

---

## **LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK– PLAYING PITCH STRATEGY SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT ADOPTION**

### **1 SUMMARY**

- 1.1 This report recommends the adoption of the Playing Pitch Strategy 2011-2026 as a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) that forms part of the Local Development Framework and supersedes the previous SPD3 – Playing Pitch Strategy (2007).

### **2 INTRODUCTION**

- 2.1 The Council is obligated to review and update the planning documents in the Rochford Local Development Framework, which includes supplementary planning documents (SPD).

### **3 BACKGROUND**

- 3.1 The draft version of the Playing Pitch Strategy SPD was approved for Regulation 17 Public Consultation by the Local Development Framework Sub-Committee on 26 September 2011.
- 3.2 A total of 11 representations were received during the consultation from 14 November 2011 to 16 January 2012.
- 3.3 In accordance with Regulation 18 (4) (b) of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004 (as amended) the appended statement sets out a summary of the main issues that were raised during the formal consultation on the Playing Pitch Strategy consultation and the response to each issue.
- 3.4 The draft SPD has now been amended where appropriate to address the main issues raised in the consultation. A copy of the amended SPD has been circulated to all Members under separate cover.
- 3.5 In one of the representations, it was suggested a list of pitch locations should be presented with the SPD. It is considered that this is a valid suggestion that would make a positive contribution to the final document, thus a list of playing pitch provision is now included in Appendix A of the Playing Pitch Strategy SPD.
- 3.6 Once adopted, the Playing Pitch Strategy will form part of the Local Development Framework, a collection of documents that will set out how the District will develop in the future.
- 3.7 The Playing Pitch Strategy SPD is required to conform to the Core Strategy and other relevant DPDs. As a Supplementary Planning Document it cannot

introduce new policies *per se*, but it can provide greater detail on the implementation of existing policies.

- 3.8 The Playing Pitch Strategy SPD will supersede the 2007 version.
- 3.9 Unlike development plan documents, SPDs are not subject to independent examination but can be regarded as material consideration in the determination of relevant planning applications.

#### **4 ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED**

- 4.1 An alternative option would be not to replace the existing 2007 SPD3 – Playing Pitch Strategy. However, following the review of the Sport England's guidance, this option is not considered to be appropriate.

#### **5 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPLICATIONS**

- 5.1 The Playing Pitch Strategy, once adopted, will be used to inform planning decisions relating to the provision of playing pitches. This, along with other actions recommended within the SPD, will have an impact on the District's environment.

#### **6 RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS**

- 6.1 The cost of production, including printing, of the Playing Pitch Strategy SPD can be met through existing budgets.

#### **7 RECOMMENDATION**

- 7.1 It is proposed that Council **RESOLVES** to adopt the Playing Pitch Strategy SPD.

Shaun Scrutton

Head of Planning and Transportation

---

#### **Background Papers:-**

None

For further information please contact Velda Wong (Assistant Planner) on:-

Phone: 01702 318002

Email: [velda.wong@rochford.gov.uk](mailto:velda.wong@rochford.gov.uk)

If you would like this report in large print, Braille or another language please contact 01702 318111.

The table below sets out the main issues raised by formal representations received on the consultation draft of Playing Pitch Strategy SPD in accordance with Regulation 18 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004.

No.	Representation Received	Individual/ Organisation	Representation ID	Main Issue(s) raised	Officer comments
1	28/11/2011	Members of public	28264	Considering a team demand is not meeting the needs of the populace.	Team Generation Rate has been assessed in Chapter 4.
2	28/11/2011	Members of public	28265	Doesn't find the return rate of questionnaires acceptable.	Comment note. However, it is considered that the response rate of the questionnaire is acceptable.
3	28/11/2011	Members of public	28266	Would like to see a list of pitch locations.	Comment noted. A list of playing pitch with their locations will be published in the final version.
4	28/11/2011	Members of public	28267	Categories do not allow for council owned pitches that are leased to clubs.	The categorisation is defined by Sport England, this standard categorisation can be shared between local authorities for

Appendix

No.	Representation Received	Individual/ Organisation	Representation ID	Main Issue(s) raised	Officer comments
					comparison. Category A(i) covers "Pitches in local authority or other public ownership or management".
5	28/11/2011	Members of public	28268	Does not agree with population breakdown v need for affordable housing for families.	Population projection was based on 2001 census data from Office of National Statistics (ONS).
6	28/11/2011	Members of public	28269	Would like to see published questionnaire responses.	One of the survey questions include personal contact details, these information is confidential and therefore will not be published. Data and comments collected from the questionnaires have been analysed and reflected in the findings.

## Appendix

No.	Representation Received	Individual/ Organisation	Representation ID	Main Issue(s) raised	Officer comments
7	30/12/2011	Members of public	28270	Do your questionnaires ask for teams that the target plays against. It seems strange there is only one Hockey club in the region ( do they have no local opposition?) and the number of Rugby / Cricket clubs also seems low.	There are other Hockey clubs within the Region, such as Chelmsford Hockey Club, Witham Hockey Club, Brentwood Hockey Club, Southend Hockey Club, etc. However, as stated in the Methodology section, the study area of this assessment focuses on the local sports club within the District.
8	11/01/2012	The Coal Authority	28271	No Observations	Comment noted.
9	16/01/2012	Members of public	28272	The shortfall of cricket pitches in the Rayleigh sub area is under estimated	Conclusions and recommendations have been drawn from the analysis of the survey results as well as desktop review, where the latent demand/ 'virtual' teams was assessed using team

## Appendix

No.	Representation Received	Individual/ Organisation	Representation ID	Main Issue(s) raised	Officer comments
					generation rates. It is concluded that the surplus in cricket and rugby pitches shown in the current PPM will turn into a small deficit in the future; actions have been recommended to help resolving this issue.
10	16/01/2012	Members of public	28273	Due to the number of returned questionnaires, the data cannot be reliable	Comment note. However, it is considered that the response rate of the questionnaire is acceptable.
11	16/01/2012	Members of public	28274	One of the additional cricket pitches in the Rayleigh sub-area should be sited as part of the housing development north of London Road (E.On)	Comment noted.

Please note: Although no comments have been made by Statutory Consultees i.e. Sport England during the formal consultation period, the Council sought initial comments from Sport England on the final draft of the Playing Pitch Strategy in April 2011 (before the document went out for Regulation 17 public consultation). These comments can be made available on request.

