%) provides an indication of the desired level of quality for sites and enables a comparison to be made across the Borough. It highlights sites that currently meet the visionary standard, and those sites falling significantly below and consequently suggests where improvement is required. Table 10.2 demonstrates the quality spectrum of sites across the Borough.

10.33 Scores are based upon assessment criteria, which are set out in Appendix Ei and where determined during site visits.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Percentage range</th>
<th>Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>90% to 100%</td>
<td>(none)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>70% to 89%</td>
<td>Desborough Allotments (Site 573) – 81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Windmill Avenue Allotments (Site 120) – 80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>St Botolph’s Road Allotments (Site 451) – 76%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Percentage range</th>
<th>Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>50% to 69%</td>
<td>Margaret Road Allotments (Site 413) – 69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Harrington Allotments (Site 590) – 69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Meadow Drive Allotments (Site 61) – 60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>30% to 49%</td>
<td>Shotwell Mill Lane Allotments (site 44) – 40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>Below 30%</td>
<td>(none)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10.34 As can be seen from Figure 10.2 the quality of allotments in Kettering Borough range from poor to good. Only two sites in the whole study scored above the quality benchmark, St Botolph’s Road Allotment and Desborough Allotment, scoring quality scores of 76% and 81% respectively. Shotwell Mill Lane Allotments is the lowest quality scoring site in the Borough, with 40%. This site also has a poor score for site accessibility, identifying it as a site that requires immediate attention.

10.35 The majority of sites are either privately owned, parish council owned or privately managed for the Council.

**ALLOT4**

| Aim to achieve the quality benchmark standard at all allotment sites within Kettering Borough. Where a site is privately owned or managed, the Council should provide guidelines for the quality and maintenance of these sites in line with the quality vision set for allotments. |

### Value Assessment

10.36 In general, most sites that have a high level of plot occupancy and regular users would normally have a good or very good quality and accessibility rating. Most sites with a low level of use would have an average or poor quality and accessibility rating. This is because the factors are related and interlinked. The Green Patch at the Grange Estate is an example of where high demand and user levels has subsequently meant plots are regularly maintained.

10.37 The quality scores and accessibility scores range from good to very poor for both quality and accessibility. Some usage assessment has been gathered through telephone consultation with allotment managers who indicated the number of plots that were available for use at each of the sites. The allotment managers spoken to indicated that there was a high level of use indicated by the fact that there were not currently any plots available and that many of the managers were operating waiting lists at the sites. For this reason, the usage of allotments at sites across the Borough was considered to be high and significant.

10.38 Four sites scored highly for quality and accessibility. Short Lane Allotments (Site ID 5), Windmill Avenue Allotments South (Site ID 120), Northfield Avenue Allotments (Site ID 154) and Desborough Allotments (Site ID 573).
The Council should protect Short Lane Allotments (Site ID 5), Windmill Avenue Allotments South (Site ID 120), Northfield Avenue Allotments (Site ID 154) and Desborough Allotments (Site ID 573) as high quality, accessible and well used allotment sites.

Further consideration should be given to sites where quality and accessibility both score poorly. Consideration to specific localised demand for these sites is required before any development decisions are made. These sites include:

- Shotwell Mill Lane Allotments (Site ID 44)
- Railway View Allotments (Site ID 156)
- Meadow Road Allotments (Site ID 61).

Investigate the usage and demand for Site IDs 44, 156 and 61. If usage is confirmed as high/often then the quality and accessibility of these sites should be improved and these sites be protected.

There are also a number of site which scored highly for one of either quality or accessibility but lowly for the other. These two factors are interdependent for many sites across the Borough. While regular use and occupancy of most plots ensures high quality levels, good accessibility is essential for allotment users on a regular basis to maintain their plots and encourage wider interest from the local community. Sites scoring highly for quality but low for accessibility include:

- Rushton Road Allotments North (Site ID 42)
- Margaret’s Road Allotments (site ID 413)
- St Botolph’s Road Allotments (Site ID 451)
- Harrington Allotment (Site ID 590).

Several of these sites were noted to have poor signage and disabled access, which contributed to their overall low accessibility scores (see assessment standards – appendix Ei).

Review level of use at Site IDs 42, 413, 451 and 590. If use levels are confirmed as high then consider actions to improve accessibility to these sites to make them sites of real value to all residents within the local community.

Sites that scored high for accessibility but low for quality included:

- Wilbarston Allotments (site ID 494)
- Pytchley Allotments (site ID 675).
10.43 Several other sites scored very close to the average for quality and have not been included in the above list. The two sites above are of very low quality and the level of usage at these sites should be considered. Further discussion with allotment managers regarding specific localised future demand projections in order to determine whether it is most beneficial to continue to use these sites as allotments in accordance with a new strategy or to redesignate to alternative open space usages. 

| ALLOT8 | Investigate further the level of use at Site IDs 494 and 675 in order to determine whether it is most beneficial to continue to use these sites and improve the quality or to redesignate to alternative open space usages. |

10.44 There are currently a number of sites and users that would benefit from a borough wide allotment strategy. This would also help the Council to more accurately target resources for specific improvements at sites across the Borough.

| ALLOT9 | Undertake borough wide allotment strategy to direct the future allocation of allotment sites in the Borough. |

Summary and recommendations

10.45 Current provision of allotments on a borough wide basis meets the recommended quantity standard of 0.38ha per 1,000 population, however there are localised shortfalls in the majority of analysis areas and opportunities should be maximised to decrease these shortfalls where this is necessary due to excess demand for allotments in a particular analysis area. Demand in specific areas should be determined through further examination of current usage and expected future trends.

10.46 The provision of allotments is very much demand led, supported by the findings in the household survey. Following on from this is the quantity standard recommended at 0.38ha per 1,000 population. The quality benchmark has been set at 76% and the accessibility standard is a 15 minute walk time (720m).

10.47 The quality of allotments is varied. The improvement of allotment sites should be addressed under a borough-wide strategy with specific attention to localised demand.

Summary of recommendations for allotments in Kettering Borough.

<p>| ALLOT1 | The Council should consider future population trends in the Borough when reviewing allotment provision. The increased level of housing and greater population will lead to a greater demand for allotments, particularly if the development is of housing which does not include gardens. |
| ALLOT2 | Further investigate the demand for allotments in Burton Latimer, Kettering and Desborough analysis areas. |
| ALLOT3 | Investigate the demand for allotments in rural areas in the Borough and where necessary investigate potential to redesignate other open space sites for allotment use. |
| ALLOT4 | Aim to achieve the quality benchmark standard at all allotment sites within Kettering Borough. Where a site is privately owned or managed, the Council should provide guidelines for the quality and maintenance of these sites in line with the quality vision set for allotments. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ALLOT5</th>
<th>The Council should protect Short Lane Allotments (Site ID 5), Windmill Avenue Allotments South (Site ID 120), Northfield Avenue Allotments (Site ID 154) and Desborough Allotments (Site ID 573) as high quality, accessible and well used allotment sites.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALLOT6</td>
<td>Investigate the usage and demand for Site IDs 44, 156 and 61. If usage is confirmed as high/often then the quality and accessibility of these sites should be improved and these sites be protected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALLOT7</td>
<td>Review level of use at Site IDs 42, 413, 451 and 590. If use levels are confirmed as high then consider actions to improve accessibility to these sites to make them sites of real value to all residents within the local community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALLOT8</td>
<td>Investigate further the level of use at Sites IDs 494 and 675 in order to determine whether it is most beneficial to continue to use these sites and improve the quality or to redesignate to alternative open space usages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALLOT9</td>
<td>Undertake borough wide allotment strategy to direct the future allocation of allotment sites in the Borough.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION 11

GREEN CORRIDORS
Green corridors

Definition

11.1 This open space type includes towpaths along canals and riverbanks, cycleways, rights of way and disused railway lines with the primary purpose to provide opportunities for walking, cycling and horse riding whether for leisure purposes or travel and opportunities for wildlife migration.

Figure 11.1 Kettering cycleway

PPG17 – the role of green corridors

11.2 With regards to green corridors the emphasis of PPG 17 appears to be on urban areas. It uses the typology from the Urban Green Spaces Taskforce Report that it is an ‘urban typology’.

11.3 Furthermore, elements of PPG 17 are contradictory to the companion guide on this issue, where despite PPG 17 suggesting that all corridors, including those in remote rural settlements should be included, the companion guide suggests that unless a green corridor is used as a transport link between facilities ie home and school, town and sports facility, then it should not be included within an audit.

11.4 Although the role that all green corridors play in the provision of open space and recreation within local authority areas is recognised an awareness regarding the necessity of urban corridors and public rights of way (PROW) within the Kettering Borough is important due to direct accessibility opportunities.
11.5 Northamptonshire County Council, as Highway Authority, are responsible for the maintenance, improvement and publicity of public rights of way through Kettering. Their responsibilities include:

- maintaining the surfaces of rights of way including the control of natural vegetation, to allow rights to be exercised
- assisting farmers and landowners with the maintenance of approved stiles and gates
- signposting footpaths, bridleways and byways where they leave a metalled road
- maintaining some bridges crossed by rights of way
- receiving complaints and taking appropriate action
- asserting and protecting the rights of the public to use and enjoy rights of way.

11.6 Kettering Borough Council acknowledge the importance of green corridor sites in the Kettering Local Plan. The leisure section of the Local Plan states key policies to:

- provide for the enhancement of existing rights of way or retain them on their original or acceptable alternative routes
- promote heritage trails including signposting, waymarking and information/interpretation boards in line with the County Council and other appropriate bodies.

11.7 The Local Plan also states support for the Countryside Commission’s target of having every public right of way legally defined, properly maintained, signposted and publicised.

11.8 In addition to the Local Plan’s references to green corridors, the Kettering Cycle Strategy refers specifically to the need for greater provision of cycleways (a facility that should be developed in coordination with green corridors).

11.9 The North Northamptonshire Green Infrastructure provides a strategic framework for the provision of green corridors in the county. It emphasises the importance of green corridors particularly in those areas where high levels of growth is anticipated.

Current position

11.10 The major green corridor sites were identified through the audit and digitised. However, no formal assessment of green corridor sites in the Borough was undertaken since these sites are of too great a length for an accurate assessment to occur.
SECTION 11 – GREEN CORRIDORS

11.11 A high percentage (91%) of people responding to the household survey felt that all forms of green corridors across the Borough were important, they were also rated highly for usage, with a total of 24% of residents using them on a daily basis. In total, 60% of people stated they used them once a month or more. Of those that deemed this typology to be of interest in the household survey, the areas with the highest proportion of residents that indicated not enough currently exists were area 2 (45%) and 5 (47% of respondents from these specific areas). The areas with the lowest figures regarding residents sighting a significant shortage of green corridors yet regarding them as of interest were areas 1 (6%) and 6 (22% of respondents from these specific areas). A significant number of respondents across all areas raised issues regarding maintenance, cycleway provision and availability (due to housing developments) as major concerns that limit further use.

11.12 Consultation with The Ramblers Association Footpath Secretary who is closely involved in the use of green corridors indicated that the existing green corridors were of a good standard. Usage could be increased if marketing and promotion of these green corridors was made a priority.

Setting provision standards

11.13 In setting local standards for green corridors there is a need to take into account any national or local standards, current provision, other local authority standards for appropriate comparison, site assessments and consultation on local needs. Full indication of consultation and justifications for the recommended local standards are provided within Appendices I, J, K and L. The recommended local standards have been summarised below in context with the green corridor sites in the Borough of Kettering.

