

New Alresford Town Council

Meeting of the Local Plan Part 2 Recreation and Open Spaces Needs Group 24 February 2015 at 7.30pm in the lower Meeting Room of Alresford Recreation Centre - Agenda and Papers

Agenda

1. Volunteer to take notes
2. Apologies for absence
3. Notes of the last meeting (Attachment 1)
4. Actions from last meeting
5. Verbal report from NATC meeting 12 Feb 15
6. Results of engagement with WCC including the applicability of the National Planning Policy Framework and inclusion of land outside parish boundaries in Open Space Strategy Schedules. (Attachments 2 and 3)

[Brief responses from WCC received by email so far:

“On the NPPF issue, the references to open spaces in that are very general, whereas we have a locally derived standard for open space provision in LPP1 (policy CP7). That has been found to be NPPF-compliant so is more relevant to the question of open space provision locally than the NPPF.”

“Purely on the issue of whether open spaces outside a settlement or parish boundary should be included or not ...

The open space standard in Table 1 in Policy CP7 in LPP1 doesn't just provide a standard for quantity, but also a standard for accessibility. For example the limit of accessibility for Informal Green Space is 400m , for parks sports and recs -650m and Natural Green Space – meadows, heaths, woodlands etc – 700m.

There may be instances where there are facilities such as these within an accessible distance from a community but beyond the parish boundary. Would we therefore exclude these facilities even though they were available to a community? People, as we know, tend to cross administrative boundaries to access open spaces without a thought.

As long as we do not double-count the same bit of open space, it seems reasonable to include open space outside a parish boundary as being available to a community and counting toward its assessment of adequacy if it falls within these accessibility limits.”]

7. Consideration of WCC programme for LPP2 submission, inspection and approval.
8. Work Programme
 - a. Formation of sub-groups?
 - b. Identification and mensuration of “important open spaces” in accordance with WCC Open Space Strategy (Attachments 5 and 6)
 - c. Development of qualitative needs eg what sort of sports should be catered for, what recreational activities need to be catered for
 - d. Method(s) of achieving community consultation

Papers Attached

Serial Number	Title/Subject
1	Notes from meeting 27 Jan 15
2	NATC questions to WCC on R&OS needs derivation
3	WCC Response to NATC re OS Feb 2015
3A	Correlation of NATC Questions and WCC Answers
4	Extract from National Planning Policy Framework
5	Suggestions for additions to list of Open Spaces in Alresford (note, the list takes no account of correspondence between members on admissibility of suggestions)
6	Notes from Sam Kerr-Smiley and Margot Power Walkabout

Notes of Open Space and Recreation Needs Group 27 January 2015

Present :

Residents : Janet Barker, Keith Barrett, Heather Burke, Joss Burn, Richard Chatwin, Mary Chesters, Martin Chesters, Brian Durham, Bob Fowler, Ingrid Fry, Elizabeth Hall, Jan Field, Sam Kerr-Smile, Steve Mitchell, Barbara Piper, Ralph Pointer, Brian Tippett, Marily Weston, John Weston, Anabela Williams.

Councillors : Roy Gentry, Lisa Griffiths, Barbara Jeffs, Ernie Jeffs (WCC), Stuart McCullouch (Chairman), Margot Power.

1. The Chairman stated that the purpose of the meeting was to discuss the production of a report of the impact on the original Recreation & Open Spaces Needs Group (R&OS NG) report occasioned by the change in estimated population numbers, which had been provided by Winchester City Council (WCC) and later amended, in New Alresford in 2031.
2. Bob Fowler raised the discrepancy in the latest figures and what is in the original report which now seems to demonstrate that the shortfall is reduced by between 10 and 15 ha. The meeting attendees voted and agreed they would like this report to be withdrawn and rewritten.
3. Ralph Pointer and Brian Tippett commented there appears to be no evidence that the original Needs Group report was agreed by the group nor was there more than one meeting held. Ralph said he had raised points which were never answered. Jan Field believed there was more than one meeting and can possibly find evidence to support. It was stated that the Summary of Needs does not tally with the body of the report.
4. Roy Gentry stated that the Needs Group meeting on the 6/3/13 was attended by Stuart Dunbar-Dempsey of WCC who set out the figures for Alresford. The most authoritative documentation of the figures at that time was the Alresford Open Space Assessment 2013. The LPP2 Open Space Strategy issued by WCC in September 2014, differs considerably from the Assessment and includes area previously not listed – most significant is the inclusion of Perins and Sun Lane playing fields. There are also other smaller areas of land now included and this sum of land now means Alresford, contrary to earlier figures provided by WCC, would not be deficient in 2031 for Open Space & Recreation land. Margot Power stated that she believed Alresford could be over-provided in Sports facilities, but under-provided in natural open space. This needs to be established clearly. Ralph Pointer mentioned that where some developers have gone out of business or landowners are unknown, these parcels of land have reverted to 'Crown Land'. WCC/HCC have adopted pavements, however the verges remain 'Crown Land'. Can such land be accounted for as Alresford OS&R?
5. Steve Mitchell stated that the Perins tennis courts were under-used and there are other local village, as well as Alresford, tennis facilities which could be used and so no need demonstrated. The further need for additional rugby pitches, use of petanque and various other facilities was queried by some attendees. Barbara Jeffs stated that the needs were established through a survey which received approximately 40% response rate in 2008 (this was a repeat survey of

one done in circa 2003). It established very similar needs to the earlier report. Attendees felt further work should be done to establish accuracy.