# Local Development Framework

# Playing Pitch Strategy



**If you would like this information in large print, Braille or another language, please contact 01702 318111.**

## Contents

	Page
Chapter 1 – Introduction .....	5
Purpose of a Playing Pitch Strategy.....	5
Defining a Playing Pitch .....	5
The Current Situation Locally.....	6
The Current Situation Nationally .....	8
National Trends in Key Pitch Sports .....	9
Issues and Opportunities .....	10
Objectives of Assessment.....	12
Chapter 2 – Policy Context.....	13
National Government Planning Policy.....	13
Local Planning Policy .....	16
Chapter 3 – Methodology .....	17
Defining a Team.....	17
Sports Included .....	17
Study Area and Sub-Areas .....	17
The Playing Pitch Model .....	18
Our Approach.....	19
Response Rate .....	20
Chapter 4 – Supply and Demand for Pitches.....	21
Supply: playing pitch provision in Rochford District.....	21
Quality .....	21
Pitches secured for community use .....	23
Demand: sport clubs in Rochford District.....	24
Current Demand – an overview .....	24
Future Demand.....	28
Chapter 5 – Findings for Sub-areas.....	30
Findings for the Rayleigh Sub-Area .....	30
Findings for the Hockley Sub-Area .....	32
Findings for the Hullbridge Sub-Area .....	34
Findings for the Rochford Sub-Area.....	35
Findings for the Great Wakering Sub-Area .....	37
School Questionnaire Findings .....	39
Chapter 6 – Analysis and Recommendations.....	40
Chapter 7 – Conclusions .....	44

Appendix A – Playing Pitch Provision in the District .....	46
Appendix B – Planning Applications Related to Playing Fields .....	50
Appendix C – Playing Pitch Questionnaire for the Sport Clubs .....	51
Appendix D – Playing Pitch Questionnaire for the School.....	54
Appendix E – Team Generation Rates for completed Playing Pitch Strategies.....	56
Appendix F – Playing Pitch Methodology Current Year.....	60
Appendix G – Playing Pitch Methodology – Future .....	66
Appendix H – Action Plan of Recommendations for Rochford .....	76

### Chapter 1 – Introduction

#### Purpose of a Playing Pitch Strategy

- 1.1 The aim of this Playing Pitch Strategy, in light of the revised Sport England Methodology, is to provide a concise and accurate update of the previous Strategy, completed in 2007, which reflects the level of supply and demand within the District. This Strategy will function as a Supplementary Planning Document for the Local Development Framework, providing guidance for playing pitch provision and improvement in the area.
- 1.2 Under Government guidance, it is recommended that such assessments are thoroughly conducted by Local Authorities in order to effectively provide for the needs of the community through strategic planning policies.
- 1.3 The necessary increase in the provision of new households in the District up to 2026 and beyond, to provide for the already growing population, will intensify the pressures on land. Thus this assessment will help ensure informed decisions are made on the future supply and distribution of playing pitches.

#### Defining a Playing Pitch

- 1.4 A 'playing pitch' has been defined within The Town and Country Planning Order 1996<sup>1</sup> as:

A delineated area which, together with any run off area, is of 0.4 hectares or more, and which is used for association football, American football, rugby, cricket, hockey, lacrosse, rounders, baseball, softball, Australian football, Gaelic football, shinty, hurling, polo or cycle polo.
- 1.5 The Department of Children, Schools and Families, however, in their most recent publication (**The Protection of School Playing Fields and Land for City Academies, Ref: DfE-1017-2004, Annex B, paragraph 13**) regarding the provision and protection of playing pitches, define a pitch used for sporting activities as:

Open grassed land that is capable of forming at least a small pitch, which is equal to, or larger than, The Football Association's recommended area for games played by under-10s, that is 2,000m<sup>2</sup>. It should also have a configuration and topography making it suitable for a sports pitch, whether it is laid out or not, or

Synthetic or artificial playing surface, or dedicated hard games court of more than 2,000m<sup>2</sup> that is set out for team games.
- 1.6 In this assessment, with regard to the guidance examined, the definition used to describe a 'playing pitch' will be:

A defined area of free draining open grassland or an artificial surface, which is generally greater than 0.2 hectares and enables the execution of one or more team games.

---

<sup>1</sup> [www.opsi.gov.uk/si/si1996/Uksi\\_19961817\\_en\\_1.htm](http://www.opsi.gov.uk/si/si1996/Uksi_19961817_en_1.htm) The Office of Public Sector Information.


1.7 Furthermore a ‘playing field’ refers to the whole of a site which encompasses at least one playing pitch (**Circular 09/98: Town and Country Planning (playing fields) (England) Direction 1998**).

### The Current Situation Locally

1.8 It is necessary to analyse the current situation of Rochford District and identify the prominent issues which will have an impact on playing pitches.

1.9 At present, the population within the District is estimated to have exceeded 83,000<sup>2</sup>, the majority of which are situated around the main urban centres of Rayleigh, Hockley and Rochford. The needs of the projected population, which is expected to reach around 90,000 by 2029 (see Figure 1.1), is to be met by an increase in housing development within the District.

**Figure 1.1 – The projected population increase of the Rochford District up to 2029**



1.10 The District has a demographic age structure which is typical of an ageing population. In the last 30 years, the proportion of the population aged over 65 has increased whilst the proportion aged under 16 has decreased. This is a trend which is expected to continue. In 2009 it was estimated that 19.31% of the population were 65 years or above, which is higher than the regional and national averages. In contrast, 23.45% were below 19 years of age, which is estimated to be below the county, the regional and national averages (Annual Monitoring Report 08/09).

<sup>2</sup> Resident Population Estimates, All Persons available from [www.neighbourhood.statistics.gov.uk](http://www.neighbourhood.statistics.gov.uk)

- 1.11 The demographic trend of the population in the Rochford District is expected to have an impact on the level of demand for future playing pitch provision. Sport England has established that as people get older, the fewer physical activities they pursue<sup>3</sup>, with the highest participation rates in the 16 to 19 year-old age group.
- 1.12 The revised East of England plan encourages the re-use of previously developed land in and around urban areas. Therefore the requirement for local authorities to allocate many of the new homes in the next 20 years around existing urban areas is likely to increase the pressure for development on playing fields and other open spaces. National Policy, however, which is discussed in Chapter 2, strongly opposes the loss or redevelopment of playing fields, unless there is a viable argument.
- 1.13 According to the National Statistics database, 16.4% of households in the Rochford District, do not have access to a private vehicle thus limiting the level of mobility for some of the population. This figure is below the average for the East of England (19.8%) and England as a whole (26.84%), suggesting that some facilities may not be easily accessible to a significant proportion of the population.
- 1.14 Unemployment in the Rochford District between Jul 2008 and Jun 2009 was found to be around 4.9%, which is below the regional and national averages of 5.9% and 7% respectively. It has been suggested that there may be a correlation between economic activity, and the propensity to participate in sports.
- 1.15 Findings in the document **Activity Profile: Rochford** (July 2007) produced by Sport England, suggest that individuals in a high socio-economic group (NS SEC 1-4 as categorised by the National Statistics Socio-economic Classification ) participate in sporting activities more frequently than those in a lower group (NS SEC 5-8). The proportion of individuals who participate in sport once a week was found to be the same for both groups. More individuals in the lower socio-economic group, however, had a higher incidence of non-participation (58.3%) than those in the higher group (44.2%).
- 1.16 The factors discussed, such as unemployment rates, population mobility and demographic change, in addition to increasing population pressures, will impact on the provision of playing pitches and their use (in reference to the type and frequency of the sports pursued).
- 1.17 It has been calculated that in 2005/06 only 6.95% of residents in the District lived within 20 minutes<sup>4</sup> of three different sports facilities, a figure which has decreased from 20.6% in 2004/05 due to the removal of a prominent leisure facilities (including three grass playing pitches) 'quality mark'. The current figure is the 4<sup>th</sup> lowest in the County and below the Essex average.
- 1.18 Nearly 20% of residents in the District (regardless of socio-economic status) regularly participate in moderate intensity sport and active recreation, three days a week for 30 minutes, according to Sport England<sup>5</sup>. Rochford is in the middle 50% of the eastern region of England.