Quantity standard

11.14 The Annex A of PPG17 – Open Space Typology 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. This means that there is no sensible way of stating a provision standard, just as there is no way of having a standard for the proportion of land in an area which it will be desirable to allocate for roads”.

LOCAL QUANTITY STANDARD
No Local Standard Set

11.15 It is therefore recommended that no provision standard should be set. PPG17 goes onto to state that:

“Instead planning policies should promote the use of green corridors to link housing areas to the Sustains national cycle network, town and city centres, places of employment and community facilities such as schools, shops, community centres and sports facilities. In this sense green corridors are demand-led. However, planning authorities should also take opportunities to use established linear routes, such as disused railway lines, roads or canal and river banks, as green corridors, and supplement them by proposals to ‘plug in’ access to them from as wide an area as possible.”
SECTION 11 – GREEN CORRIDORS

Kettering Borough Council should work in tandem with Northamptonshire County Council and the local Primary Care Trust (PCT) to help maximise the use of green corridors in the Borough.

Quality standard

11.16 The Countryside Agency have issued guidance on what the user should expect to find in terms of quality on green corridor sites, including, a path provided by the protection and reinforcement of existing vegetation; ground not soft enough to allow a horse or cycle to sink into it and a path on unvegetated natural surfaces. This standard should also be applicable to all urban corridors and public rights of way. There are currently no local standards for this typology.

11.17 Highest rated aspirations of this type of open space included clean and litter free, clear footpaths and nature features. Dog fouling and litter problems were considered to be the worst quality issues at the current time and highest rated safety factors included adequate lighting, clear route to open spaces and Closed Circuit Television. The general size of most green corridors means that CCTV will only be feasible at particular strategic locations and not on all sites. These key quality factors alongside other consultations have been the basis of the recommendation for green corridors. The full context and justification for this standard is outlined in Appendix J.

LOCAL QUALITY STANDARD

“A clean, well maintained, safe and secure corridor with clear pathways, linking major open spaces together and enhancing natural features. Corridors should provide ancillary facilities such as bins, seating and lighting in appropriate places and signage.”

Justification

Green corridors play an important role in linking communities and provide an opportunity for exercise for local residents. It is therefore important that any new provision meets this local quality standard which incorporates the Council’s visions and public aspirations. This is particularly in light of the strategic function of green corridors highlighted in the North Northamptonshire Green Infrastructure Study. Ultimately sites need to be safe with clear pathways and well maintained to encourage usage. These major routes also need to be well lit and secure.

11.18 Green corridor sites in the Borough have not been assessed through sites assessments due to their linear nature. Therefore there is no set recommended minimum quality benchmark. In applying this standard, an assessment of these sites would provide a realistic base in improving green corridors sites in the Borough.

All green corridors in Kettering Borough should aspire to the quality vision for this typology.
**Accessibility standard**

11.19 Provision and development is demand led in accordance with external factors and influences such as planning permission being granted. There is however a degree of opportunity led development where land is publicly accessible and biodiversity can be actively protected and enhanced.

**LOCAL ACCESSIBILITY STANDARD**

No Local Standard Set

**Links with the health agenda**

11.20 Green corridors represent an important chance to link open spaces within the urban area and to promote transport by cycle and walking. These opportunities for informal recreation will help towards keeping the public active and improving health within the local area.

11.21 The latest government plan published by the Department for Transport and entitled “Walking and Cycling: an action plan” states:

> “Walking and cycling are good for our health, good for getting us around, good for our public spaces and good for our society. For all these reasons we need to persuade more people to choose to walk and cycle more often.”

11.22 Therefore it is important to address any qualitative deficiencies of existing green corridors and capitalise on any opportunities to increase and enhance the existing network.

**GC3**

Kettering Borough Council should also work with the County Council to establish a network of green corridors to enhance the usage of natural and semi natural provision in the rural areas.

**Applying provision standards**

11.23 Given that it is not appropriate to set any local quantity or accessibility standards. It is also not appropriate to state areas of deficiency or need, however there are certain areas within Kettering Borough that have been identified through analysis of other typologies that could potentially benefit from the provision of green corridors, or improved quality and accessibility of green corridors to aid increased level of usage to other types. A green infrastructure strategy should look to incorporate the promotion and enhancement of green corridors to increase direct usage and to aid access to other typologies.
The development of green corridors should link with sustainable transport agendas and policies. It is suggested in the North Northamptonshire Green Infrastructure Strategy (2005) that a further routeway between the Ise Valley and Harper’s Brook sub-regional GI corridors (via the Geddington – Stanion local corridor) should be considered in due course to provide sustainable access between Kettering/Wicksteed Park and Corby (and its accessible sub-regional green space) in due course. Furthermore the report also recommends continuous recreation routes from the Nene Valley to Wellingborough, and from Wellingborough to Kettering should be developed to improve connectivity at the inter-settlement level, to provide access to the strategic destination of Wicksteed Park and Boughton Park and sustainable movement options for local users.

It is suggested that a green infrastructure study is produced that builds upon this, and other local documentation that will offer guidance towards environmental systems, biodiversity, and community access and movement. Overall the Council should look to establish a Sustainable Movement Network.

| GC4 | Linking existing green corridors with open spaces in the Borough should be a key priority for the Council to provide opportunities for informal recreation and alternative means of transport, using all types of open spaces. |
| GC5 | Investigating the feasibility of a green infrastructure study to help link green corridors with open spaces to help create a network of multifunctional green space in Kettering Borough should be an extension of the Kettering Open Space Study. |

Summary and recommendations

Green corridors provide opportunities close to people’s homes for informal recreation, particularly walking and cycling, as part of every day routines or part of an exercise programme to enhance fitness.

The development of a linked green corridor network will help to provide opportunities for informal recreation and improve the health and well being of the local community linking in with current strategies, particularly the development of the Cycling Strategy and North Northamptonshire Green Infrastructure Study.

There are already a number of footpaths and green corridor networks within the Borough, enhanced and maintained mainly by Northamptonshire County Council. Public consultation suggests that this type of open space is high valued, used by 60% of residents across the Borough once a month or more. Highest demand which emanates from level of interest and desire for more green corridors existed in analysis area 5 around the town of Burton Latimer.

Providing a network of multi functional green space will contribute to the high quality natural and built environment required for existing and new sustainable communities in the future. Providing an integrated network of high quality green corridors will link open spaces together to help alleviate other open space deficiencies and provide opportunities for informal recreation and alternative means of transport.
11.30 Due to the nature of this open space and the general ownership, maintenance and management there are no site or geographical specific recommendations, however a number of general recommendations have been summarised below to help maximise the use of green corridors in relation to other types of open space in the Borough.

Summary of recommendations for green corridors in Kettering Borough

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GC1</th>
<th>Kettering Borough Council should work in tandem with Northamptonshire County Council and the local PCT to help maximise the use of green corridors in the Borough.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GC2</td>
<td>All green corridors in Kettering should aspire to the quality vision for this typology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GC3</td>
<td>Kettering Borough Council should also work with the County Council to establish a network of green corridors to enhance the usage of natural and semi-natural provision in the rural areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GC4</td>
<td>Linking existing green corridors with open spaces in the Borough should be a key priority for the Council to provide opportunities for informal recreation and alternative means of transport, using all types of open spaces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GC5</td>
<td>Investigating the feasibility of a green infrastructure study to help link green corridors with open spaces to help create a network of multifunctional green space in Kettering Borough should be an extension of the Kettering Open Space Study.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION 12

CEMETERIES AND CHURCHYARDS
Cemeteries and churchyards

Definition

12.1 Churchyards are encompassed within the walled boundary of a church and cemeteries are burial grounds outside the confines of a church. These include private burial grounds, local authority burial grounds and disused churchyards. The primary purpose of this type of open space is for burial of the dead and quiet contemplation but also for the promotion of wildlife conservation and biodiversity.

Figure 12.1 London Road Cemetery

Strategic context and consultation

12.2 Cemeteries and churchyards can be a significant open space provider in some areas particularly in rural areas. In other areas they can represent a relatively minor resource in terms of the land, but are able to provide areas of nature conservation importance.

12.3 Some churchyards retain areas of unimproved grasslands and other various habitats. They can make a significant contribution to the provision of urban green space sometimes providing a sanctuary for wildlife in the urban settlements and often providing some historic value to the more rural landscapes.

12.4 Cemeteries and churchyards need to be considered as an important asset, including the value to the families of the deceased, peaceful areas for contemplation, a ‘piece of history’ and a sanctuary for wildlife.

12.5 79% of people from the household survey thought that this type of open space was important and 55% of people stated they use churchyards and cemeteries (occasionally or more than occasionally). This suggests that this type of open space is well valued by the residents of the Borough and there is recognition of the benefits offered.
SECTION 12 – CEMETERIES AND CHURCHYARDS

12.6 Just over half (53%) of respondents believed that their provision was enough or more than enough, with 20% having no opinion. This should be considered in relation to burial space at specific cemeteries as the primary purpose of churchyards is for locating graves rather than providing an amenity green space.

12.7 The importance of this type of open space for the purposes of quiet reflection was frequently mentioned at drop in sessions. The importance of keeping these open spaces well maintained was also emphasised.

Setting provision standards

Quantity standard

12.8 No Quantity Standards are to be set for Cemeteries and Churchyards. PPG 17 Annex states "many historic churchyards provide important places for quiet contemplation, especially in busy urban areas, and often support biodiversity and interesting geological features. As such many can also be viewed as amenity greenspaces. Unfortunately, many are also run-down and therefore it may be desirable to enhance them. As churchyards can only exist where there is a church, the only form of provision standard which will be required is a qualitative one."

LOCAL QUANTITY STANDARD

No Local Quantity Standard to be set

12.9 For Cemeteries, PPG 17 Annex states "every individual cemetry has a finite capacity and therefore there is steady need for more of them. Indeed, many areas face a shortage of ground for burials. The need for graves, for all religious faiths, can be calculated from population estimates, coupled with details of the average proportion of deaths which result in a burial, and converted into a quantitative population-based provision standard." This does not relate to a quantitative hectare per 1,000 population requirement.

Quality standard (see Appendices J and L)

12.10 It is essential that quality of churchyards and cemeteries are prioritised especially where they provide the only open space within small rural settlements.
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LOCAL QUALITY STANDARD

"A clean and well-maintained site providing long-term burial capacity, an area of quiet contemplation and a sanctuary for wildlife. Sites should have clear pathways and varied vegetation and landscaping and provide appropriate ancillary accommodation (eg. facilities for flowers, litter bins and seating.) Access to sites should be enhanced by parking facilities and by public transport routes, particularly in urban areas."

Quality benchmark: 70%

Justification

It is important for the Council and the public to acknowledge the important open space function that churchyards and cemeteries provide. This can be particularly the case in rural areas where cemeteries and churchyards may be the only open space in the village. However, it is essential that sites are regularly maintained with clear footpaths so as to increase the ease of access and safety for those who visit the sites. It is important that good practice is promoted throughout the Borough.

Accessibility

12.11 There is no realistic requirement to set catchments for such typologies as they cannot easily be influenced through planning policy and implementation.

LOCAL ACCESSIBILITY STANDARD

No Local Accessibility Standard to be set

Applying provision standards – identifying geographical areas

12.12 Given that it is not appropriate to set any local quantity or accessibility standards it is also not appropriate to state areas of deficiency or need.