6. It was stated that Sports/Recreation land cannot be changed to Natural Open Space – they are clearly defined categories. So if there is a deficiency in one group and over-provision in another, it does not compensate.
7. Keith Barrett stated that it is not a statutory requirement to meet the shortfall in land that is needed although it is the population number which will drive how large the shortfall is. Ernie Jeffs stated that the OS&R figure will be calculated based on the population figure every few years to provide an OS&R space figure. It was commented that windfall sites and other developments may cause variance in the population figure to that predicted.
8. The Chairman stated that the Perins School site as an Academy as a 125 year lease on the land but does not own the site and under the terms of the lease, the school must allow community use. His understanding is that should the school look to sell land, it is expected to trigger a referral to the Secretary of State for Education in order to seek approval.
9. Janet Barker thanked the Chairman for the inclusive way he had run this meeting and raised her concerns about the unsatisfactory outcome of the Infrastructure Needs Group meeting last week. She asked how it was possible to seek action to ensure that the report for the Infrastructure Needs Group be rewritten as she, and others present, were unhappy with the outcome of the Infrastructure Needs Group meeting. Richard Chatwin said that at the meeting last week attendees had been told categorically that the reports could not be rewritten. The Chairman of OS&R recommended them to attend the next full Town Council meeting to address the point of rewriting the original Needs Groups reports and seek the response of The Council on that occasion. He stated that The Council operates as a body and that councillors present could not speak for those who are not present.
10. A brief discussion was held on how we will establish what the town is short of in terms of facilities and what is needs. It was agreed that we need to establish what land falls into the various categories and what needs to be found before looking at seeking the uses of that land.
11. Actions :
 - a. To provide names of who attended the original needs group meeting which was held on 6/3/13.
 - b. To establish whether more than one meeting was held of the original group.
 - c. In relation to land classified as Open Space & Recreation land in the Open Space Strategy:
 - i. To establish whether it is correct that Perins & Sun Lane playing fields are correctly included in the September 2014 report and if it is correct, does it include Perins tennis courts?
 - ii. To establish the amount of natural open space, children's play areas and sports/recreation land already in existence and what is needed in each of those categories to fulfil the Alresford requirement in the different classifications at 2031.

- iii. To obtain advice from WCC on whether the proposed Nursery Road land suggested by Sam Kerr-Smilely can be included in the OS&R land.
 - iv. To seek clarification from WCC/HCC as to what happens with 'Crown Land' and can it be included in the Alresford OS&R land calculation? If so, need to identify land.
 - v. To seek advice from WCC on if there is a minimum size, or what would mean a piece of land could be included under this classification.
12. Meeting attendees to advise the Chairman of land which they feel should be included in the OS&R classification.
 13. The Needs Group (made up of the attendees at this meeting) asked the Chairman of the Group to ask New Alresford Town Council at its next meeting (on 12 February 2015) to resolve to:
 - a. Advise WCC that the publication of the Open Space Strategy calls into question the validity of the original R&OS NG Report.
 - b. Ask WCC to
 - i. Clarify the criteria for inclusion of spaces in strategies and assessments as "Open" spaces counting towards the satisfaction of the CP7 requirements (criteria might include size, minimum single dimension, shared use with schools and cost of access etc).
 - ii. Clarify the concept of "protection" of spaces, in particular whether spaces can be protected even though they do not count towards the satisfaction of the CP7 requirements.
 - iii. Withdraw the original report from the website (due to its errors and because developers may use the content to prepare their submissions for planning).
 - iv. Receive a new Open Spaces & Recreation Needs Group report once clarification has been received from WCC on the existing land classified under OS&R and that which still requires to be provided to meet the CP7 requirements for the expected population of Alresford in 2031.
 14. The Chairman undertook to ensure that members are consulted on any future reports produced by the R&OS NG and to try to obtain a consensus for submission, and if not a consensus, then overall democratic majority.
 15. At a subsequent meeting to look, when the various land type quantities are known, at how the land is used by which activities (ie what the specific as opposed to quantitative needs are).
 16. The Chairman is to call a further meeting approximately 2 weeks after the next Full Town Council (next meeting is 12 February 2015).