---


<sup>3</sup> Participation in Sport in England: 2002.

<sup>4</sup> Max walking time (urban areas); Max driving time (rural areas) – Sport England.

<sup>5</sup> [www.sportengland.org/061206\\_active\\_people\\_east\\_factsheet\\_embargo\\_7\\_dec.pdf](http://www.sportengland.org/061206_active_people_east_factsheet_embargo_7_dec.pdf) Table of findings for 'Number of Sports Playing Fields Continues to Grow' Department for Culture, Media and Sport and Sport England (October 2006).

- 1.19 The previous Playing Pitch Strategy, carried out in 2002, concluded that there was sufficient playing pitch provision to satisfy the level of demand within the District, although there was a noted variation in the supply of pitches between the sub-areas. Ancillary facilities and the quality of the playing surface were found to be substandard.
- 1.20 The Strategy also determined that football was the most popular team sport pursued within the Rochford District. The graph (Figure 1.2) below shows that the percentage of youth football teams based in the District was measured below the national trend between 2006 and 2007.

**Figure 1.2 – The percentage of youth teams playing in Rochford at each age**



Source: Essex County Football Association – Local Area Data: Rochford Season 06/07

### The Current Situation Nationally

- 1.21 Research conducted by the Department for Culture, Media and Sport and Sport England published in 2006<sup>6</sup> suggests that the situation for playing fields and playing pitches in England continues to improve.
- 1.22 Nationally, the number of submitted planning applications on playing fields increased by almost a quarter between 2000/2001 and 2005/2006 to over 1300 (see Appendix B). Ninety-seven percent of the applications which reached full conclusion either enhanced or had no negative impact on the quality of the sports provision, according to Sport England.
- 1.23 In 2004/2005, 26 new playing pitches were created in England. These were not built on existing sites, thus increasing the provision for sporting activities.

<sup>6</sup> [www.culture.gov.uk/NR/rdonlyres/52DE2AA2-0CD1-4610-9969-2A1757F0C475/0/PN\\_132\\_06\\_table.pdf](http://www.culture.gov.uk/NR/rdonlyres/52DE2AA2-0CD1-4610-9969-2A1757F0C475/0/PN_132_06_table.pdf)

1.24 Sport England’s ‘Active People Survey’, which was completed in 2006, focuses on the level of participation in sport and recreational activities throughout England. It has divided England into nine different regions. Generally the amount of active participation in the east of England by the adult population is around or above the national average, for example:

- Over a fifth (20.5%) of the adult population in the eastern region frequently participates in recreational activities. The national average is 21%.
- The proportion of the adult population involved in sports clubs (26.2%) is above the national average.
- With reference to local sports, over 70% of adults have satisfactory sports provision in their area.

### National Trends in Key Pitch Sports

1.25 Sport England has summarised the significant statistics and trends for a variety of national sports, and identified the implications for future demand for playing pitches. The four most played sports in the District have been included in the table below.

**Table 1.1 – Participation in Key Sports**

	Overall Participation	Key facts	National and Local Key Trends	Implication for Pitches
Football	Over 2 million regular players (adult and youth)	Out of school, football has experienced the biggest growth in ‘frequent’ participation from 37% in 1994 to 43% in 1999.	National: More children are playing due to popularity of mini-soccer (30% increase over last three years).  Local: Mini-soccer has become increasingly popular in the District, but the latent demand is still relatively low compared to other neighbouring Councils.	More mini-soccer-sized pitches needed and therefore more junior pitches in future (due to ripple effect).
		Female soccer is now starting to grow nationally at a rapid pace.	National and Local: More women are playing football.	Improved quality of ancillary facilities and in particular dedicated changing facilities.
		A 300-400% growth in informal five-a-side football.	National: More midweek fixtures, more non-grass pitches.  Local: Most of the pitches in the District are grass pitches, but there is a trend that more people are interested in playing five-a-side football.	Players defecting to five-a-side, therefore additional floodlit synthetic turf pitches/MUGAs may be required.
		The FA forecasts the number of youth players to increase by 10% over next five years.	National: More pitches will be needed.  Local: There is shortage in junior and mini pitches, more of the mini playing pitches will be needed.	The vast number of children playing mini-soccer will result in the need for more junior pitches over next five years.

	Overall Participation	Key facts	National and Local Key Trends	Implication for Pitches
Cricket	660,000 regular players (adult and youth)	Kwik cricket – a game devised for children – is played by 1.1 million pupils in 90% of the country's primary schools. Of these, 434,000 are girls.	National and Local: Increased participation by young people.	More pitches used for kwik cricket and new mobile flicx pitches to be introduced in schools.
		The number of women's clubs increased from 4,200 in 1997 to 7,611 in 2001.	National: Increased participation by women.	Improved access needed to quality training pitches and improved ancillary facilities required in smaller clubs.
Rugby union	Circa 250,000 regular players (adult and youth)	The number of adult males playing rugby has decreased by 12% over last five years.	National: Decline in the men's game is recognised but many initiatives in place to increase opportunities and promote the sport.	Need to safeguard rugby pitches in anticipation of recovery in participation.
		Women's participation has increased significantly in recent years, from approximately 2,000 players in 1988 to 8,000 in 1998.	National: Increase in participation by women. Local: There is no increase in women team in the District.	Improved clubhouse facilities and increased access to pitches.
		The number of mini teams has increased by 4% over last five years to 5,188.	National and Local: More young children playing rugby.	More dedicated mini-rugby pitches and 'child-friendly' changing facilities will be required.
Hockey	100,000 regular players (adult and youth)	Hockey is one of the top five most popular games in school, although participation declined from 20% in 1994 to 17% in 1999 and the number of children citing it as enjoyable dropped from 13% to 10% over the same period.	National: Slight decline in youth participation. Emphasis is therefore placed on promoting hockey towards young people to secure the future of the game. However, many clubs still do not have access to synthetic turf pitches (STPs). Local: Hockey is not a popular sport in the District. Slight decline in women's team is recorded.	Continuing requirement for STPs and improved clubhouse facilities to meet league requirements and to encourage club/team formation. Grass pitches still an important component of the game.

### Issues and Opportunities

- 1.26 Previously there have been inaccurate and sporadic attempts to quantify the provision of playing pitches for sports in England. Some initiatives have estimated that there were around 70,000 pitches, however, this cannot be confirmed, and without a comprehensive monitoring system of playing pitches in light of threats from development, it is unknown how many of these valuable open spaces may have been lost.
- 1.27 In recent years there has been a national effort to raise awareness of the importance of playing pitches in enhancing community cohesion, social inclusion and general well-being. The Playing Fields Monitoring Group was launched in April 2000 the Department

for Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS) to deal with issues affecting pitches.

Representatives from stakeholder groups such as the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister and the National Playing Fields Association (now Fields in Trust) monitor planning applications and examine the wider concerns regarding playing pitches.