12.13 Cemeteries and churchyards, although needed for the burial of the dead, provide an open space to be used on an opportunity led basis, ie where there are churchyards and cemeteries there are also opportunities for wildlife and use of the open space by the public for walking and relaxing.

12.14 It is however important to consider the quality of the provision of cemeteries and churchyards and the value of the current provision, striving to achieve the quality vision set for all churchyards and cemetery sites.
Quality benchmarking

12.15 The application of the quality benchmarking standard (set at a score of 70%) provides an indication of the desired level of quality for sites and enables a comparison to be made across the Borough. It highlights sites that currently meet the visionary standard, and those sites falling significantly below and consequently suggests where improvement is required. Table 12.1 demonstrates the quality spectrum of sites across the Borough.

12.16 Scores are based upon assessment criteria, which are set out in Appendix Ei and where determined during site visits.

Table 12.1 Example of sites above and below the benchmark quality indicator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Percentage range</th>
<th>Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Very good      | 90% to 100%      | St Mary’s Church (Site 33) – 91%  
|                 |                  | St James’ Church, Grafton Underwood (Site 626) – 91% |
| Good           | 70% to 89%       | Burton Latimer Cemetery (Site 630) – 88%  
|                 |                  | St Mary Magdalene Church (Site 547) – 79%  
|                 |                  | Desborough Cemetery (Site 570) – 72% |
| Average        | 50% to 69%       | Pytchley Cemetery (Site 678) – 69%  
|                 |                  | All Saints Church (Site 556) – 61% |
| Poor           | 30% to 49%       | (none) |
| Very poor      | Below 30%        | (none) |

12.17 Churchyards and cemeteries in the Borough are of a good quality. The majority of sites scored good and two sites scored very good. All Saints Church (Site ID 556) is the lowest scoring site, scoring an average of 61% which is below the quality benchmarking score of 70%.

Details of assessment criteria can be found in Appendix Ei. Sites are assessed in terms of their ability to accommodate those residents visiting them, regardless of whether the purpose of visit is to utilise the site as an amenity greenspace or to use the churchyard facilities.

Value assessment

12.18 The wider benefits of churchyards are key and it is wrong to place a value on churchyards and cemeteries focusing solely on quality, accessibility and usage. In addition to offering a functional value, many cemeteries and churchyards have wider benefits including heritage, cultural and landscape values.

12.19 In some instances, particularly in the rural settlements, a churchyard is one of the only type of formal open space provision and becomes a focal point of the village.
12.20 A number of churchyard and cemetery sites score above the quality benchmark score of 70% although the specific usage breakdown of individual sites is unknown. The benchmark is relatively low as most churchyards and cemeteries are generally good and focus should be on maintenance and protection rather than major redevelopment. In relation to this there is also a consideration that churches and managing authorities generally have limited funds to invest on major changes to the open space around their site.

12.21 A number of sites fall below the quality benchmarking score. There are 10 sites, which score below 70%. The two lowest scoring sites are

- Burton Latimer (Site ID 32)
- All Saints Church (Site ID 556).

| CC1 | The lowest scoring sites below the quality benchmark score should be prioritised for improvements, specifically where there are known additional problems with access.
Where the ownership and maintenance of these facilities is in private ownership, community groups should be encouraged to take ownership in improving the quality of these sites. |

Summary and recommendations

12.22 Cemeteries and churchyards can be a significant open space provider in some areas particularly in rural areas. In other areas they can represent a relatively minor resource in terms of the land, but are able to provide areas of nature conservation importance and are often among the few areas of greenspace where the local community is able to have some contact with the natural world.

12.23 In general the quality of sites is very good and the quality benchmarking score has been set at 70%, a realistic quality vision that can be achieved by all sites.

12.24 PPG 17 states there is little need to set a quantity and accessibility standard for this type of open space. They should be valued as an additional resource of open space, particularly in areas that are deficient in natural and semi natural provision.

12.25 Where there are opportunities to encourage local community groups/church groups to maintain these sites and encourage biodiversity, this should be maximised.

12.26 In addition to the recommendation outlined, further general recommendations have been provided to help maximises the value of these sites. These have been successfully employed by other borough councils, summarised overleaf in CC2 and CC3.
Summary of recommendations for churchyards and cemeteries in the Borough of Kettering

| CC1 | The lowest scoring sites below the quality benchmark score should be prioritised for improvements, specifically where there are known additional problems with access. Where the ownership and maintenance of these facilities is in private ownership, community groups should be encouraged to take ownership in improving the quality of these sites. |
| CC2 | Produce a cemeteries and churchyards action plan, accounting for all provision, not just that owned and managed by the Council. |
| CC3 | Promote the nature conservation value of cemeteries and churchyards and begin to develop more awareness of ecological management of cemeteries and churchyards, particular in relation to CC1, involving voluntary groups. |
SECTION 13

CIVIC SPACES
**Civic spaces**

**Definition**

13.1 Civic spaces include civic and market squares and other hard surfaced community areas designed for pedestrians with the primary purpose of providing a setting for civic buildings, public demonstrations and community events.

**Figure 13.1 The Clock**

---

**Strategic context and consultation**

13.2 Civic spaces can be important open space particularly in urban areas and town centres.

13.3 As PPG 17 states “the purpose of civic spaces, mainly in town and city centres, is to provide a setting for civic buildings, and opportunities for open air markets, demonstrations and civic events. They are normally provided on an opportunistic and urban design led basis. Accordingly it is for planning authorities to promote urban design frameworks for their town and city centre areas.”

13.4 Civic spaces need to be considered as an important asset as an area of open space for the residents in towns and settlements across Kettering and is the only open space type that is not considered as green space.
13.5 The Kettering Masterplan is an important strategic document that may potentially affect the civic spaces in the Borough. The May 2005 document proposes developments which are potentially far reaching and for the future as opposed to the immediate present. The Masterplan contains a number of development plans at sites around the town centre. Civic space sites, present or future, that are referred to in the Masterplan include:

- Times Square. (civic space at the junction of Gold Street and Lower Street and The Clock)
- Market Place.

13.6 77% of respondents from the household survey thought that this type of open space is important. However only 6% of people identified this type of open space as the type of space they spend time at most frequently. This does not necessarily suggest that residents do not use these open spaces, just that they spend more time at other types of areas on a more frequent basis.

Setting provision standards

13.7 In setting local standards for civic spaces there is a need to take into account any national or local standards, current provision, other local authority standards for appropriate comparison, site assessments and consultation on local needs. Full indication of consultation and justifications for the recommended local standards are provided within Appendices I, J, K and L. The recommended local standards have been summarised below in context with the civic space sites in the Borough of Kettering.

**Quantity Standard**

13.8 It is not possible to make a reasoned judgement in setting provision standards for civic spaces across the local authority area due to the limited amount of civic space provision. Furthermore, PPG17 suggests that it is not realistic to set a quantity standard for civic spaces.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCAL QUANTITY STANDARD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Local Quantity Standard to be set</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13.9 Therefore from the analysis it is suggested that **no provision standard** is set. However, PPG17 adds that it is desirable for planning authorities to promote urban design frameworks for their town and city centres.
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Quality Standard

13.10 There are no national or existing local guidelines for the quality of civic spaces. User aspirations for civic spaces in the Borough of Kettering are clean and litter free; flowers, trees and shrubs; and toilets. Adequate lighting, CCTV and reputation of area/space were the most frequently cited safety considerations at these sites. These key quality factors alongside other consultations have been the basis of the recommendation for civic space. The full justification for the proposed standard can be found in Appendix J.

LOCAL QUALITY STANDARD

“A clean, well-maintained, safe and secure site, with generally hard landscaping but may accommodate soft areas. Sites should be adequately designed and maintained in order to serve a particular civic function. Ancillary accommodation, including toilets, lighting and CCTV should be provided where appropriate.”

Quality benchmark: 68%

Justification

Although based on the consultation responses, the standard also incorporates elements of standards set for other authorities due to the limited response rate. Vandalism and security are issues for civic spaces and as such the focus of this standard is on this issue requiring increasing perceptions of safety amongst local users.

13.11 Appendix L highlights the links between the quality vision and the findings of the site assessments that have been undertaken for civic spaces, converting the key factors of the vision into an expected score against the site assessment matrix used and consequently providing a minimum quality benchmark. It is important to set a benchmark indicator against which the comparative quality of civic spaces within Kettering Borough can be assessed. This standard can also serve to guide improvement programmes by striving to attain the quality threshold rating at each site.

13.12 This quality vision percentage calculated for civic spaces in Kettering Borough, determined from site assessments and users aspirations, is 68%, which is intended as an aspirational benchmark for the civic spaces within the Borough.

Accessibility standard

13.13 There is no realistic requirement to set catchments for such an open space typology as there is limited scope to provide additional provision. Civic spaces tend to be located in town or local centres and are opportunities led through the development of civic or large buildings.

13.14 This is particularly true in rural areas, where it may not expected that civic spaces would be located in close proximity.
Applying provision standards

13.15 Given that it is not appropriate to set any local quantity or accessibility standards, it is also not appropriate to state areas of deficiency or need.

**LOCAL ACCESSIBILITY STANDARD**

No Local Accessibility Standard to be set

Quality benchmarking

13.16 The application of the quality benchmarking standard (set at a score of 68%) provides an indication of the desired level of quality for sites and enables a comparison between sites across the Borough. It highlights sites that currently meet the visionary standard, and those sites falling below the benchmark and consequently suggests where improvement is required. Table 13.1 demonstrates the quality spectrum of all civic space sites across the Borough.

13.17 Scores are based upon assessment criteria, which are set out in Appendix Ei and were determined during site visits.

**Table 14.1 Examples of sites above and below the benchmark quality indicator**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Percentage range</th>
<th>Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>90% to 100%</td>
<td>(none)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>70% to 89%</td>
<td>Horsemarket Open Space (Site 825) – 87% Market Place (Site 827) – 85% The Clock/ Time Square (Site 823) – 81% High Street, Desborough Civic Space (Site 802) – 81% Bridge Street (Site 913) – 78% Alfred East Memorial Gardens (Site 828) – 77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>50% to 69%</td>
<td>Queen Eleanor Cross (Site 715) – 68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>30% to 49%</td>
<td>(none)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>Below 30%</td>
<td>(none)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13.18 There are only a handful of civic space sites identified within Kettering Borough. Some of these sites include such sites where the value and level of use is limited eg monuments and memorials. The quality of sites range between 68% and 87%.
Value assessment

13.19 Usage assessments of civic spaces is not appropriate, especially at sites which are small and have little function. This is particularly true of most of the civic space sites in the Borough and as such it is not possible to place a value against the civic space sites.

Summary and recommendations

13.20 Due to the existence of such a small number of sites it is considered inappropriate to set quantitative and accessibility local standards for civic spaces. However, a quality standard has been set as a benchmark for new areas of civic space and maintaining existing areas of civic spaces in the Borough.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CS 1</th>
<th>Adopt the quality vision for all current and future civic spaces.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CS 2</td>
<td>Continue to examine the possibility of the creation of new civic spaces, or extension of existing civic spaces, as part of urban extensions or town centre improvements in the town centres of Kettering, Rothwell and Desborough.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION 14

RESOURCING AND OPEN SPACE
Resourcing open space

Introduction

14.1 CABE Space suggest within their ‘manifesto’ that:
- a strategic vision is essential
- political commitment is essential
- and to start by making the case for high quality green spaces in house (persuading other departments is key – high priority).