Dear Steve,

1. At their meeting on Thursday 12 February 2015, the New Alresford Town Council (NATC) passed the following resolutions (the wording may vary a little from that which will appear in the minutes of the meeting but the meaning is accurate):
 - a. To advise Winchester City Council (WCC) that the publication of the Open Space Strategy calls into question the validity of the original NATC Recreation and Open Space (R&OS) Needs Group (NG) Report.
 - b. To ask WCC to:
 - i. Clarify the criteria for inclusion of spaces in strategies and assessments as “Open” spaces counting towards the satisfaction of the Core Policy (CP) 7 requirements of WCC’s Local Plan Part 1 (LPP1) (criteria might include size, minimum single dimension, shared use with schools and cost of access etc).
 - ii. Clarify the concept of “protection” of spaces, in particular whether spaces can be protected even though they do not count towards the satisfaction of the CP7 requirements.
 - iii. Place a notice before the original NATC R&OS NG report on the WCC website stating that the report is under review (due to its errors and because developers may use the content to prepare their submissions for planning).
 - iv. Receive a new Open Spaces & Recreation Needs Group report once clarification has been received from WCC on the existing land classified under OS&R and that which still requires to be provided to meet the CP7 requirements for the expected population of Alresford in 2031.
2. The resolutions were requested by the reconvened NATC R&OS NG at a meeting on 27 January 2015. The NG was reconvened, as were others, following the discovery of an error in the prediction of the population of New Alresford provided to NATC by WCC as part of the basis for the work that the needs groups and NATC did in order to provide an input to WCC’s Local Plan Part 2. NATC will be responding separately on the impact of that error on the original R&OS report but in essence it is relatively simple - reduction of the overall requirement for recreation and open space from 27.6 ha to 24.9 ha with pro-rata reductions in each of the sub-categories. However, while the NG was computing this impact, it became evident that the basis of assessment of the *existing* recreation and open space in the town could also be deemed to have changed since the issue of the original R&OS report and this had a greater impact than the reduction in the CP7 requirement.
3. The purpose of this email is to initiate the process of discharging Clauses 2bi, 2bii and 2biii of the Resolutions above.
4. To deal with Clause 2biii first, I shall forward the minutes of the meeting when they have been issued so that you have the exact wording of the resolution. We would then be grateful if you would place the notice as indicated in the Resolutions above.

5. Moving on to Clauses 2bi, 2bi, our concern is based on the assumption that the Strategy has force in support of LPP2 so perhaps this is the first point that we would like cleared up – should we now regard the Strategy as the document that is authoritative in deciding what New Alresford’s holdings of recreation and open space are (as opposed to the originally provided assessment, for instance)?
6. The basis of assessment that was used for the original R&OS NG report was the WCC Open Space Assessment 2013 for New Alresford (attached). This showed that there was a current provision of 11.23 ha of recreation and open space in the town. It emerged during the NG’s deliberations when reconvened, however, that WCC had issued in September 2014, well after the NG had submitted its final report for scrutiny at several public meetings, and thereafter to WCC as part of its LPP2 submission, an Open Space Strategy 2014/15 Part 2 (attached) that could be construed as concluding that there is a current provision of 20.86 ha of recreation and open space in the town. On this basis, the shortfall of slightly more than 4 ha against the 2031 CP7 requirement would be provided as part of the development yielding New Alresford’s allocation of 500 new houses and the original R&OS NG’s report would be deemed to be misleading.
7. The introduction to the WCC Open Space Strategy 2014/15 Part 1 (attached) states that the purpose of the Strategy is to “offer some protection to [important open spaces] which can be subject to development pressure”. Although the Strategy does not make its methodology clear, it could be interpreted that one of its major functions it to show on the maps and spreadsheets (which are perhaps the “schedules” that are mentioned in the Introduction) the “important areas” in each community within the District and to record whether or not each area meets certain criteria against which it would be eligible or ineligible to be protected. These criteria appear to be: public accessibility of the areas; and value of the areas in terms of amenity, recreation, biodiversity and heritage. The spreadsheets or schedules appear to assign an assessment of “yes” (indicated by a forward slash mark), “no” indicated by the word “no” or no assessment (indicated by an empty box). No “algorithm” is provided by which it might be decided that a site that has a variety of these types of assessments does or does not warrant protection. So this is the first point on which we request guidance: how is the spreadsheet or schedule to be used to combine these assessments together to reach a decision on each site and can grades of compliance with the criteria rather than “yes” or “no” be used? We understand that it is government policy for decisions such as these to be made at a local level but we would not like to rely on a method of assessment with which WCC does not agree if we need to press an objection to a development on the basis of the site’s appearance in the strategy as “protected”.
8. The Strategy does not make it clear how areas will be protected. For instance, would the schedules be amongst documents that were inspected when an application to develop an area was considered? If not, how would areas be protected?
9. Moving to the New Alresford map and schedule in particular, the introduction to the Strategy states that “Other important open areas may not be publicly accessible, like school or college playing fields. These have therefore been mapped but not added to the quantum

of publicly accessible open space.” It appears though, that in the case of New Alresford, Perins School and Sun Hill Infant School playing fields have been so included despite the latter having a “no” under the “Public Access” column in the schedule. How would you suggest that this be resolved? An instance of a sports ground that has been excluded from the total provision, it having been marked “no” under the “Public Access” column in the schedule, may be seen in the case of the IBM Sports Ground in the Hursley schedule.