- 1.28 The original Playing Pitch Strategy, which was developed in 1991 by the National Playing Fields Association (now Fields in Trust), the Sports Council (now Sport England) and the Central Council for Physical Recreation (CCPR), is replaced by the current Playing Pitch Methodology produced by Sport England.
- 1.29 The Active Places database, which is an initiative of Sport England, was launched in 2004 and provides a current estimate of various sporting facilities in England. Data accuracy is reliant on the quantity and quality of information gathered and submitted by several organisations such as The Leisure Database Company, and as a result it is an ongoing process.
- 1.30 The Register of English Football Facilities (REFF) is a database commissioned by the Football Foundation in 2001 and backed by several partners including the Football Association and Sport England. The database is being frequently updated. Using this source, preliminary research revealed that there are:
- Approximately 35 grass and artificial playing fields in Rochford District.
  - 11 of these are on school sites, with a total of 17 playing pitches.
- 1.31 In 1996, Sport England was designated a statutory consultee on all proposed developments that conform to certain criteria with regards to the protection of playing fields. Any submitted planning applications to Local Authorities, which may result in the loss of playing fields, land that is currently used as a playing field, or has been in the past five years, and land that has been identified in a recent development plan for potential use as a playing field, must be presented to Sport England for consultation.
- 1.32 Sport England (whose guidance is reviewed in Chapter 2) state that it is their:
- ‘policy to object to any planning application, which will result in the loss of a playing field, unless it meets one of five exceptions as defined in Planning Policy Statement – A Sporting Future for the Playing Fields of England’<sup>7</sup>.
- 1.33 Fields In Trust (FIT), which replaced the National Playing Field Association (NPFA), has provided protection for 1,200 playing fields throughout the UK using a series of flexible options including legally binding Deeds of Dedication, Community Amateur Sports Clubs (CASCs) Status, Custodian Trustee/Freehold Protection and King George V Fields<sup>8</sup>.
- 1.34 According to the Fields In Trust’s database of protected fields, the following playing fields in Rochford District have been awarded protection status:
- Doggetts Close Recreation Ground, Doggetts Close, Rochford (0.5 acres).
  - Rochford Recreation Ground, Stambridge Rd, Rochford (9 acres).

---

<sup>7</sup> [www.sportengland.org/planning\\_for\\_sport\\_playingfields](http://www.sportengland.org/planning_for_sport_playingfields)

<sup>8</sup> [www.fieldsintrust.org/what\\_we\\_do/our\\_work\\_programmes/protecting\\_fields.php#options2](http://www.fieldsintrust.org/what_we_do/our_work_programmes/protecting_fields.php#options2)

- Grove Road Playing Field, Grove Road, Rayleigh (7 acres).
  - Turret House Farm (Recreation Ground), Hockley Road, Rayleigh (11 acres).
  - Holly Tree Gardens (Public Open Space), Rayleigh (2 acres).
- 1.35 Locally, the Essex Playing Fields Association (EPFA) is responsible for supporting and advising Parish/Town Councils, community and other groups responsible for maintaining playing fields. The EPFA tries to work closely with national organisations such as Sport England and the Foundation for Sports & Arts.
- 1.36 The Council owned playing pitches in Rochford District are maintained by an external contractor.
- 1.37 Active Rochford was established in 2007 under the guidance of Sport Essex to bring together voluntary, public and private stakeholders involved in the development of sport within the District, with the broad objectives of ensuring a more coordinated approach, and encouraging greater participation and access to sport within the local community. Other organisations include the Rochford Sports Council, which is a voluntary body providing advice and support for local sports clubs.

### Objectives of Assessment

- 1.38 The key objectives of this playing pitch strategy are to:
- Analyse the current balance between the supply and demand of playing pitches within the Rochford District, and the quality of the pitches through the use of the revised Playing Pitch Methodology developed by Sport England (which is explained in detail in Chapter 3).
  - Determine the accessibility of each pitch in relation to the surrounding population.
  - Identify areas which require additional investment in order to meet the needs of the local community.
  - Interpret the demand for playing pitches in the Rochford District, both now and in the future.
  - Draw informative conclusions on the futurity of playing pitches in the District.
  - Suggest recommendations for guiding local policies, such as areas requiring improvements and proposals for the provision of new pitches, in line with national and regional guidance (discussed in Chapter 2).
  - The Playing Pitch Strategy SPD will assist in the work of a number of Council departments including planning, leisure, parks, as well as other relevant organisations such as education department in Essex County Council

## Chapter 2 – Policy Context

### National Government Planning Policy

#### PPG17 – Planning for open space, sport and recreation

- 2.1 The Government recognises the importance of providing well-designed, plentiful open areas for sport and recreational activities, as a means of improving the quality of life and general well being of individuals as outlined in Planning Policy Guidance 17, published in July 2002.
- 2.2 As stated in the guidance, such areas are fundamental to delivering broader Government objectives. These include:
- Supporting an urban renaissance
  - Supporting a rural renewal
  - Promotion of social inclusion and community cohesion
  - Health and well being
  - Promoting more sustainable development.
- 2.3 Local Planning Authorities are required to assess the existing and future needs of their communities for open space, sports and recreational facilities, whilst also considering the needs of workers and visitors from outside the local area. Such assessments should critically evaluate, for example the accessibility and quality of the areas in question, and the current balance between supply and demand, which will aid in the setting of locally derived standards.
- 2.4 The guidance also states that open spaces, sports and recreational areas should be protected against development if they are of high quality, or of particular value to a local community, unless it can be demonstrated that they are surplus to requirements.
- 2.5 But the guidance goes further in saying:
- Development of open space, sports or recreational facilities may provide an opportunity for local authorities to remedy deficiencies in provision. For example, where a local authority has identified a surplus in one type of open space or sports or recreational facility but a deficit in another type, planning conditions or obligations may be used to secure part of the development site for the type of open space or sports and recreational facility that is in deficit.**
- 2.6 With specific reference to playing fields as used in the guidance (a field is defined as containing one or more pitches), development may be permitted in certain circumstances, for example if it is not detrimental to the current condition of the pitch or the loss of a pitch will result in replacement locations being allocated.

- 2.7 Where necessary, the quality of existing recreational facilities should be improved through investment and suitable management to encourage greater utilisation of these areas. Initiatives such as improving the accessibility of identified sites may encourage better use of the facilities available to a specific population.
- 2.8 Further to this, much emphasis in the guidance is on providing good accessibility to open spaces, and sport and recreational areas, particularly when allocating new areas for these functions. Other factors, which are inline with the government's overarching objectives that should be considered, include encouraging the use of brownfield sites, siting these desirable facilities on town centre peripheries or within commercial and industrial areas, and strictly controlling development of green belt land where necessary.
- 2.9 PPG17 is supplemented by a companion document, which further expands the guidance for the management of green spaces. In addition, it identifies numerous factors affecting the provision of playing pitches, which should be taken into consideration, such as:
- The age and social structure of the community
  - The distribution and density of residents
  - Local promotion of sports development and community involvement
  - The ownership of sites which will affect the level of community access to facilities
- 2.10 The provision of new open spaces, sports and recreational facilities should be proportional to the increase of proposed housing developments, or access and the quality of existing facilities should be improved, in order to meet the needs of the increased population as stated in PPG17. As a result of future population projections, however, the District of Rochford has been allocated 3,800 additional dwellings to be provided between 2011 and 2026 which is likely to result in an increase in demand for sport facilities. Policies within the Local Development Framework will be needed to ensure that the requisite open space and sports and recreational facilities accompany new development.
- 2.11 Guidance on the issue of housing development is outlined in PPS3 (Housing). The majority of Rochford District that has not yet been developed for employment or housing is within the Metropolitan Green Belt, however, bringing about the contentious issue of expanding settlement boundaries or developing greener areas. In light of future housing needs in the District, there will undoubtedly be increased pressure to develop areas of existing open space. Such proposals will need to be critically analysed in accordance with the guidance in PPG17 and PPS3, regional and local policies, and the conclusions drawn from this Playing Pitch Strategy.