14.2 It will be essential to gain any financial support (both internally and externally) for any improvements to existing provision or new provision.

Section 106 planning agreements

14.3 In particular, Section 106 agreements can be used to achieve environmental improvements once a new development has come on stream and this will be dependant on the areas where development proposals are put forward and may not be all areas.

14.4 Once a strategy framework has been established, the process of obtaining these improvements will be enhanced because they can be used to achieve specific purposes, eg:
- by opening linear route ways to connect green spaces
- providing walking and cycling routes
- obtaining open space in areas of deficiency
- funding open space improvements
- some Councils have used part of the contributions towards revenue ‘Development Officer’ posts; e.g. in Nottinghamshire
- there are maintenance considerations to be taken into account; i.e. significant costs may arise, particularly if new open space is acquired and it may therefore be necessary to obtain a commuted maintenance sum wherever possible to cover these ongoing costs. It should of course be noted that such Agreements have to meet the test of Circular 05/2005, and “planning obligations should not be used solely to resolve existing deficiencies.”

14.5 It is recommended that the Council continue to ensure that revenue is maximised through funding for greenspace from developer contributions. Further detail is provided in Section 15.

Use of redundant buildings

14.6 Sympathetic use of redundant facilities for leisure and recreational purposes is also a possibility. This could include the establishment of small commercial sports facilities (e.g. tennis) in parks. Another example could be the use of a redundant sports pavilion as a children’s crèche or nursery.
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Business funding/sponsorships

14.7 Examples from other boroughs include sponsorship of Cardiff City Council’s events and festivals programme, and the Body Shop Playground Project in Auchinlea Park, Glasgow.

Partnership arrangements with the voluntary sector

14.8 This could include the formation of parks ‘friends’ groups. An example is that of Rossmere Park, Hartlepool, where the community was encouraged to take ownership. The park was promoted and became heavily used, attracting investment from funding bodies.

Lottery funding

14.9 This could include the Heritage Fund if works are carried out which are of outstanding interest and importance to the national heritage. Funding is provided for whole park projects, the conservation of park features or park activities. Grants are available from £50,000 to £5 million for a period of up to five years. Projects must be designed to involve all stakeholders, must demonstrate sustainability, and must demonstrate the heritage value of the park in question.

14.10 The Young People’s Fund aims to support projects that will improve local communities and offer more opportunities to young people. The scheme involves young people coming up with ideas for projects and to be involved in making them happen. Funds are between £250 and £5,000 and available for an age range of between 11 and 25.

The Big Lottery Fund

14.11 The Big Lottery Fund will bring together the work of two National Lottery distributors: the Community Fund, which provides funding for charities and the voluntary and community sectors, and the New Opportunities Fund, which provides funding for health, education and environment projects. There are several different funding sources available. Those relating to open space, sport, play and recreation facilities include:

• changing spaces – between 2006 and 2009, £234 million is available to help communities in England improve the environment. The programmes has 3 priorities, including community spaces and access to the natural environment

• Young People’s Fund - the Young People’s Fund aims to support projects that will improve local communities and offer more opportunities to young people. Grants are available for individuals, to help them make a difference in their community; grants to voluntary groups and community organisations to run local projects with and for young people and national grants.

14.12 More information can be found at: www.biglotteryfund.org.uk/default.aspx

The Landfill Tax Credit Scheme

14.13 The Landfill Tax Credit Scheme was revised in April 2003, and allows registered landfill operators to contribute 6.6% of their annual landfill tax liability to environmental bodies approved by the organisation ENTRUST.
14.14 The scheme must be used for social, environmental and community based projects complying with specific “approved objects.” These objects are the provision and maintenance of public amenity, and restoration and repair of buildings open to the public with historical or architectural significance.

14.15 The project must be within 10 miles of a landfill/extraction operation.

Local Heritage Initiatives

14.16 Local Heritage Initiatives are to assist local communities in the preservation of their environment, landmarks and traditions including archaeological, natural, built and industrial heritage. A community group could investigate and celebrate a historic park, prepare a public exhibition in a park, and repair a feature. Up to 100% of project costs between values of £3,000 and £25,000 are payable.

Lottery Small Grants Scheme

14.17 The Lottery Small Grants Scheme offers Awards for All grants of between £500 and £5,000 for small projects, which involve people in their community, and can include local environmental work and community park projects.

The Tree Council

14.18 The Tree Council supports the Community Trees Fund which funds up to 75% of all expenditure on tree planting schemes having a value of £100 to £700.

The Esmee Fairbairn Foundation

14.19 The Esmee Fairbairn Foundation aims to improve quality of life, particularly for people who face disadvantage. Eligible activities include the preservation and enhancement of open space, and good management of woodlands, gardens and allotments. The size of grant is not limited, with the average award for the year 2006 being £53,478. In 2006 they expect to make grants of £27 million across the UK.

Others

14.20 The degree of funding will define the scope and timescale over which any developments could be implemented. It is therefore essential to carefully consider all possible sources of funding.

14.21 These sources of funding should include Council capital and revenue funding, but should also include consideration of the release of existing funds; commercial opportunities such as the franchising of facilities (e.g. catering outlets); the delegated management of facilities such as outdoor sports; commercial sponsorship (e.g. floral bedding); planning gain (e.g. through Section 106 agreements); volunteer support; reviews of fees and charges; increased income from events and activities and improvements negotiated as ‘added value’ from service providers.

14.22 Further detailed information regarding grants can be found in ‘Claiming Your Share: A Guide to External Funding for Parks and Green Space Community Groups’, obtainable from www.greenspace.org.uk.
SECTION 15

PLANNING REVIEW
Planning overview

Policy Assessment and guidance for the implementation of Section 106 contributions

Introduction

15.1 The purpose of this section is to provide a planning overview for Kettering Borough Council, in particular;

- putting the recommendations of Sections 1-14 into context for the development of planning policies in Kettering Borough
- assessing current policies in light of the PPG17 study undertaken (as set out in Sections 5 to 14 of this report), and
- providing guidance relating to Section 106 contributions.

Planning Policy

15.2 The Local Plan for Kettering Borough was adopted in 1995. Saved Local Plan policies identified in the Secretary of States Saved Policies Direction (September 2007) form part of the development plan for the borough. These policies are saved indefinitely and will continue to form part of the development plan, until replaced by a relevant Local Development Framework (LDF) policy.

15.3 Saved policies included in the Direction of relevance to this study are as follows:

- Policy No 88 – Protection of existing outdoor sports facilities
- Policy No 89 – Enhancement of Existing outdoor sports facilities
- Policy No 90 - New Outdoor sports facilities
- Policy No 94 - Existing Open Space
- Policy No 95 - New open space provision
- Policy No 96 – Allotments.

15.4 Saved Northamptonshire Structure Plan policies of relevance to the study are as follows:

- Policy GS5 – Design
- Policy GS6 – Infrastructure.

15.5 The emerging Local Development Framework (LDF) will consist of a Joint Core Spatial Strategy and Statement of Community Involvement, being produced on a North Northamptonshire wide basis and a suite of locally produced Development Plan Documents (DPD’s), providing the Council’s policies for meeting the community’s economic, environmental and social aims for the future of the Borough.
15.6 The North Northamptonshire Joint Planning Unit (JPU) is preparing the Core Spatial Strategy jointly for Kettering, Corby, East Northamptonshire and Wellingborough as well as a joint Statement of Community Involvement (SCI). Details of these documents are available from the council or at www.nnjpu.org.uk.

15.7 The following pages provide an assessment of the current local plan policies.
## Local Plan Policy Assessment

15.8 Through the review of policies as part of the Local Development Framework process, Kettering Borough Council will be able to feed the results and analysis of this study into the preparation of policies. The following policy assessment sets out some key considerations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy name and number</th>
<th>Description of policy</th>
<th>Comments and recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Protection of existing outdoor sports facilities (Policy No 88) | Protects existing outdoor sports facilities. Exceptions are where replacement is provided, where it is an educational site and there is a reduced need for education and the community, where it is community pitches and there is a reduced community need. The policy also seeks greater public access to sites. | • local standard for outdoor sports facilities supports the retention of the policy – the standard is set at 1.8ha per 1,000 population with the existing level of provision at 1.72ha per 1,000 population. This standard also encourages the greater use of school sites by the public and this element of the policy should also be retained.  
• the wording of the policy should be revised to reflect government guidance that the exception applies only where it can be demonstrated the site is surplus to all open space requirements. This should be revised through the production of Kettering Borough Council’s Local Development Framework.  
• in order to provide the full level of detail to support this policy, a Playing Pitch Strategy would be required (an update to the 2002 Northamptonshire wide Playing Pitch Strategy). |
| Enhancement of existing outdoor sports facilities (Policy No 89) | The policy supports the enhancement of existing sports facilities where it is appropriate, without significant adverse impact on surrounding residents, where it is accessible to users and involves access to facilities for public use. | • there is an identified quantitative deficiency in outdoor sports pitches but at the same time, comments from Council Officers during the consultation indicated that a reorganisation of sports pitches may alleviate this problem. Other consultations indicated that the overall quality of pitches was good but that ancillary accommodation was the main issue.  
• the necessity of the policy is however questioned particularly within the Local Plan. This policy may be more appropriate within a sports strategy. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy name and number</th>
<th>Description of policy</th>
<th>Comments and recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| New outdoor sports facilities (Policy No 90) | Planning permission for new outdoor sports facilities will be granted where it is appropriate in location terms, incorporates adequate ancillary accommodation, has no significant adverse impact on highway network or surrounding residents, is accessible to users, is appropriate in design and it involves access to the public. | - ancillary accommodation was rated as important and was identified as a current issue through the consultation. As such, its inclusion within the policy is supported. The quantitative deficiency identified through the standard setting also supports the need for a policy encouraging the provision of new sports facilities.  
- it is considered that this policy could become more comprehensive by the provision of a policy for all new recreation facilities rather than just outdoor sports. |
| Existing open space (Policy No 94) | Planning permission for the development of existing parks and public open spaces in the towns, and environmentally important open spaces in the towns and villages will not be granted. Management and enhancement schemes for existing major parks and open spaces will be prepared to improve their use, nature conservation value and attractiveness. | - the local standards for parks and gardens, natural and semi-natural open space, amenity green space, children’s play areas and provision for young people are set above the existing level of provision. This indicates that these open spaces should be protected and opportunities sought to meet these existing deficiencies. As such, this policy is supported.  
- flexibility should be incorporated by the inclusion of exceptions such as where replacement provision is provided of at least equivalent access and quality and where it can be demonstrated that the site is surplus to all open space uses. As previously stated, this policy could also incorporate the protection of sports pitches.  
- management plans are incorporated into the quality standard for parks and gardens as this was identified through the consultations. As such, this element of the policy is supported. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy name and number</th>
<th>Description of policy</th>
<th>Comments and recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| New open space provision (Policy No 95) | Planning permission will not be granted for new development proposals which do not make adequate provision for new public open space for leisure purposes in accordance with the standards (equivalent of): Neighbourhood parks: 1.2ha per 1000 population and play areas at 0.8ha per 1000 population (provided in a scaled table showing the level of open space required for different sizes of development). A series of criteria as to how the open space should be provided is also included, particularly stating that the open space should be accessible on foot from the area served. | • this policy should be amended to reflect the open space standards devised for the typologies of open space.  
• in addition, table 8.1 could be greatly enhanced in terms of clarity to the user.  
• the accessibility standards can also provide clear guidance as to existing open spaces within the accessibility catchment that would serve the new development/require quality enhancements.  
• further detail on the provision of open space as part of new housing developments is provided later in this section. |
| Allotments (Policy No 96) | Planning permission for the development of allotment land will not be permitted except as provided for in Policy K13. Policy K13 indicates that a number of allotment holdings have been re-organised within the town to allow for housing association development. | • the local quantity standard for allotments is set at the existing level of provision, therefore protecting the existing provision. As such, this policy is supported, although there may be some flexibility for the loss of some parts of some sites and the enhancement/increase of provision elsewhere. |
Informing the LDF

15.9 This study has made a series of recommendations on open space provision for a variety of typologies – a summary of which is provided in Section 17. These recommendations are based on a robust evidence base including:

- an open space audit
- GIS mapping and identification of area deficiencies
- PPG17 recommendations
- community consultations
- PMP’s expert knowledge including a review of the other LPA standards
- demand and supply modelling accounting for future population projections.