10. The Hursley example indicates that areas can be included in the schedule for protection but not count as satisfying the CP7 requirements. Would you please confirm that this is true? Could you also answer the allied question of whether there is any impact to the over-provision of recreation and open space either in a specific category or in total? For instance, could developers use over-provision as an argument in favour of developing protected areas?

11. It is not clear to us how the sites listed in the New Alresford schedule have been selected for inclusion. The Introduction to the WCC Open Space Strategy states that:

“Also included on the maps and schedules are open areas with a significant ‘amenity’ value. Most of these areas were previously identified under Policy RT1 in the earlier Local plan Review and identified on the ‘proposals’ maps, but have been reviewed and added to.”

I do not recall NATC having been asked to input to or ratify the selections and additions referred to above and clarification of this process, especially in terms of how we would make inputs to the document in future, would be much appreciated.

12. In the category of Open Green Space in the Schedule, several areas have been added to those listed in the original Assessment. Some members of the community believe that the list is still incomplete but it is not clear if there are any criteria that govern which areas should be included in or excluded from the list. As indicated in NATC’s resolution, such criteria might include overall size in square metres and minimum single dimension (as would be the case for thin strips of land), for instance. Please would you tell us if there are any such criteria?

13. Chapter 7 – Active Communities - of the WCC LPP1 makes reference to the Open Space, Sports and Recreation Study for Winchester City Council (2008) and that document includes the comment that:

“Traditionally, School based open space and recreational provision, particularly in Secondary Schools, primarily exists to meet educational need. It does have the potential to be used by the wider community where there is a policy, practice or agreement in place promoting such dual use. School based provision may offer some scope to assist in meeting local needs for playing pitches and built provision where there may otherwise be local shortages.

Changes in legislation since 1986 including the recent “Extended Schools” agenda have had a major impact on the life of schools, notably outside school hours. School premises are

now under the control of governing bodies within each school. Local authorities could issue direction about its use; however this cannot amount to control.”

14. This indicates that the value of Perins sports ground may not be a simple “yes/no” decision but may warrant a more nuanced approach. Again, we realise that this should probably and properly be a local decision, but we would welcome your view on the acceptability of scaling such areas as Perins School playing fields in the assessment of recreation and open space provision against CP7 targets (eg rather than include the area as its actual 5.06 ha, scale it by, say, 30% to 1.5 ha because it is only publicly available for 30% of the time). This would, of course, be subject to negotiation with the school.
15. It is Hampshire County Council policy to recover part of the costs of owning and running schools to hire out the facilities rather than make them available free of charge. Academies may have similar policies. This brings up the question of whether the public access criterion in the WCC Open Space Strategy presumes free access. Confirmation of this would be welcome.
16. We understand that WCC’s plan for LPP2 is to issue a Pre-Submission version In June for consultation period lasting 6 weeks. We are anxious to be able to clear up our confusion over how we should assess our current R&OS provision so that we have an accurate view of the requirements we need to meet via LPP2 and can make a contribution to the Pre-Submission version of the plan or comment usefully on the Pre-submission version when it comes out. Consequently we are keen to move ahead expeditiously and have a meeting of our R&OS NG scheduled for 24 February 2015. Your help in answering the questions posed and issues identified above before then would be very much appreciated. You or a member of your staff would be most welcome at the 24 February meeting but I believe that shall be able to make more progress if we have these answers before the meeting. Accordingly I and other members of the NG are available to meet with you to discuss these issues at your offices if that is possible.

With regards,



Councillor Stuart McCullouch
01962 732059
07548 313127

Response to New Alresford Town Council (NATC) re WCC Open Space Assessment Questions.