### Department for Culture, Media and Sport – A Sporting Future for All

- 2.12 Additional Government policy on sport is predominantly conveyed through the Department for Culture, Media and Sport. In the document **A Sporting Future for All**<sup>9</sup>, as implied by the title, the focus is on initiatives to improve the equality in people's access to sport, with particular emphasis on improving school sports facilities and encouraging individuals to continue to participate in sport after education.

---

<sup>9</sup> 'A Sporting Future For All', Department for Culture, Media and Sport. (April 2000).

2.13 Other important elements highlighted include:

- Improved coordination between groups involved in sports provision.
- Developing a proactive approach to tackle issues such as social exclusion of certain groups within sports, where identified.
- The importance of improving access to recreational facilities.
- Guidance providing protection for playing fields and pitches will continue to be revised and strengthened to prevent unnecessary loss and/or degradation.

2.14 The Government has succeeded, for example, in significantly curbing the degradation of playing pitches due to development since this guidance was published in 2000. Recent figures<sup>10</sup> show that only 3% of the “1216 concluded planning applications affecting playing fields in 2005-06” had a detrimental impact.

2.15 Other initiatives have included the establishment of school sports co-ordinators<sup>11</sup> and improving the communication between school and community sports clubs, which have altered the demand and use of playing pitches.

### **Department of Children, Schools and Families – The Protection of School Playing Fields and Land for Academies**

2.16 The protection of school playing fields are discussed in-depth in documents published by the Department of Children, Schools and Families (formerly the Department for Education and Employment). This latest document<sup>12</sup> replaces Guidance 0580/2001 (which superseded Circular 3/99) on school playing fields.

2.17 The document refers to:

- Section 77 of the School Standards and Framework Act 1998, which ‘protects school playing fields used by maintained schools in the last ten years’; and
- Schedule 35A to the Education Act 1996 (as amended by Schedule 7 to the Education Act 2002), which ‘protects land, including playing fields, used by community or county schools within eight years of the date of disposal where that land is needed for an Academy’.

2.18 The guidance clearly identifies when the Secretary of State needs to be consulted in respect to the ‘disposal, or change of use, of school playing fields’.

---

<sup>10</sup> [www.sportengland.org/news/press\\_releases/playing\\_field\\_safeguards\\_secure\\_a\\_better\\_deal\\_for\\_sport.htm](http://www.sportengland.org/news/press_releases/playing_field_safeguards_secure_a_better_deal_for_sport.htm)

<sup>11</sup> [www.sportdevelopment.org.uk/sscomakingadifference2002.pdf](http://www.sportdevelopment.org.uk/sscomakingadifference2002.pdf)

<sup>12</sup> ‘The Protection of School Playing Fields and Land for Academies’. Department of Children, Schools and Families (November 2004).

**Sport England – Planning Policies for Sport: A land use planning policy statement on behalf of sport**

2.19 This document outlines the role of Sport England with respect to playing fields.

**Fields in Trust – Planning and Design for Outdoor Sport and Play**

2.20 The **Planning and Design for Outdoor Sport and Play** supersedes ‘The Six Acre Standard’ which was published by the National Playing Fields Association and indicates the amount of open sport and play space which should be available for every 1,000 of the population, providing a benchmark for local authorities. The guidance recommends Benchmark Standards to planning authorities to use as a tool for assisting in the development of local standards.

**Figure 2.1 – Benchmark Standard recommendations for Playing Pitches**

**Quantity – Playing Pitches**

Type of Local Authority	Benchmark Standard (hectares per 1000 population)
Urban	1.15
Rural	1.72
Overall	1.20

2.21 Taking into account the national standards set out on the above in addition to the findings of the Open Space Study, the local provision standard for outdoor sports facilities is recommended to be 1.8 hectares per 1000.

2.22 The PPM model toolkit provided by Sports England has been used in this document for all the calculations with regard to quantitative standard, and is explained in detail later in this document.

**Local Planning Policy**

**Core Strategy**

2.23 Local policy recognises the importance of playing pitches as areas of formal open space which are significant for community well-being. The Core Strategy welcomes playing pitches outside of the Green Belt, as this will often provide facilities in more accessible locations, particularly if pitches are accompanying other visitor-generating activities.

2.24 The creation of playing pitches is recognised as an appropriate form of development within Green Belt land, and the Council seeks to protect and promote the playing pitches by taking a positive approach, as stated in the Core Strategy.

### Chapter 3 – Methodology

- 3.1 The Playing Pitch Methodology outlined in the Sport England guidance **Towards a Level Playing Field: a Guide to the Production of Playing Pitch Strategies** will be used as a guide to determine the current provision of playing pitches within the District. It will also aid decision-making, particularly with respect to increasing housing allocations, population growth and changing pitch demand.
- 3.2 The methodology provides a sound universal benchmark to which all local authorities can be measured against.
- 3.3 A successful methodology and Strategy relies upon the accuracy of the information used. Full and reliable data of the football, rugby, hockey and cricket clubs playing on pitches within the District was collected through liaising with different council departments, consulting governing bodies, examining league handbooks and distributing questionnaires to community clubs and schools.
- 3.4 An important aspect of the assessment is to determine the level of secured community use, which refers to the amount of access the community has to the use of a playing pitch.

#### Defining a Team

- 3.5 Teams, as defined within Sport England guidance, are used to determine the level of demand for playing pitches. Teams for each sport were identified, along with 'team equivalents', for example junior teams converted into an adult equivalent, to provide a standard baseline.

#### Sports Included

- 3.6 This assessment has taken into consideration the wide variety of team games which may be played on a playing pitch, as defined above, such as football, cricket, rugby, hockley rounders, baseball and lacrosse. The predominant sports, however, which form the majority of team participation in Rochford District, are the focus of this study. These include association football (from hereon referred to as 'football'), rugby union (from hereon referred to as 'rugby'), cricket and hockey. Other pitch sports i.e. rounders and baseball which are not popular and have no sport club set up or playing within the District will not be included in the study this time.

#### Study Area and Sub-Areas


- 3.7 The whole of the Rochford District is the study area for this assessment. As required by Sport England, however, in assessing current playing pitch provision and demand, the study has endeavoured to identify local District teams which may, for a variety of reasons, play home games outside the District's boundaries.
- 3.8 The District is divided and analysed according to five distinct sub-areas, as set out in Table 3.1 below, due to their differing geographical characteristics and population structures.