15.10 As such, it is recommended that the standards presented in Sections 5-13 should be applied to all future developments in the Borough, regardless of open space need in the immediate (on-site) area to ensure a fair and consistent approach for developers.

15.11 The application of these standards will enable the Council to prioritise for each future development. Each new development should be taken on a case-by-case basis but also the aggregate effect of adjacent or closely related development will be taken into account. All open space contributions should be directly applicable to the impact of the new development, using accessibility standards to determine this catchment area. It should be at the Council’s discretion to allocate the financial contributions to a particular type of open space. The S106 contribution method is specific to each council although all financial development contributions should account for all typologies at a standard typology tariff rate. This will deliver a fair, transparent and accountable charge.

Planning Obligations

15.12 New housing planned for the borough will put strain on the existing open space provision. New populations did not directly feed into the standards; however the study can be used to determine the level of open space required in major new urban extensions as well as within smaller new housing developments. The existing level of provision is measured against the projected population within Appendix I which shows how much open space should be provided to meet the open space standards, however this includes existing deficiencies. All typology population projections were based on the Office of National Statistics estimates for 2025.

15.13 The first key step detailed within the flow diagram (15.1 that follows) is to determine whether the dwellings proposed are required to provide open space.
15.14 The existing approach undertaken by Kettering Borough Council in relation to new open space requirements for housing development proposals are set out in the Local Plan and relate to new developments that are equal or greater than 50 dwellings. The requirement for open space where this threshold is exceeded covers play areas, neighbourhood parks and outdoor sports.

15.15 Under Supplementary Planning Guidance Note 4 (Local Plan) S37, the Council requires open space to be determined for housing development but also on a strategic level, to be applied with new industrial development.

15.16 S40 of SPG Note 4 states that carefully designed amenity/seating areas should be provided with sheltered housing and other forms of housing for the elderly at levels comparable to that for toddlers play.

15.17 The approach taken in relation to affordable housing is to include a statement within the guidance stating that affordable housing schemes will require the same level of open space provision as open market housing but will examine the practicalities of this where appropriate.

15.18 PMP recommends the use of the flow diagram, which is based on the review of guidance and provides a step-by-step process for determining developer contributions. This is intended as a guide for Kettering Borough Council to develop the process for determining developer contributions. The next section will guide the reader through the steps necessary to utilise the recommendations set out in this Section.
Assessing Types (relating to flow diagram, Fig.15.1)

15.19 STEP 1: Determine whether the dwellings proposed are required to provide open space.

15.20 PMP recommends the use of a matrix to clearly state the types of housing mix that will be required to contribute to open space. This can be broken down to indicate the types of open space different housing types will be required to contribute to. An example is shown below. The next stage following this report for Kettering Borough Council is to produce a specific matrix that is agreed amongst members as part of the production of a more detailed Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) or Development Plan Document (DPD). The matrix will depend on the local context and will use the results of this report to identify types of open space that need to be prioritised.
### Assessing Quantity (relating to flow diagram, Fig.15.1)

15.21 STEP 2: Determine whether, after the development there will be sufficient quantity of open spaces within recommended distances of the development site, including on site, to meet the needs of existing and new residents based on the proposed local standards.

15.22 By applying the quantity standard based on the increased level of demand this ensures the developer is paying directly for the associated impact of the development rather than contributions being dependent on what open space happens to be around the development. In addition, by applying the open space study it is likely that if there is no quantitative or accessibility deficiency, there may be a qualitative deficiency that needs to be addressed.

#### PLAN 1

Apply the calculation of s106 contributions to all proposals for residential development (i.e. one dwelling and above) without a minimum threshold and regardless of the open space need in the area.

#### Work out the requirement for each applicable type of open space

15.23 This step refers to the use of a formula for the provision of open space. There are a number of approaches taken, however at a basic level, a number of authorities use this approach, which is recommended by PMP:

\[
OSR^n = A \times B \times C
\]
**SECTION 15 – PLANNING OVERVIEW**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OSR</th>
<th>Open space requirement for the relevant typology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>Relevant typology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>The number of people in a development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This is usually based on an assessment of existing occupancy rates and needs to be broken down according to the number of bedrooms in each dwelling e.g. the average occupancy for 1 bed may be 1.3 but the average occupancy for a 2 bed house may be 2.9.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>The quantity standard for the relevant typology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The level of open space provision (ha) is directly a result of the quantity standards devised through the PPG17 study. Note: where the quantity standard is per 1000 population it will need to be divided by 1,000 to provide the quantity standard per person.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>The cost of open space per person relates to off-site provision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The costs should be based on local current costs but a guide can be found on the Sport England website: <a href="http://www.sportengland.org/kitbag_fac_costs.doc">http://www.sportengland.org/kitbag_fac_costs.doc</a> and the NPFA Cost Guides for Play and Sport. Some authorities include a costings spreadsheet appendix to the Supplementary Planning Guidance and update this annually and may consider the value of the land separately.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PLAN2**

Continue to use a formula for the calculation of the provision of open space required. Update costings regularly and expand to include all open space types. Devise a matrix approach to clearly state the types of housing mix that will be required to contribute to open space typologies. Replace the existing quantity standards with the revised standards from the PPG17 study.

15.24 A worked example of this formula is provided in Section 16 in addition to an example from another Borough on how specific contributions are determined based on various scenarios.

15.25 The application of this formula ensures that the level of provision required from developments is worked out proportionally as to the level of increased demand the development incurs.

15.26 The East Midlands Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) identifies Kettering as a growth area with an additional 13,100 new dwellings planned up to the year 2021. This will involve some urban extension areas.

15.27 The quantity standards set as part of this PPG17 Study for Kettering are largely based on the existing level of population and the consultations undertaken with existing residents.
Formula (relating to flow diagram, Fig.15.1)

15.28 STEP 3: Work out the requirements for each applicable type of open space

15.29 The accessibility and quantity standards need to be jointly applied on a case-by-case basis but also assess the aggregate effect of adjacent or closely related development to identify what typologies are required within the direct area around the development. The developer should not have to contribute to any existing shortfalls outside of catchment areas. If it is deemed that no open space provision is required on-site then the off-site charge would be consistent in that the developer would pay per person/dwelling into a communal pot. The council would need to agree with the developer where this would be used as part of the S106 or planning contribution. Where contributions are pooled, if they are not used locally within a certain period the developer has the right to claim the contribution back.

15.30 The contributions off-site are either at a set tariff rate for all typologies or specific to those typologies that are identified as having a quantity shortfall within the accessibility standard set, this is a council specific policy. Varying tariffs will apply for each typology due to different build and maintenance costs. Quantity deficiencies are normally addressed prior to qualitative shortfalls although this is open to negotiations between the Council and developer.

On-site provision (relating to flow diagram, Fig.15.1)

15.31 STEP 4: Determine whether the open space can/should be provided on-site

15.32 PMP recommends that a matrix approach is employed to indicate the general approach to the types of provision that should be provided on and off site. The Figure 15.2 provides an example of a good practise approach (for example the need for community centres/meeting halls will be assessed on a case-by-case basis and may take the aggregate effect of development into consideration):

Figure 15.2 – On-site provision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Provision</th>
<th>10-49 dwellings</th>
<th>50 – 199 dwellings</th>
<th>200-599 dwellings</th>
<th>600+ dwellings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Playing fields</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local play areas</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood play areas</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Centres/Meeting Halls</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local parks</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District parks</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming pool</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport halls</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allotments</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key

☑ on site provision normally sought

☒ off site provision normally required

❓ on site provision may be required, depending on site circumstances

15.33 By applying the standards within this report and consulting with Council members and those in the planning department the Council should look to produce a matrix as part of a detailed SPD. This will be specific to particular areas, as supply varies and when each typology is set against standards will produce different open space typologies that require prioritisation.

### PLAN3

Develop a matrix approach to determine the threshold of dwellings for on versus off site provision as a guide only. A case-by-case approach will still be required. Include a statement to clearly set out the approach to affordable housing and the implications for S106 contributions. Continue to apply the policy of open space provision with commercial and industrial development.

---

**Off-site provision (relating to flow diagram, Fig.15.1)**

15.34 STEP 5 – Determine whether the open space can/ should be provided off-site

15.35 Similar to on-site provision, the PPG17 study provides a justifiable basis for determining what the open space contribution should consist of off-site, applying the quantity, quality and accessibility standard set in this report to the respective development area in line with the Council’s S106 contribution methodology.

15.36 If quantity provision is identified as adequate both on and off-site within the accessibility boundaries of the development (standards set for each typology within this report) then the quality of sites should be examined.

15.37 Prioritisation of site improvements is usually a Council’s decision and contributions may be required towards all types of open space if required.

**Quality**

15.38 Does the quality of open spaces within the recommended distances match the standard in the Assessment

15.39 The quality examination process is implemented when no quantitative deficiency is identified. Qualitative deficiency is recognized in accordance with the quality standards set in this report and the appropriate benchmarking for each typology. It may be applicable to use the site assessment matrix and the database of current sites to identify where immediate improvements are required.

15.40 Where this is determined to be the case, the developer should be expected to contribute to the upgrading of off-site open spaces, within the recommended accessibility standard distances.
15.41 When adopting a quality guideline the Council will need to adhere to the specific guidelines already in place within various internal departments. This should be detailed within the SPD/DPD. By conducting follow up consultations with internal departments and residents within the accessibility standard of the new open space provision it will possible to develop a weighting criteria to apply to the current quality scores (provided in the access database, accompanying this report) to determine the essential and desirable features specific to the relevant typology. Through this approach, upgrading methods are likely to be more specific and relevant to the local community such as improving access (better signage/information) or upgrading paths across or to the site. This is an example of a method that could be refined and then adopted within the SPD/DPD.

15.42 The quality contribution is usually equal to that of what the quantitative contribution would have been for the specific typologies that require upgrading based on the increased demand from the new development (number of dwellings/people). This will allow for a consistent approach between areas where either quality or quantity contributions are required. Contributions may be required towards all typologies based on tariffs set out in the SPD.