1. Before responding to the questions raised by the Town Council, it is important to clarify that open space policies deal with two matters in relation to open space:
 - i. **PROVISION** of adequate open space to meet a locally derived standard (first part of Local Plan Part 1 policy CP7 and Table 1, Local Plan Part 2 policy DM6, NPPF para 73);
 - ii. **PROTECTION** of existing open spaces (second part of Local Plan Part 1 policy CP7, Local Plan Part 2 policy DM5, NPPF para 74).
2. The work being undertaken by the Needs Group to test the implications of the correction to population projections relates primarily to the **provision** of open space, as the standard used is population-based.
3. Reference is made to both
 - i. the 'LDF Open Space Assessments' undertaken by WCC in 2013 ('the LDF Assessment') and
 - ii. the latest iteration of the WCC 'Open Space Strategy' (OSS) which was revised and updated in Autumn 2014.
4. Whilst there are similarities, these documents fulfil different purposes. The LDF Assessment was concerned solely with open space **provision** in relation to the CP7 standard and was confined to Winchester and the 8 Market Towns and Larger Villages: i.e., Bishops Waltham, Colden Common, Denmead, Kings Worthy, New Alresford, Swanmore, Waltham Chase and Wickham.
5. It examined the adequacy of the 5 categories of recreational open space set out in Policy CP7 Table 1 in Local Plan Part 1 (LPP1) against the Open Space Standard of 4.00 hectare (ha) per thousand population. The policy CP7 standard is focussed purely on open spaces which have a recreational value and the LDF Assessment consequently confined itself to **provision** of the 5 categories of *recreational* open space, i.e. allotments, equipped children's and young people's space, informal green space, natural green space and parks, sports & recreation grounds.
6. The previous version of the Local Plan, the Winchester District Local Plan Review 2006 (WDLPR), had addressed the **protection** of 'important recreational space' under Policy RT.2 in the chapter 'Recreation and Tourism'.
7. The latest Open Space Strategy is different to the LDF Assessment as it deals with the **protection** of important open areas, as well as the adequacy of **provision** of those open spaces falling within the CP7 standard. It also examines all settlements in the non- South Downs National Park (SDNP) part of the District, i.e., not just the 9 main settlements, and includes, for the first time, an inventory of open areas with a significant *amenity* value. Many of these spaces had been previously identified and mapped in the WDLPR under Policy RT.1 as making a significant contribution to the *character* of the towns and villages, along with important *recreation* space mapped under policy RT2.
8. In the Strategy, these areas have been combined in the 'protection' table to provide a broader more integrated picture of open spaces within a settlement needing protection. Many open spaces perform more than one single function and many recreational spaces will also have a significant visual amenity value. However, there is no quantity standard for the amount of *amenity* open space that should be available to a community

and, what is more, an important amenity open space may not be available to public access.

9. With this in mind, responses can be provided to the Town Council's questions from their meeting of the 12th February.

i. The criteria for inclusion of open spaces.

- a. In the LDF Assessment this relates to open space **provision** and depends on whether they fit into one of the 5 categories of recreational open space set out in Policy CP7, Table 1 in Local Plan Part 1 (LPP1) and whether they are accessible to the public.
- b. These facilities can be of any size so long as they are usable for the type of open space concerned*: ranging from small equipped children's play areas or areas of Informal Green Space within housing areas (such as the green space at Lindley Gardens in Alresford (0.12 ha) or the small play area at Sun Hill Recreation Ground (0.30 ha), to larger areas of 'Natural Green Space' such as Winnall Moors Nature Reserve in Winchester (8.4 ha) or Claylands Nature Reserve in Bishops Waltham (3 ha). Sports fields in schools and other private sports facilities were not originally included in the LDF Assessment as they were not considered to be generally 'open' and publically accessible, although this was revised in the 2014 OSS**.
- c. The criteria for inclusion of open spaces in the most recent draft OSS differs from the above as it includes a list of all important spaces for **protection**. It inherited all the play and sports facilities which had been included in previous editions of the OSS and included the additional recreational open spaces which had come to light in the LDF Assessment***. Additionally, it attempted to capture green spaces which had not been included before which in many cases were both contributing to the visual amenity of the town and providing a degree of informal public access. Examples of this include the green spaces beside the Avenue.
- d. The criterion for the inclusion of a space under the heading of *amenity* is that it should be contributing substantially to the appearance of the surrounding area. Obviously, many such green spaces which fit this description are also in active use, so can be classified under the heading of Informal Green Space (under the CP7 categories).
- e. Many of these areas of open space were previously described in the WDLP under the heading of Policy RT.3 (small spaces which were not mapped or listed). The commentary to the policy explained that:

'In addition to identified open areas, there are often other smaller areas of open space which are an intrinsic part of the surrounding housing. Areas of open space of less than 0.4 hectares are too small to be separately identified on the Proposals and Inset Maps, but they have generally been provided in conjunction with the surrounding development, contributing to its appearance and providing opportunities for informal recreation'.