**Table 3.1 – The clusters of wards in the Rochford District which make up the five sub-areas**

Sub-Areas	Wards Included
Rayleigh	Downhall & Rawreth, Sweyne Park, Grange, Wheatley, Rayleigh Central, Lodge, Whitehouse, Trinity
Hockley	Hockley North, Hockley West, Hockley Central, Hawkwell North, Hawkwell South, Hawkwell West
Rochford	Rochford, Ashingdon & Canewdon
Great Wakering	Barling & Sutton, Foulness & Great Wakering
Hullbridge	Hullbridge

3.9 The geographical extent of each sub-area is shown in the figure below.


**Figure 3.1 – The five identified sub-areas in the Rochford District**



### The Playing Pitch Model

3.10 The eight-stage model has been used to determine the level of supply and demand for playing pitches within Rochford District. The first six stages quantify the findings of the questionnaires and the last two stages aim to develop conclusions and appropriate policy options for managing future demand.

Figure 3.2 – The eight stages of the Playing Pitch Model



### Our Approach

- 3.11 A comprehensive list of clubs for football, rugby, cricket and hockey clubs playing in the District was predominantly compiled through the use of the Essex County Football Association's league handbook, sports association websites such as the FA, league websites and information from relevant departments.
- 3.12 All primary and secondary schools within the District were included as part of the playing pitches review as current or potential providers of pitches for community use.

- 3.13 Questionnaires (which can be viewed in Appendix C and D) were sent out to club secretaries and schools based on the information gathered, to obtain relevant information such as home pitches to accurately complete the Playing Pitch Model and to determine the balance between supply and demand within the District. Further information was obtained, where necessary, using league websites, club websites and third party websites to determine the league in which teams are playing, and when they are playing their home games.

### Response Rate

- 3.14 The table below summarises the response rate from the sports clubs and schools consulted as part of the Playing Pitch Strategy.

**Table 3.2 – Sample sizes and response rate by different sports club**

Respondent	Number of questionnaires sent	Number of questionnaires received	Response Rate
Football Club	97	37	38.1%
Cricket Club	9	2	22.2%
Rugby Club	2	0	0
Hockey Club	1	1	100%
Schools/Colleges	29	16	55.17%

## Chapter 4 – Supply and Demand for Pitches

### Supply: playing pitch provision in Rochford District

4.1 Using both desktop review (including information drawn from Active Places, Essex County Football Association Handbook and fixtures on different sports league websites) and the results from the questionnaire, 85 playing pitches were identified in the District. This figure includes all known public, private, school and other pitches whether or not they are in secured public use.


These comprise of:

- 54 adult football pitches
- Four junior football pitches
- 17 mini-soccer pitches
- Seven cricket pitches
- Two adult rugby union pitches
- One grass hockey pitch

### Quality

- 4.2 In order to provide a balanced and informative evaluation of playing pitches within the District, a qualitative element is included within the strategy to counteract the predominant quantitative leanings, and aid effective decision-making.
- 4.3 As suggested within the Sport England guidance, a qualitative aspect was included within the questionnaire to assemble both providers and users views of playing pitches within Rochford District.
- 4.4 In addition, on-site pitch quality assessment was carried as part of the Open Space Study (2010). They have been rated according to their quality ranging from 'very poor' to 'very good' condition based on quality definitions which can be found in Appendix F and Appendix G of the Study. These results should be read in conjunction with the findings from the questionnaire survey.
- 4.5 Figure 4.1 shows the perception of the quality of the football pitches within the District according to participants who responded to the questionnaire.

Figure 4.1 – Perceived Quality of Football Pitches in the Rochford District



4.6 Perceived quality of pitches (and ancillary facilities) is almost as important as actual quality as it can heavily influence the pattern of play. Perceived quality of pitches was examined primarily from a user’s perspective. Questionnaires were sent out to all sports clubs and schools in Rochford District which asked for their perceptions of pitch quality. Comments and figures discussed below are therefore based primarily on the returned questionnaires only.

4.7 In general, there are relatively high levels of satisfaction with football pitches and ancillary facilities amongst users within the District.

4.8 Over 85% respondents felt that the overall quality of the pitches were average or better.

4.9 The highest rated quality factors of pitches were free from litter, dog fouling etc, firmness of surfaces and grip underfoot.

4.10 However, about one third of the respondents indicated that the evenness of the playing pitches and parking provision are poor.

4.11 Another relatively high level of dissatisfaction was value for money, 16% of the respondents rated this aspect as poor.

4.12 In terms of other sports, no questionnaire response was received from any rugby clubs; only one questionnaire has been received from a hockey club, and responses from two cricket clubs.

4.13 Due to the poor response rate and the small sample size, the perceived quality of rugby, hockey and cricket pitches will not be recorded in the assessment.

### Pitches secured for community use

4.14 It is important that playing pitches are available for community use. The following categorisation as defined by Sport England seeks to indicate which pitches should, and should not, be included within this assessment. A list of the playing pitch provision can be found in Appendix A of this document.

4.15 Secured community pitches can be defined and categorised as:

- pitches in local authority or other public ownership or management – A(i)
- pitches in the voluntary, private or commercial sector which are open to members of the public – A(ii)
- pitches at education sites which are available for use by the public through formal community use arrangements – A(iii)

4.16 Pitches which are used by the community, but are not secured for use include school/college pitches without formal user agreements (Category B).

4.17 Pitches located at establishments which are not, as a matter of policy or practice, available for hire by the public, are not open for public use (Category C).

4.18 Table 4.1 shows the quantity of outdoor playing fields within the District which are available for community use.

4.19 Of the 37 playing fields identified, 32 (86.49%) of them are secured for the local community use (Category A). This percentage is extremely high in comparison to some other authorities (see Table 4.2 below) from which data is available.

**Table 4.1 – Categories of Outdoor Playing Fields**

	A(i)	A(ii)	A(iii)	B	Total
Football	14	7	3	3	27
Cricket	2	4	0	1	7
Rugby	0	2	0	0	2
Hockey	0	0	0	1	1

**Table 4.2 – Pitches with secured community use<sup>13</sup>**

Local Authority	% of pitches secured for community use
Rochford District Council	86.49%
Ipswich Borough Council	84%
Maidstone Borough Council	61%
Chelmsford Borough Council	61%
Canterbury City Council	50%
St Albans City and District Council	49%

<sup>13</sup> This data was obtained from the Playing Pitch Strategies of Chelmsford Borough Council and Darlington Borough Council published in 2005 and 2009 respectively.

### Demand: sport clubs in Rochford District

- 4.20 The assessment looked at the supply of the playing pitches which are available for community use from the last section. However, even there is a high supply of playing pitches, there could still be shortfall for pitches if the demand is high.
- 4.21 In this section, the demand for playing pitches in the District is assessed using responses received from the questionnaires, in conjunction with the Playing Pitch Model (PPM).
- 4.22 The PPM is a tool recommended by Sport England as a numerical model that is used to:
- Analyse the local current situation using survey data on existing teams and pitches.
  - Determine whether the current level of provision is adequate to meet the current level of demand as identified.
  - Predict future requirements for pitches by incorporating projected changes in population levels derived from the local demographic profile for the area and the most recent Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (previously known as Urban Capacity Study). In addition, it allows for any growth in participation that may arise as a consequence of known or anticipated local sports development activity.
- 4.23 Whilst the current population data was based on the 2001 census, the future active population was derived from the 2006-based subnational population projections.