**Committed maintenance sums**

15.43 Maintenance sums are also an important element of any section 106 process. A review of the approach taken by other authorities is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maintenance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tynedale Council</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developers are expected to make a contribution equivalent to 25 years maintenance costs, where a) they are providing on site facilities and asking the Council to take on responsibility for management and maintenance or b) making a financial contribution to the capital costs of provision of facilities in the area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fareham Borough Council</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance of sites is required. If transferred to the Council, this is usually done after a period of 12 months, following completion of open space. The developer is only liable for maintenance of the amount of open space equivalent to that required by the development where the council demonstrates that the off-site provision is of direct benefit to the residents of the proposed development (based on NPFA defined sphere of influence for equipped play and 1 km radius of development site for outdoor sports facilities).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance rates are worked out on a number of beds/open space type basis and are updated annually.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Maintenance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Council</th>
<th>Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Milton Keynes Council</td>
<td>Developer will be required to maintain the site for a period of 12 months after completion. Maintenance sum will then be required for a period of 20 years following establishment. The sum is based on contract prices and allows for inflation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Borough Council</td>
<td>The Council will normally adopt and maintain properly laid out open space, subject to a commuted sum payment. The commuted sum payment should cover 20 years of maintenance costs. Commuted maintenance sum is calculated using current contract prices and maintenance costs for maintaining open spaces (i.e. work schedules) and multiplied to establish a 20 year figure. This allows for inflation of contract prices and deflation for diminishing present values over time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrogate Borough Council</td>
<td>Where the provision of open space is principally of benefit to the occupants of a proposed development rather than the wider public, the developer will normally be required to pay a commuted sum to cover the cost of future maintenance. New provision of open space should be maintained by the developer for 12 months and will be transferred to the Council after this period with the commuted sum. Revise figures annually for the cost of maintaining different types of open space. Total commuted payment is calculated by adding 10% contingencies to the annual costs and multiplied by the number of years. Maintenance is required for a period of five years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sedgemoor District Council</td>
<td>Arrangements will be made for the transfer of new areas of open space to the Council (or Parish Council) after a period of 12 months. A commuted maintenance sum will be required for 15 years after the year of adoption by the Council.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Maintenance

The commuted maintenance sum shall equate to the anticipated future expenditure of 15 years annual maintenance costs taking into consideration the cost of inflation and the interest received on the diminishing average balance of the sum.

Sum is calculated by: costs and expenses estimated for the first years maintenance based on the Council’s ground maintenance bills, minus the interest received on the annual maintenance sum, with the cost of inflation added (in accordance with the annual rate of increases in the Retail Price Index at the time of calculation).

Daventry Council Maintenance sum will be for a 20 year period.

Maintenance costs should be based on current costs of maintaining the specific type of outdoor space that has been provided with an allowance made for inflation, calculated over a number of years. Examples are provided for the cost of maintenance per sq metre for a range of facilities.

15.44 Where contributions are secured through planning obligations, which are predominantly for the benefit of users of the associated development, it will be appropriate for the development to make provision for subsequent maintenance. Such provision may be required in perpetuity.

Pooled contributions

15.45 Where the combined impact of a number of developments creates the need for infrastructure, it may be reasonable for the associated developer contributions to be pooled. In addition, where individual development will have some impact but is not sufficient to justify the need for a discrete piece of infrastructure, local planning authorities may seek contributions to specific future provision.

Formulae and standard charges

15.46 Local authorities are encouraged to employ formulae and standard charges where appropriate as part of their framework for negotiating and securing planning obligations. The benefits to the system are as follows:

- speed up the negotiation process
- ensure predictability by indicating the likely size and type of some contributions in advance
- promote transparency by making indicative figures public and
- assist in accountability in the spending of monies.
15.47 Standard charges and formulae applied to each development should reflect the actual impacts of the development or a proportionate contribution to an affordable housing element and should comply with the general tests in ODPM Circular 05/2005.

15.48 Where appropriate, new developments should make contributions towards the capital expenditure required to provide/enhance areas of open space and for its on going maintenance.

15.49 Where facilities for open space are to be provided by the developer and which may be subsequently adopted by the Council:

- the Council should normally adopt and maintain properly laid out open space within residential areas subject to the payment, by the developer, of a commuted sum to cover the cost of future maintenance
- it is anticipated that the developer will be required to maintain the open space for 12 months, or other reasonable period for 'establishment'
- a commuted sum payment is payable on transfer of the land covering cost of maintenance for a defined period. From the review of existing supplementary planning policy, maintenance periods are normally 10 – 20 years
- the commuted maintenance sum should be calculated using current maintenance prices to manage open space, multiplied to allow for inflation of prices and the interest received on the diminishing average annual balance of the sum.

15.50 For the avoidance of doubt, where the Council does not adopt the open space, a S106 obligation will be made for the developer to provide appropriate management of the relevant open space.

| PLAN 4 | Set out maintenance (commuted sums) required and update these regularly. |

**Summary and recommendations**

15.51 This PPG17 Study is an invaluable tool in the formulation and implementation of planning policies. This relates to both the protection and enhancement of existing open space and the framework for developing planning obligations.

15.52 The study provides the tools in which the value of an open space can be assessed on a site-by-site basis, as and when a development proposal is submitted for an existing piece of open space. Similarly, this approach can be the basis for determining what type of open space provision is appropriate to be provided within a housing or industrial development.

15.53 The use of a standard formula for open space provision in new housing and industrial developments will greatly aid the negotiation process and provide a transparent approach.
15.54 There are many other factors to consider in administering planning obligations such as determining occupancy rates, cost estimates and on or off site provision. The Council’s approach should be set out clearly within a Supplementary Planning Document.

15.55 Maintenance sums are an important element of open space provision. It is not considered reasonable to expect maintenance in perpetuity, however the authorities reviewed are typically requiring between 10 and 20 years maintenance.

15.56 The recommendations for the planning overview section are as follows:

Summary of recommendations

| PLAN 1 | Apply the calculation of s106 contributions to all proposals for residential development (i.e. one dwelling and above) without a minimum threshold and regardless of the open space need in the area |
| PLAN 2 | Continue to use a formula for the calculation of the provision of open space required. Update costings regularly and expand to include all open space types. Devise a matrix approach to clearly state the types of housing mix that will be required to contribute to open space typologies. Replace the existing quantity standards with the revised standards from the PPG17 study |
| PLAN 3 | Develop a matrix approach to determine the threshold of dwellings for on versus off site provision as a guide only. A case by case approach will still be required. Include a statement to clearly set out the approach to affordable housing and the implications for s106 contributions. Continue to apply the policy of open space provision with commercial and industrial development |
| PLAN 4 | Set out maintenance (commuted sums) required and update these regularly |
SECTION 16

EXAMPLE OF PROVISION CALCULATIONS
Example Provision Calculations

16.1 It is important to be able to take the strategic standards provided and understand how these will impact upon new developments in certain areas of the Borough. While most the standards are set as a borough-wide visionary standard it is important to consider current level of localised provision of all types of open space before proposal for specific types of open space are agreed upon.

16.2 Certain sites will be able to offer dual-functionality so it may not be necessary for all residents to be within the catchment area of all typologies. There may also not be a sufficient resident demand to provide a certain typology. If there is already an oversupply then there may be justification to upgrade the quality of current sites rather than provide new developments.

16.3 The example provided is solely theoretic and is based on the Sports England and other SPG Borough pricing guides, and incorporates the standards brought forward within this report; these examples are not specific recommendations. Consideration of green corridors, churchyards and cemeteries and civic spaces have been excluded from the table below as these typologies require protecting rather than additional provision and further supply will not necessarily be the direct financial responsibility of the developer.

16.4 For the purpose of this example the table relates to Figure 15.1, which makes the assumption that the “analysis area” equates to the ‘recommended distances’ from a new development and that all contributions are delivered off site. We have used the analysis area as this data has been used within this report, but the same principles would be applied to a relevant area from a development.
Table 16.2 - Example of provisions required

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specific Settlement and Analysis Area</th>
<th>Population (2001)</th>
<th>Specific settlements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burton and Latimer (Area 5)</td>
<td>6740</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks and Gardens (Site ID 26 and 871):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- currently 0.3568 ha. = 0.0529ha per 1000 = 0.25ha shortfall per 1000 = 1.685ha total area size required</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- accessibility shortfall in south of settlement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- quality of current sites: 81.1% and 92.4% - benchmark set at 83%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSN (Site ID 20, 39, and 994):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- currently 5.6871ha = 0.8437ha per 1000 = 0.06ha shortfall per 1000 = 0.404ha total size required</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- accessibility shortfall in south of settlement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- quality of current sites: 76.7%, 49.2% and 85.6% - benchmark set at 80%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGS (Site ID 993, 997, 25, 950, 995, 996, and 40)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- currently 5.98ha = 0.89ha per 1000 = 0.09ha oversupply = 0.61ha oversupply</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- accessibility shortfall in south of settlement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- quality of current sites: 62.1%, 63.4%, 66.9%, 84.6%, 77.2%, 75.2%, 64.6% - benchmark set at 74%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## SECTION 166 - EXAMPLE PROVISION CALCULATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Shortfalls (based on report standards)</th>
<th>Specific settlements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Children provision (Site ID 951, and 28)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Currently 0.349ha = 0.05ha per 1000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- standard set at 0.45 facilities per 1000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- NPFA standard of open space suggests 0.8ha per 1000 for all ages of children</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- standard (in this report) for children is 64% (0.45) of overall YPC provision (0.7) as YP standard is 0.25 facilities per 1000 (36%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- If only one children’s and young peoples play area is to be constructed for 1000 people the size would be 0.8ha (YPC 6 acre standard) x 0.7 (number of facilities per 1000) = 0.56ha per 1000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- multiply by 64% to establish children’s play areas = 0.36ha per 1000 population. This is the visionary standard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- minus the current supply (0.05ha per 1000) = 0.31ha per 1000 shortfall = <strong>2.09ha total size</strong> required in settlement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• currently 0.29 children’s facilities per 1000 (2 facilities) = 0.16 facility shortfall per 1000 = Between 1 and 2 facilities should be provided (0.16/1000) x by population = <strong>1.08 facilities</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• accessibility shortfall in south and north east of settlement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• quality of current sites: 72% and 79.4% - benchmark set at 81%.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Example Provision Calculations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Shortfalls (based on report standards)</th>
<th>Specific settlements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Young people provision: (Site ID 952)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• currently 0.1344ha = 0.02ha per 1000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- standard set at 0.25 facilities per 1000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- NPFA standard of open space suggests 0.8ha per 1000 for all ages of children</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- standard (in this report) for children is 36% (0.25) of overall YPC provision (0.7) as children’s standard is 0.45 facilities per 1000 (66%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- If only one children’s and young peoples play area is to be constructed for 1000 people the size would be 0.8ha (YPC 6 acre standard) x 0.7 (number of facilities per 1000) = 0.56ha per 1000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- multiply by 36% to establish young persons play areas = 0.20ha per 1000 population. This is the visionary standard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- minus the current supply (0.02ha per 1000) = 0.18ha per 1000 shortfall = 1.21ha total size required in settlement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• currently 0.15 young persons facility per 1000 (1 facility) = 0.10 shortfall per 1000 people = 1 facility to be provided (0.10/1000) x population = <strong>0.67 facilities</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• accessibility shortfall in all areas excluding the centre of the settlement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• quality of current site: 71.6% - benchmark set at 78%.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Shortfalls (based on report standards)</th>
<th>Specific settlements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outdoor Sports (excluding bowls and golf): (Site ID 35, 36, 23, 24, 22, 21, 30)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• currently 8.024ha = 1.19ha per 1000 (minus report standard - 1.8ha per 1000) = <strong>0.61ha shortfall per 1000</strong> = 4.11ha total size required in settlement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• accessibility shortfall in south and north east</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• quality of current sites: 81.6%, 73.5%, 67.8%, 86.9%, 77.8%, 73.3%, 80% - benchmark set at 78%.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**SECTION 16 - EXAMPLE PROVISION CALCULATIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Allotments (Site ID 200):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• currently 1.8ha = 0.26ha per 1000 = <strong>0.12 per 1000 undersupply</strong> = 0.81ha total size required in settlement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• accessibility in north and west of settlement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• quality of current site: not currently known - benchmark set at 76%.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall analysis area deficiencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All sites already captured - outside of town is generally very rural and doesn't currently have any undersupply that feasibly requires addressing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size of proposed dwelling (example)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 x 2-bed dwellings (12.5 people)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 x 3-bed dwellings (35 people)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 x 4-bed dwellings (45 people)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 x 5-bed dwellings (11 people)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of people (16.4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>103.5 people</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommended typology (based on PMP recommendations)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Park that provides children and young persons provision located in the south of the settlement. Despite a substantial outdoor sports facility the geographic distribution of current sites is generally good with high accessibility levels across the area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Justification for typology (new typology specific shortfall)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A significant shortfall of parks and gardens exists despite the fact the current provision is of high quality, therefore regularly maintained and with good accessibility is of high value to the community. There is a significant deficit of all types of children and young peoples play areas. All deficits exist in the south of the settlement that also suffers from AGS deficit (partly the reason for the park).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Typology Specific (based on this report)</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 x child’s play area, 1 x young persons play area, 1 x park</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Quality | See quality standards in table 7.1 for specific typologies |  
| Accessibility | Located in south of the region around Miller Road/Finedon Road |
### Specifics of new facilities to be provided and justification (number of and size facilities to be created)