- f. The criteria for inclusion of green spaces under this policy were that they should be 'important small areas of informal open space within housing developments, in active use, well maintained and contributing substantially to the appearance of the surrounding area'. These criteria continue to be used.
 - g. The OSS therefore performs a different function to the LDF Assessment because it addresses **protection** and **provision** of open space, so brings together both recreational open space and these additional smaller amenity open spaces. Where additional open spaces are brought to the Council's attention they can be assessed and the report reviewed to identify and map spaces in Alresford (and other settlements) which fall into this category in order to update the OSS.
- ii. The protection of open spaces.
- a. The spaces identified and individually listed in the OSS have protection by virtue of the planning policies in the development plan, LPP1 Policy CP7 says that:
 - (i). *'There will be a presumption against the loss of any open space, sports or recreation facility (including built facilities), except where it can be demonstrated that:-*
 - (ii). *Alternative facilities will be provided which are at least as accessible to current and potential new users and at least equivalent in terms of size, usefulness, attractiveness and quality; or*
 - (iii). *The benefit of the development to the community outweighs the harm caused by the loss of the facility'.*
 - b. This approach to protection of open space in the Local Plan reflects national planning policy on open space, contained in paragraph 74 of the National Planning Policy Framework, which says that:
 - (i). *'Existing open space, sports and recreational buildings and land, including playing fields, should not be built on unless:*
 - (ii).
 - (iii). *an assessment has been undertaken which has clearly shown the open space, buildings or land to be surplus to requirements; or*
 - (iv). *the loss resulting from the proposed development would be replaced by equivalent or better provision in terms of quantity and quality in a suitable location; or*
 - (v). *the development is for alternative sports and recreational provision, the needs for which clearly outweigh the loss.'*
 - c. It is clear that the protection of public open space could therefore apply to an amenity green space included in the OSS, but that this space might not contribute to the CP7 standard. For example, Mitford Road roundabout is not considered to be a recreational CP7 open space but is a significant visual amenity nonetheless. In order to qualify as an important open space that should be protected, a space should meet one or more of the criteria in the 'reason for protection' columns of the OSS, reflecting the fact that some open

spaces may be important only for amenity reasons, for example, while others may be valuable for several reasons.

- d. The Local Plan policy intended to protect significant open spaces within the settlements (CP7), is amplified so far as necessary in the draft LPP2 at Policy DM5 'Protecting Open Areas'.
- iii. Open Space report. The City Council web site has been updated to refer to the possibility of some Needs Group reports being revised.
- iv. Updated report. Noted.

10. Footnotes:

* In terms of whether an area of open space would be considered useable or capable of being used, the smallest limit is that suggested by the Fields In Trust (formerly the National Playing Fields Association – NPFA) for a Local Area for Play (LAP) – which is 100 sq m. An area smaller than this is unlikely to be capable of being used as a kick-about or an informal play area so would not be counted.

For whether an area of green space is important from an amenity point of view, i.e. whether it could be said to be making a significant contribution to local character and distinctiveness, then size is less of an issue and professional judgement comes into play. Green space left over after the houses, roads and car parks have been laid out is frequently not making a positive contribution to amenity. However, some spaces have been deliberately laid out as amenity space as part of the housing and sometimes planted with trees. These spaces can be any size, although those supporting mature trees tend to offer more value than those which do not.

** A significant difference between the LDF Assessment and the Open Space Strategy is the approach to school and other private sports fields. This is always a difficult area as such spaces are available to a section of the public (students) and may be available for wider use, but are not generally accessible to all. At the time the LDF Assessment was carried out, school playing fields and other private sports grounds were not included in the CP7 definition of public open space. This initially was also the approach of the Strategy.

During the process of drafting the Local Plan this was reviewed taking account of the approach that was taken to defining the open spaces standard in the first place. As a result it was concluded that school playing fields should be considered as available, in the same way as other facilities which cater for particular sections of the community e.g. sports clubs, tennis courts or pitches. The 2014 OSS figures therefore include school playing fields as contributing to the 'sports grounds' category.

This is an area of ongoing debate and is an issue on which the Needs Group may wish to give a local view. However, as the only category of 'adequate' provision, this is not particularly relevant to the issue of the scale of any shortfalls.

*** WCC writes to town and parish councils each year in December, advising them that the OSS is about to be revised for the forthcoming financial year and asking for input. Specifically the parishes are asked to confirm that the sites identified continue to be

available and whether any new open spaces should be added. This process has been taking place since at least 2003. For the preparation of the 2014 edition of the OSS every parish was sent maps for each of the CP7 categories and asked to mark-up on these maps the known open spaces in each category.