### Current Demand – an overview

- 4.24 The numbers of football, cricket, rugby and hockey teams (in real terms) playing on pitches in Rochford District in 2008/09 are identified in the table below.

**Table 4.3 – Sports clubs using playing pitches in Rochford District**

Sports	Number of clubs	Number of teams
Football	83 <sup>14</sup>	199 <sup>15</sup>
Cricket	9	34
Rugby union	2	21
Hockey	1	1

- 4.25 When assessing the demand, team generation rates (TGRs) was used as one of the indicators.
- 4.26 TGRs indicate how many people in a specified age group are required to generate one team. TGRs are derived by dividing the appropriate population age band for the relevant sport (e.g. for adult football it is the 16-45 age group) by the number of teams playing that sport. Calculating TGRs enables fair comparison to be made between different areas where similar studies have been undertaken.

---

<sup>14</sup> This number represents the clubs that have teams playing in this season (2008-2009). Virtual teams are not included in the calculation.

<sup>15</sup> Mini soccer is not included in this number.

- 4.27 The TGR calculator provided in the Sport England electronic toolkit has been used to work out the TGR of the pitch sports. Results are demonstrated in Table 4.4 – 4.7 below.
- 4.28 The following examples help clarify what TGR mean:

**Figure 4.2 – What are Team Generation Rates**

TGR calculations				
<b>TGR = population in age group ÷ number of teams relevant to that age group</b>				
Example:				
<b>If an average TGR for a particular sport is 1:500 then</b>				
1:100	➔	high TGR	➔	relatively low latent (unmet)
1:1000	➔	low TGR	➔	relatively high latent (unmet) demand

**Football**

- 4.29 When compared to other local authorities and the national average, the figures in Table 4.3 shows that the latent demand in the Rochford District for mini and adult football are relatively low. Team Generation Rates from other councils which have completed a Playing Pitch Strategy can be found in Appendix E as a point of comparison.
- 4.30 In contrast, there is a relatively high demand for junior football, especially for junior female teams.

**Table 4.4 – A Comparison of Football Team Generation Rates**

Age Group	Rochford TGR	Chelmsford TGR	Peterborough TGR	National Average
Mini Soccer	<b>1:55</b>	1:141	1:117	1:431
Senior male	<b>1:42</b>	1:248	1:269	1:452
Senior female	<b>1:1006</b>	1:33,136	-	1:19647
Junior male	<b>1:119</b>	1:57	1:103	1:195
Junior female	<b>1:4936</b>	1:905	-	1:4038
Totals for football (excluding mini)	<b>1:178</b>	1:316	-	-

**Cricket**

- 4.31 There are no women and girls cricket teams in the District. Table 4.5 shows that the latent demand for men and boys are relatively low when comparing to the national average.

**Table 4.5 – A Comparison of Cricket Team Generation Rates**

Age Group	Rochford TGR	National Average TGR
Senior male	<b>1:873</b>	1:1415
Senior female	<b>0</b>	1:54815
Junior male	<b>1:286</b>	1:1481
Junior female	<b>0</b>	1:21052
Totals for Cricket	<b>1:1347</b>	

## Rugby

4.32 Table 4.6 illustrates that the latent demand for rugby in the District is fairly low.

**Table 4.6 – A Comparison of Rugby Team Generation Rates**

Age Group	Rochford TGR	National Average TGR
Mini – mixed team	1:509	1:2639
Senior male	1:1515	1:7032
Senior female	0	1:43770
Junior male	1:243	1:2105
Junior female	1:452	1:19524
Totals for Rugby (excluding mini)	1:1470	-

## Hockey

4.33 There is only one hockey team in Rochford District and the TGR is much higher than the national average.

4.34 This indicates that the adult participation in hockey in Rochford District is conspicuously above the national average. In other words, there seems to be latent demand for hockey in the District.

**Table 4.7 – A Comparison of Hockey Team Generation Rates**

Age Group	Rochford TGR	National Average TGR
Senior male	1:14638	1:7944
Senior female	0	1:8943
Junior male	0	1:4304
Junior female	0	1:5229
Totals for Hockey	1:33389	-

4.35 Supply and demand analysis is determined throughout the Playing Pitch Strategy at peak time usage. The PPM below summarises the surplus/deficit of pitches for each sports. Full details of the current and future PPM are included in Appendix F and G.

4.36 As shown in Table 4.8, the major issues arising from the PPM (current) are shortage of mini football pitches on Sunday AM and junior football pitches on both Sunday AM and Sunday PM.

4.37 Other sports list in the Current PPM table i.e. cricket, rugby and hockey, have demonstrated a surplus of playing pitches in the District.

4.38 Despite a surplus being identified for cricket, rugby and hockey in general terms, shortage of pitches for cricket and rugby are noted in some areas at the a more localised level.


Table 4.8 – Current PPM calculations for the District (2008/09)

		Mini-soccer		Football	Cricket	Rugby Union	Hockey
Stage 1: Number of teams		74	Adult teams	126	22	9	1
			Junior teams	73	12	12	0
Stage 2: Calculating home games per team per week		0.33	Adult teams	0.2	0.5	0.5	0.5
			Junior teams	0.2	0.4	0.3	0
Stage 3: (S1XS2) Assessing total home games per week		24	Adult teams	30	9.9	4.5	0.5
			Junior teams	15	4.3	4.3	0
Stage 4: Establishing temporal demand for games	Saturday AM	0%	Adult teams	0%	0%	0%	0%
			Junior teams	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Saturday PM	0%	Adult teams	38%	72%	100%	33%
			Junior teams	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Sunday AM	100%	Adult teams	52%	0%	0%	0%
			Junior teams	31%	83%	83%	0%
	Sunday PM	0%	Adult teams	10%	18%	0%	0%
			Junior teams	69%	0%	17%	0%
	Mid week 1	0%	Adult teams	0%	5%	0%	67%
			Junior teams	0%	17%	0%	0%
	Mid week 2	0%	Adult teams	0%	0%	5%	0%
			Junior teams	0%	0%	0%	0%
Stage 5: (S3XS4) Defining pitches used/required on each day	Saturday AM	0.0	Adult teams	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
			Junior teams	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Saturday PM	0.0	Adult teams	11.5	7.1	4.5	0.1
			Junior teams	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Sunday AM	24.4	Adult teams	15.7	0.0	0.0	0.0
			Junior teams	4.8	3.6	2.9	0.0
	Sunday PM	0.0	Adult teams	3.0	1.8	0.0	0.0
			Junior teams	10.6	0.0	0.6	0.0
	Mid week 1	0.0	Adult teams	0	0.4	0.0	0.3
			Junior teams	0	0.7	0.0	0.0
	Mid week 2	0.0	Adult teams	0	0.4	0.0	0.0
			Junior teams	0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Stage 6: Establishing pitches available		12	Adult teams	58	8	7	1
			Junior teams	2		3	
Stage 7: (S6-S5) Shortfall or surplus	Saturday AM	12.0	Adult teams	58.0	8.0	7.0	1
			Junior teams	2.0	8.0	3.0	1.0
	Saturday PM	12.0	Adult teams	46.5	0.9	2.5	1.0
			Junior teams	2.0	8.0	3.0	1.9
	Sunday AM	-12.4	Adult teams	42.3	8.0	7.0	1.0
			Junior teams	-2.8	4.4	0.1	1.0
	Sunday PM	12.0	Adult teams	55.0	6.2	7.0	1.0
			Junior teams	-8.6	8.0	2.4	1.0
	Mid week 1	12.0	Adult teams	58.0	7.6	7.0	0.7
			Junior teams	2.0	7.3	3.0	1.0
	Mid week 2	12.0	Adult teams	58.30	7.6	7.0	1.0
			Junior teams	2.0	8.0	3.0	1.0