- The park should be a significant size, around 1.6ha, to ensure the quantity standard in the region is met. There must be good site access (proper paths and several entrance) in order to provide a maximum amount of amenity greenspace to those in the south of the settlement.

- The children’s facility should be significant in size, approximately 1.3ha, and become the main children’s focal point for the area. Such a considerable site would benefit from the good site access provided on the park. The remaining children’s quantity deficiency should be located in a completely separate site in the north east of the settlement and contribute approximately 0.79ha (NEAP standard - NPFA).

- The young persons facility should be around 1.21ha, and again be the main focal point for young people within the settlement. Only one site can be justifiably provided (based on quantity standard) so it is important a variety of facilities and needs are catered for. (NEAP standard - NPFA).
| Cost of provision (based on SPG from Bridgnorth) | YPC: NEAP = £108 per metre square for child’s play and young persons = 1.3 + 1.21 = 2.51ha x £108 per square metre = £2,710,800  
Park: £4.10 per metre square of informal open space/ park land = 1.6 x £4.10 per square metre = £65,600 |
| Size of land required (based on quantity standard and number of people) | 4.26ha |
| Overall cost | Total cost = £2.78m |
| Contribution of area from developer | 103.5 people  
provision of park per 1000 = 0.3ha (visionary standard) = (0.3/1000) x 103.5 = 0.03  
provision of children’s area per 1000 = 0.36ha = (0.36/1000) x 103.5 = 0.04  
provision of youth facilities per 1000 = 0.20ha = (0.20/1000) x 103.5 = 0.02 |
| Contribution of cost | Park = 0.03ha x £4.10 per square metre = £1,230  
Child’s play area = 0.358 x £108 per square metre = £386,640  
Young persons play = 0.2 x £108 per square metre = £216,000  
**Total payable** = £603,870 |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost per new resident/cost per each size of dwelling</th>
<th>£5,834 per resident</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2-bed = £14,585</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-bed = £20,419</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-bed = £26,253</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-bed = £32,084</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other consideration costs - maintenance</th>
<th>NEAP = 2.35 £/per square metre per year (approximately £50k per year for YPC facility given above)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Informal open space/park = 0.5 £/per square metre per year (approximately 8 £8k for the park given above)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total maintenance cost would be £58k per year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following are various examples of how specific commuted sums for construction and maintenance are determined based on theoretical scenarios that would be located in a Supplementary Planning Document. The method adopted by the council in these examples is to charge for specific typologies that will be required as a result of the increase in population.

**EXAMPLE A**

A development of six dwellings with all elements of public open space provided off site.

**Construction costs**

Playing fields
- 18 persons @ £134.20 per person £ 2,415.60

Playgrounds
- 18 persons @ £94.50 per person £ 1,701.00

Casual open space
- 18 persons @ £28.70 per person £ 516.60

Passive open space
- 18 persons @ £21.20 per person £ 381.60

£ 5,014.80

**Maintenance costs**

Playing fields
- 18 persons @ £119.60 per person £ 2,152.80

Playgrounds
- 18 persons @ £133.00 per person £ 2,394.00

Casual open space
- 18 persons @ £48.40 per person £ 871.20

Passive open space
- 18 persons @ £46.00 per person £ 828.00

£ 6,246.00

**Overall total £ 11,260.80**

**EXAMPLE B**

A development of twenty dwellings with a LAP (Local Area for Play), casual open space and passive open space constructed by the developer on site. The "playing fields" element of public open space to be provided off site.
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Construction costs - on site

Playground
- funded by the developer £ 0.00

Casual open space
- funded by the developer £ 0.00

Passive open space
- funded by the developer £ 0.00

Construction costs - off site

Playing fields
- 60 persons @ £134.20 per person £ 8,052.00

£ 8,052.00

Maintenance costs - on site

Playground
- LAP (Local Area for Play) £ 26,600.00

Casual open space
- 60 persons @ £48.40 per person £ 2,904.00

Passive open space
- 60 persons @ £46.00 per person £ 2,760.00

Maintenance costs - off site

Playing fields
- 60 persons @ £119.60 £ 7,176.00

£ 39,440.00

Overall total £ 47,492.00

EXAMPLE C

A development of fifty dwellings with three LAPs (Local Area for Play), casual open space and passive open space constructed by the developer on site. The “playing fields” element of public open space to be provided off site.

Construction costs - on site

Playgrounds (three LAPs)
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- funded by the developer £ 0.00

Casual open space
- funded by the developer £ 0.00

Passive open space
- funded by the developer £ 0.00

Construction costs - off site

Playing fields
- 150 persons @ £134.20 per person £ 20,130.00

£ 20,130.00

Maintenance costs - on site

Playground - three LAPs
- 3 @ £63,700.00 £79,800.00

Casual open space
- 150 persons @ £48.40 per person £ 7,260.00

Passive open space
- 600 sq.m (0.06 ha) @ £11.50 £ 6,900.00

Maintenance costs - off site

Playing fields
- 150 persons @ £119.60 £ 17,940.00

£ 111,900.00

Overall total £ 132,030.00
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CONCLUSION
**SECTION 17 - CONCLUSIONS**

**Conclusions**

**Introduction**

17.1 This section provides a summary of the following:-

- the standards for each typology
- recommendations for each of the Analysis Areas
- all the recommendations from each typology section (5 – 13).

**Standards**

17.2 The table below provides a summary of all proposed standards.

**Table 17.1 – Standards summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Typology</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>Accessibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Parks and Gardens     | URBAN - 0.3 ha per 1000 population | "A welcoming, clean and litter free site providing a one-stop community facility with a wide range of leisure, recreational and enriched play opportunities for all ages. Parks and gardens should be well maintained, providing varied vegetation, clear pathways, appropriate lighting and ancillary accommodation (including seating and litter bins) and well-signed to and within the site. Sites should have a written management plan and measures should be taken to address identified issues at these sites."
* For country parks a separate set of standards will be applicable. | 10 minute walk time (480 metres) |
| Natural and Semi-natural | 0.9 ha per 1000 population | 'A clean, well vegetated, litter free site with clear pathways and natural features that encourages wildlife conservation, biodiversity and environmental awareness. Management of local sites should involve the community/stakeholder if at all possible and there should be a clear focus on the site's success.’ | URBAN - 15 minutes walk time (720 metres) |
**Standards**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Typology</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>Accessibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amenity Greenspace</td>
<td>0.8 ha per 1000 population</td>
<td>&quot;A clean and well-maintained greenspace site. Sites should have appropriate ancillary accommodation (dog and litter bins etc), pathways and landscaping in the right places providing a spacious outlook and overall enhancing the appearance of the local environment. Larger sites should be suitable for informal play opportunities and should be enhanced to encourage the site to become a community focus. Smaller sites should adopt a design led approach to discourage inappropriate informal play.&quot;</td>
<td>10 minutes walk time (480 metres)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision for Children</td>
<td>0.4 play facilities per 1,000 population</td>
<td>&quot;A site providing a mix of well-maintained formal equipment and enriched play environment in a safe and secure convenient location overlooked by housing and footpaths or located within a larger park facility. The site should have clear boundaries; be clean; be litter, dog, vandalism and graffiti free; and be lit. Sites should also comply with appropriate national guidelines for design and safety.&quot;</td>
<td>URBAN - 10 minute walk time (480 metres) RURAL – 10 minutes walk time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision for Young People</td>
<td>0.25 young people facilities per 1,000 population</td>
<td>&quot;A site providing a robust yet imaginative play environment for older children in a safe and secure location, with clear separation from younger children facilities, that promotes a sense of ownership. The site should include clean, litter and dog free areas for more informal play and areas of shelter (with seating) and where appropriate sites should be well lit. Sites should also comply with appropriate national guidelines for design and safety.&quot;</td>
<td>URBAN - 10 minute walk time (480 metres) RURAL – 10 minute walk time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Typology</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>Accessibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Sports Facilities</td>
<td>1.8ha per 1000 population</td>
<td>“A well-planned, clean and litter and dog fouling free sports facility site, with level and well-drained good quality surfaces, appropriate good quality ancillary accommodation including changing accommodation, toilets and car parking. The site should have appropriate management ensuring community safety and include lighting and the use of mobile CCTV where appropriate to address anti-social behaviour.”</td>
<td>20 minute walk time for outdoor sports facilities (960m) (exc. bowls and golf) 20 minute drive for golf courses and bowling greens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allotments</td>
<td>0.40 ha per 1,000 population</td>
<td>“A clean, secure and well-kept site that encourages sustainable development, bio-diversity, healthy living and education objectives with appropriate ancillary facilities (eg litter bins and water supply) to meet local needs, well kept grass and good quality soils. The site should be spacious providing appropriate access and clear boundaries and conform to current best practice and local policy for allotment management.”</td>
<td>15 minutes walk time (720 metres)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Corridors</td>
<td>N/a</td>
<td>“A clean, well-maintained, safe and secure corridor with clear pathways, linking major open spaces together and enhancing natural features. Corridors should provide ancillary facilities such as bins, seating and lighting in appropriate places and signage.”</td>
<td>N/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cemeteries and Churchyards</td>
<td>N/a</td>
<td>“A clean and well-maintained site providing long-term burial capacity, an area of quiet contemplation and a sanctuary for wildlife. Sites should have clear pathways and varied vegetation and landscaping and provide appropriate ancillary accommodation (eg. facilities for flowers litter bins and seating.) Access to sites should be enhanced by parking facilities and by public transport routes, particularly in urban areas”</td>
<td>N/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Spaces</td>
<td>N/a</td>
<td>“A clean, well-maintained, safe and secure site, with generally hard landscaping but may accommodate soft areas. Sites should be adequately designed and maintained in order to serve a particular civic function. Ancillary accommodation, including toilets, lighting and CCTV should be</td>
<td>N/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Typology</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>Accessibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>provided where appropriate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Analysis area summary