Correlation of NATC Questions and WCC Answers

Ser No.	NATC Para	Question	WCC Para	Answer
1.	5.	Should we now regard the Strategy as the document that is authoritative in deciding what New Alresford's holdings of recreation and open space are (as opposed to the originally provided assessment, for instance)?	7.	The latest Open Space Strategy is different to the LDF Assessment as it deals with the protection of important open areas, as well as the adequacy of provision of those open spaces falling within the CP7 standard. Note: Steve Opacic emailed this morning: Yes, happy to keep one schedule and that will reflect the OS Strategy approach, and we can pull out from it the spaces which contribute to meeting the standard for various open space types.
2.	7.	How is the spreadsheet or schedule to be used to combine these assessments together to reach a decision on each site and can grades of compliance with the criteria rather than "yes" or "no" be used?	9iic	In order to qualify as an important open space that should be protected, a space should meet one or more of the criteria in the 'reason for protection' columns of the OSS.
3.	8.	Would the schedules be amongst documents that were inspected when an application to develop an area was considered? If not, how would areas be protected?		
4.	9.	." It appears though, that in the case of New Alresford, Perins School and Sun Hill Infant School playing fields have been so included despite the latter having a "no" under the "Public Access" column in the schedule. How would you suggest that this be resolved?	Footnote**	The 2014 OSS figures include school playing fields as contributing to the 'sports grounds' category. This is an area of ongoing debate and is an issue on which the Needs Group may wish to give a local view. <i>However, as the only category of 'adequate' provision, this is not particularly relevant to the issue of the scale of any shortfalls. SM Note: there would be a shortfall if we discounted Perins and Sun Hill playing fields.</i>
5.	10.	The Hursley example indicates that areas can be included in the schedule for protection but not count as satisfying the CP7 requirements. Would you please confirm that this is true?	9iic	It is clear that the protection of public open space could therefore apply to an amenity green space included in the OSS, but that this space might not contribute to the CP7 standard. For example, Mitford Road roundabout is not considered to be a recreational CP7 open space but is a significant visual amenity nonetheless.
6.	10.	Is there any impact to the over-provision of recreation and open space either in a specific category or in total? For		

		instance, could developers use over-provision as an argument in favour of developing protected areas?		
7.	11.	I do not recall NATC having been asked to input to or ratify the selections and additions in the OS Strategy and clarification of this process, especially in terms of how we would make inputs to the document in future, would be much appreciated.	Footnote***	For the preparation of the 2014 edition of the OSS every parish was sent maps for each of the CP7 categories and asked to mark-up on these maps the known open spaces in each category. Steve Opacic emailed this morning: "Yes, happy to keep one schedule and that will reflect the OS Strategy approach, and we can pull out from it the spaces which contribute to meeting the standard for various open space types."
8.	13	As indicated in NATC's resolution, such criteria might include overall size in square metres and minimum single dimension (as would be the case for thin strips of land), for instance. Please would you tell us if there are any such criteria?	9ia&b	Facilities that match one of the 5 categories of recreational open space set out in Policy CP7 can be of any size so long as they are usable for the type of open space concerned. The smallest limit is that suggested by the Fields In Trust for a Local Area for Play (LAP) – which is 100 sq m. An area smaller than this is unlikely to be capable of being used as a kick-about or an informal play area so would not be counted.
9.		we would welcome your view on the acceptability of scaling such areas as Perins School playing fields in the assessment of recreation and open space provision against CP7 targets (eg rather than include the area as its actual 5.06 ha, scale it by, say, 30% to 1.5 ha because it is only publicly available for 30% of the time)		
10.		Does the public access criterion in the WCC Open Space Strategy presume access free of charge?		

NPPF Extract on Open Spaces:

73. Access to high quality **open spaces** and opportunities for sport and recreation can make an important contribution to the health and well-being of communities. Planning policies should be based on robust and up-to-date assessments of the needs for open space, sports and recreation facilities and opportunities for new provision. The assessments should identify specific needs and quantitative or qualitative deficits or surpluses of open space, sports and recreational facilities in the local area. Information gained from the assessments should be used to determine what open space, sports and recreational provision is required.

74. Existing open space, sports and recreational buildings and land, including playing fields, should not be built on unless:

- an assessment has been undertaken which has clearly shown the open space, buildings or land to be surplus to requirements; or
- the loss resulting from the proposed development would be replaced by equivalent or better provision in terms of quantity and quality in a suitable location; or
- the development is for alternative sports and recreational provision, the needs for which clearly outweigh the loss.

75. Planning policies should protect and enhance public rights of way and access. Local authorities should seek opportunities to provide better facilities for users, for example by adding links to existing rights of way networks including National Trails.

76. Local communities through local and neighbourhood plans should be able to identify for special protection green areas of particular importance to them. By designating land as Local Green Space local communities will be able to rule out new development other than in very special circumstances. Identifying land as Local Green Space should therefore be consistent with the local planning of sustainable development and complement investment in sufficient homes, jobs and other essential services. Local Green Spaces should only be designated when a plan is prepared or reviewed, and be capable of enduring beyond the end of the plan period.

77. The Local Green Space designation will not be appropriate for most green areas or open space. The designation should only be used:

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

Definition: Open space: 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 act as a visual amenity. See Also **Planning Policy Guidance 17: Planning for Open Space, Sport and Recreation (24 July 2002)**.