17.3 The table below sets out our recommendations for each of the Analysis Areas.

**Table 17.2 – Analysis Area Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analysis Area</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 – Welland</td>
<td>This rural analysis area has a good coverage of publicly accessible green space with all but one of the major settlements having access to a variety of typologies. The one exception is the village of Ashley, which only has a childrens play area and an amenity green space. It is recommended that the Council investigate the possibility of an additional typology being made available in Ashley with the most likely greenspace types being either a natural or semi natural site or an outdoor sports facility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2- Slade</td>
<td>Again a good coverage of open space is evident in this rural analysis area but there is one area within it that only access to a childrens play area and amenity greenspace – this is Mawsley, although provision is currently being made. It is recommended that this area is the first priority for any new greenspace provision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - Desborough and Rothwell</td>
<td>The areas of Desborough and Rothwell do have a good range of high quality greenspace in both settlements but both suffer from the location of the sites being very centralised. This is particularly evident on the west (where a shortage of play areas has been acknowledged by the council), and to a lesser extent east, side of Desborough and it is recommended that future public open space is located in this area to help even out this imbalance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - Kettering</td>
<td>The area of urban Kettering is the most complete area in terms of the variety of open spaces area. However, because of its level of urbanisation it has the most gaps in accessibility in terms of population. The first priorities for this area should be to ensure there is a complete overlap between amenity greenspaces and parks or gardens so that everyone can access one of these typologies within the agreed catchment areas. The Council should also look to improve the large gaps in childrens and young persons provision that are evident.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analysis Area</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 - Burton Latimer</td>
<td>The area of Burton Latimer has two main deficiencies in terms of open spaces, the first is allotments but as this is a demand led typology it may be that no demand is evident for the town. The second deficiency is for childrens play areas where the centralised provision has left significant areas to the north east and south outside of the catchment area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 – Buccleuch, Queen Eleanor</td>
<td>As the largest settlement in this analysis area, the main focus for provision should be Geddington. There is a lack of both park and garden and natural or semi natural provision and the Council should work towards one of these deficiencies being corrected.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendations**

17.4 This section provides the recommendations from each typology.

**Parks and gardens**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P&amp;G1</td>
<td>Council to investigate upgrading amenity green spaces in the east and west of Desborough to park or garden status. Alternatively the Council should aim to provide a new park or garden in both the east and west of Desborough in the long term.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P&amp;G2</td>
<td>Long term aim for the Council to make new park and garden provision in the west of Rothwell.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P&amp;G3</td>
<td>Long term aim for the Council to make new park and garden provision in the south of Burton Latimer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P&amp;G4</td>
<td>Council to create to green spaces in the south and north west of Kettering.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P&amp;G5</td>
<td>Protection of all parks and gardens as they are all of high value.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P&amp;G6</td>
<td>Prioritise improvements for sites identified.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Natural and semi natural

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NSN1</th>
<th>Long term aim for the Council to provide an accessible natural or semi natural site in Walgrave, Pytchley, Geddington and Wilbarston.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NSN2</td>
<td>Long term aim for the Council to provide an accessible natural or semi natural site in Walgrave, Pytchley, Geddington and Wilbarston.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSN3</td>
<td>Council to create two new pocket parks in Desborough.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSN4</td>
<td>Council to investigate changing an amenity green space to natural/semi natural provision in the south of Burton Latimer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSN5</td>
<td>Long term aim for the Council to provide three new natural and semi natural sites on the outskirts of Kettering.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSN6</td>
<td>Carry out improvements at identified sites where appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSN7</td>
<td>Protect all natural semi natural sites and use high scoring sites as benchmarks for other sites in the Borough.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Amenity greenspace

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGS1</th>
<th>Council to provide a new amenity green space in both Broughton and Cransley Lodge.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AGS2</td>
<td>Council to provide a new amenity green space in the north of Rothwell.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGS3</td>
<td>Three new amenity green spaces to be provided for the Kettering analysis area – one in the north west and two in the south.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGS4</td>
<td>Improve all amenity green space sites to meet the expected benchmarking score of 70%, aspiring to the quality vision for this type of open space.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGS5</td>
<td>Protect identified sites and use as examples for improvements to lower scoring sites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGS6</td>
<td>Prioritise sites identified for improvements to increase scores above the average, and strive to reach the quality benchmark score.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Provision for children and young people

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CYP1</th>
<th>Council to work towards providing childrens play facilities in Braybrooke, Cranford and Grafton Underwood.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CYP2</td>
<td>Council to work towards providing young persons facilities in Geddington, and either Wilbarston or Ashley.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYP3</td>
<td>Council to consider relocating the existing young persons area and provide an additional childrens and young persons play area towards the west of Desborough.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYP4</td>
<td>Council to consider relocating one existing play area or provide new provision in the north east of Rothwell. It should also be a long term aim to provide additional young persons facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYP5</td>
<td>Long term aim for Council to provide additional childrens play facilities in the north east and south of Burton Latimer. Consideration should be given for an additional young persons facility when demand dictates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYP6</td>
<td>Long term aim for Council to provide additional play areas so all residents are within a catchment. Short term aim for four additional play areas and consideration for new play areas on the additional amenity green space sites recommended.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYP7</td>
<td>Short term aim for three additional young persons facilities and consideration for new young persons facilities on the additional amenity green space sites recommended.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYP8</td>
<td>These sites must be prioritised for improvements to ensure user safety and satisfaction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYP9</td>
<td>Site 912 must be prioritised for improvements to ensure user safety, satisfaction and to maintain usage levels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYP10</td>
<td>The identified sites for young people that scored above average for accessibility and quality must be protected and should set the standard for the lower scoring sites in the Borough.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Outdoor sports facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OSF1</th>
<th>Council to investigate the possibility of supplying sporting facilities in rural areas where no facilities are currently present.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OSF2</td>
<td>Council to work with the County Council to ensure playing pitch strategy findings are still up to date.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSF3</td>
<td>Improve all outdoor sports facilities below the quality benchmarking score. All facilities should aspire to the quality benchmark standard of 78%.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSF4</td>
<td>Private facilities should be protected, particularly high scoring outdoor sports facilities similar to those listed above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSF5</td>
<td>Current community use of school facilities should be investigated. Where there are opportunities to develop dual use agreements, particularly in the rural parishes, this should be supported by the Council and maximised to alleviate any deficiencies or access issues to outdoor sports within settlements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSF6</td>
<td>Sites scoring poorly on access should be a priority for improvements by the Council in relation to the provision of outdoor sports facilities. In particular, kick about areas, highlighted by young people as an important open space, should be made accessible, alleviating usage on formal outdoor sports facilities and helping to maintain the quality of these sites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSF7</td>
<td>Consultation with users of outdoor sports facilities aids the understanding of what demand there is in the Borough. Young people have highlighted kick about areas as important open space. Access to these sites should be maximised, particularly Site ID’s 52, 77, 85, 812 and 90.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Green corridors

| GC 1 | Kettering Borough Council should work in tandem with Northamptonshire County Council and the local PCT to help maximise the use of green corridors in the Borough. |
| GC 2 | All green corridors in Kettering should aspire to the quality vision for this typology. |
| GC 3 | Kettering Borough Council should also work with the County Council to establish a network of green corridors to enhance the usage of natural and semi natural provision in the rural areas. |
| GC 4 | Linking existing green corridors with open spaces in the Borough should be a key priority for the Council to provide opportunities for informal recreation and alternative means of transport, using all types of open spaces. |
| GC 5 | Investigating the feasibility of a green infrastructure study to help link green corridors with open spaces to help create a network of multi functional green space in Kettering Borough should be an extension of the Kettering Open Space Study. |

### Allotments

| ALLOT 1 | The Council should consider future population trends in the Borough when reviewing allotment provision. The increased level of housing and greater population will lead to a greater demand for allotments, particularly if the development is of housing which does not include gardens. |
| ALLOT 2 | Further investigate the demand for allotments in Burton Latimer, Kettering and Desborough analysis areas. |
| ALLOT 3 | Investigate the demand for allotments in rural areas in the Borough and where necessary investigate potential to redesignate other open space sites for allotment use. |
| ALLOT 4 | Aim to achieve the quality benchmark standard at all allotment sites within Kettering Borough. Where a site is privately owned or managed, the Council should provide guidelines for the quality and maintenance of these sites in line with the quality vision set for allotments. |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ALLOT 5</th>
<th>The Council should protect Short Lane Allotments (Site ID 5), Windmill Avenue Allotments South (Site ID 120), Northfield Avenue Allotments (Site ID 154) and Desborough Allotments (Site ID 573) as high quality, accessible and well used allotment sites.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALLOT 6</td>
<td>Investigate the usage of Site IDs 44, 156 and 61. If they have low usage, then further thought should be given to the primary use of these sites. If usage is high/often then the quality and accessibility of these sites should be improved and these sites be protected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALLOT 7</td>
<td>Review level of use at Site IDs 42, 413, 451 and 590. If use is high then consider actions to improve accessibility to these sites to make them sites of real value to local community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALLOT 8</td>
<td>Investigate further the level of use at Sites IDs 494 and 675 in order to determine whether it is most beneficial to continue to use these sites and improve the quality or to redesignate to alternative open space usages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALLOT 9</td>
<td>Undertake borough wide allotment strategy to direct the future allocation of allotment sites in the Borough.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Cemeteries and churchyards**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CC1</th>
<th>The lowest scoring sites that are well below the quality benchmark score should be improved. Where there are known additional problems with access, these should also be prioritised for improvement. Where there is private ownership and maintenance of these facilities, community groups should be encouraged to take ownership in improving the quality of these sites.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CC2</td>
<td>Produce a cemeteries and churchyards action plan, accounting for all provision, not just that owned and managed by the Council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC3</td>
<td>Promote the nature conservation value of cemeteries and churchyards and begin to develop more awareness of ecological management of cemeteries and churchyards, particular in relation to CC1, involving voluntary groups.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Civic spaces**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CS 1</th>
<th>Adopt the quality vision for all current and future civic spaces.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CS 2</td>
<td>Continue to examine the possibility of the creation of new civic spaces, or extension of existing civic spaces, as part of urban extensions or town centre improvements in the town centres of Kettering, Rothwell and Desborough.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Planning**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLAN 1</th>
<th>Apply the calculation of s106 contributions to all proposals for residential development (i.e. one dwelling and above) without a minimum threshold and regardless of the open space need in the area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PLAN 2</td>
<td>Continue to use a formula for the calculation of the provision of open space required. Update costings regularly and expand to include all open space types. Devise a matrix approach to clearly state the types of housing mix that will be required to contribute to open space typologies. Replace the existing quantity standards with the revised standards from the PPG17 study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLAN 3</td>
<td>Develop a matrix approach to determine the threshold of dwellings for on versus off site provision as a guide only. A case by case approach will still be required. Include a statement to clearly set out the approach to affordable housing and the implications for s106 contributions. Continue to apply the policy of open space provision with commercial and industrial development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLAN 4</td>
<td>Set out maintenance (commuted sums) required and update these regularly.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>