Consolidated list of suggested additions to Schedule and comment

Rec and Open Space - Alresford			5
OS Strat Ref N.		Area (m ²)	Comments (by Margot and Stuart DD except where indicated)
1	Spring Gardens Allotments	6889	
2	Arlebury Park Play areas	4662	
3	Stratton Bates Play Area	23,794	
4	Sun Hill Play Area		
5	Appledown Close	1,602	
6	Orchard Close	1,695	
7	Lindley Gdns	1,193	
8	Beneden Green	4,510	
9	The Avenue	10,854	
10	Mitford Rd Roundabout/Circle	1,229	should be public access/is publicly accessible
11	Oak Hill	310	
	Stratton Bates Recreation Ground		Ralph considers this area to be more widely used as informal open space than for sport, it should therefore be re-categorised.
12		10,666	MP/SK think used more for open space than sport, youth football use it Sat & Sun. In OPS – 12, Park/Recreation which is right
13	Sun Hill Recreation Ground	10,660	
14	Arlebury Park Rugby Ptiches	30,569	
15	Sun Hill Infant School Playing Field	18,258	not publicly accessible
16	Sun Lane Bowling Club	1,283	not publicly accessible
17	Perins School	50,565	Equipped Play area. not publicly accessible
18	Arlebury Park sports grounds	37,572	Arlebury Park is north half(ish) Park & Recreation, south half(ish) Sports Grounds
	Off Hasted Drive		
	Twixt Shepherds Down & Fairview		
	Churchyard - St John's		
	Carpenters		
	The Soke		
	Brill Close		
	The Gate - Spring Gdns		Outside parish
	Lovells Walk		
	Makins Court		
	Chestnut Walk		
	Ash Walk		
	Nursery Rd		
	Watercress Line Picnic Area		Not accessible to public, visual amenity only/green lung
	Sun Lane - Opp Langtons		
	Nicholson Place		
	Meryon Rd		
	Memorial Gdns		Park/Recreation
	Natural Green Space		
	Definition	Land that is completely accesible to the public, e.g. Medstead Woods	
	Wayfarers Walk		
	Hassock's Copse		
	river "surrounds		
	Churchyard - St John's		Churchyard in use, therefore not in OPS, SDD to check definition but maybe we need another category e.g. Valuable Public Amenity. Only green space in town centre so very much used.
	Bakeland Gardens		Not in parish
	Wayfarers Walk		Not in parish
	Key:		
	In OS strategy		
	Suggested additions by Ralph		Note: Ralph's suggestions are all in the Informal Open Space Category
	Suggested by Ralph and already in Strategy Schedule		
	Suggested additions by Keith		

<u>Notes from Stuart Dunbar-Dempsey and Margot Power Walkabout</u>	Our thoughts from today's drive around
Stratton Bates	Used more for open space than sport, youth football use it Sat & Sun. In OPS – 12, Park/Recreation which I think is right.
Mitford Road	In OPS -10
Oak Hill	In OPS -11
Wide verge with trees, Hasted Drive	Informal Green Space
Off Hasted Drive	Informal Green Space
Twixt Shepherds Down & Fairview	Informal Green Space
Fairview/Paddock Way	Informal Green Space
Orchard Close	In OPS -6
The Avenue	In OPS -9
Churchyard - St John's	Churchyard in use, therefore not in OPS, SDD to check definition but maybe we need another category e.g. Valuable Public Amenity. Only green space in town centre so very much used.
Appledown Close	In OPS -5
Carpenters	Informal Green Space
Lindley Gdns	In OPS -7
Benenden Green	In OPS -8
The Soke	Informal Green Space
Brill Close	Informal Green Space
Thornton	Informal Green Space
Mitford Rd Circle	In OPS 10 but should be public access
The Gate - Spring Gdns	Outside parish
Lovells Walk	Informal Green Space
Robertson Road on Jacklyns lane	Informal Green Space
Makins Court	Informal Green Space
Chestnut Walk	Informal Green Space
Ash Walk	Informal Green Space
Nursery Rd	Informal Green Space
Perins	Equipped Play area
Meryon Road, between flats	Informal Green Space
Lovells Walk	Informal Green Space
Meryon Road, before bungalows	Informal Green Space
Churchyard, is in use therefore specifically excluded	
Watercress Line Picnic Area	Not accessible to public, visual amenity only/green lung
Sun Lane - Opp Langtons, railway bridge to Ash Walk	Informal Green Space
Memorial Gdns	Park/Recreation
Bakeland Gardens	Not in parish
Wayfarers Walk	Not in parish

Comments on OPS 13/14, MJP

10 Mitford Road roundabout is publicly accessible

15,16,17 are not publicly accessible

18 Arlebury Park is north half(ish) Park & Recreation, south half(ish) Sports Grounds.