Future Demand

4.39 The population in the District is projected to increase to 89800 by 2021, and the demand for playing pitches would also increase. Figure 4.3 shows the projected changes in the District’s population over time by age, this shows a breakdown of the active age groups in the District up to 2029.

Figure 4.3 – Projected changes in the District’s population over time by age



4.40 The PPM calculations in Table 4.9 estimate the future demand for the playing pitches in the District.

Table 4.9 – Future PPM calculations for the District (2021/22)

		Mini-soccer	Football	Cricket	Rugby Union	Hockey	
Stage 7: (S6-S5) Shortfall or surplus	Saturday AM	12.0	Adult teams	58.0	8.0	7.0	1.0
			Junior teams	2.0	8.0	3.0	1.0
	Saturday PM	12.0	Adult teams	32.7	-3.9	-9.8	0.8
			Junior teams	2.0	8.0	3.0	1.0
	Sunday AM	-35.4	Adult teams	23.4	8.0	7.0	1.0
			Junior teams	-16.1	-3.0	-5.1	1.0
	Sunday PM	12.0	Adult teams	51.3	5.0	7.0	1.0
			Junior teams	-38.2	8.0	1.3	1.0
	Mid week 1	12.0	Adult teams	58.0	7.3	7.0	0.6
			Junior teams	2.0	5.8	3.0	1.0
	Mid week 2	12.0	Adult teams	58.0	7.3	7.0	1.0
			Junior teams	2.0	8.0	3.0	1.0

- 4.41 The shortage for mini and junior football pitches will continue and become more significant – a deficit of 35 pitches (Sunday AM) for mini teams and a deficit of 16 pitches (Sunday AM) and 38 pitches (Sunday PM) for junior teams.
- 4.42 Notwithstanding this, there is a significant surplus of adult football pitches during the mini and junior football peak time on Sunday. Although a surplus is required to allow for resting, renovation, development and increase in demand, this significant surplus reflects that there may be potential for some of the adult pitches to be redesignated as mini/ junior pitches to ease the pressure on these pitches.
- 4.43 The future demand for cricket and rugby pitches will also be in deficit on Saturdays PM and Sundays AM.
- 4.44 Cricket will have a deficit of about four adult pitches on Saturdays PM and three junior pitches short on Sundays AM.
- 4.45 When shortages will occur in both pitches for adult and junior cricket, it would be very difficult to ease the demand without providing new pitches.
- 4.46 Future demand for rugby is slightly higher than that for cricket. There will be a deficit of about 10 adult pitches and five junior pitches on Saturdays PM and Sundays AM, respectively.
- 4.47 No shortage in future demand for Hockey is recorded.
- 4.48 Further issues regarding quality, accessibility and recommendation will be discussed in more detail in the next chapter.

### Chapter 5 – Findings for Sub-areas

- 5.1 This chapter considers qualitative findings at the sub-area level.
- 5.2 Qualitative findings are based primarily on the comments made through the questionnaire-based survey, but are not limited to matters raised through this. Four general areas will be scrutinized:
- (1) Quality of the playing pitches and ancillary facilities;
  - (2) Availability and bookings;
  - (3) Accessibility, and
  - (4) Access to other outdoor sports facilities.
- 5.3 As suggested in the Sports England guidance, it is important to look at the whole picture in terms of what outdoor sports facilities the District provides. Formal sport is just one use of open space, an integrated approach should be adopted to reflect the formal requirements for playing pitches into other informal uses of open space.
- 5.4 Participation in sports that are regarded as informal uses include bowling greens, tennis courts yacht clubs, etc, has social and health benefits. Other open spaces such as children's play areas, kick-about areas and allotments are also some important assets of the District which should not be neglected.
- 5.5 Where issues have been identified within each section of this chapter, recommendation to remedy these issues are presented in the next chapter.

#### Findings for the Rayleigh Sub-Area

- 5.6 12 questionnaire responses have been received from the clubs based in Rayleigh. Comments were received from four football clubs and one cricket club.
- 5.7 In terms of football, two comments received were related to the quality of the playing pitches and ancillary facilities and another one raised an issue about the management methods of a pitch.
- 5.8 For cricket, although it shows from the current PPM (Table 4.7) that there was no deficit in 2008/09 in general, there was a shortage of 1.2 adult pitches and 0.7 junior pitches on Saturdays PM and Sundays AM respectively in Rayleigh.
- 5.9 The only cricket club that responded to the questionnaire suggested provision of a new cricket pitch for Rayleigh.

#### Quality of the playing pitches and ancillary facilities

- 5.10 In question 17 of the questionnaire, we asked the clubs to fill in three of the best pitches they have played. Two clubs felt Fairview Playing Field in Rayleigh was one of the best three pitches they have played in 2008.

- 5.11 In contrast, four pitches in Rayleigh were selected more than once in response to question 18 “one of the three worst pitches you have played on this season”. Though Fairview Playing Field was selected twice as being one of the best, it was also selected four times as one of the three worst pitches clubs have played in 2008.
- 5.12 The other three pitches in Rayleigh which were selected by respondents as one of the worst include they had played on were: Vincent Valley Playing Fields on Trender Avenue (selected five times); Land off Rawreth Lane Playing Pitch (selected three times) and John Fisher Recreation Ground (selected twice).
- 5.13 A football team training in Rawreth Lane Playing Field pointed out the surface of the pitch is uneven; and some improvement work such as the erection of fences and the cutting back of the hedgerow could be carried out to avoid losing balls in the match/ training.
- 5.14 One football club commented in the questionnaire that their pitches are solely maintained by voluntary labour at the expense of the club.
- 5.15 Four football clubs believed that lack of appropriate local facilities (Q.10) was one of the problematic issues for them. Among those clubs who felt that this was the case, two were sited on John Fisher Recreation Ground, one was on Rawreth Lane Playing Field and another one on King George V Playing Field.
- 5.16 The cricket club that responded also felt that there was lack of appropriate local facilities for their 5<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> team. In addition, there was lack of voluntary assistance to back the positions in the club.

### Availability and bookings

- 5.17 Looking at the sub-area level, all of the undersupply for mini and junior football pitches have fallen on Sundays AM and both Sundays AM and PM, respectively; while there was a high number of surpluses on senior pitches on a Sunday.
- 5.18 Senior pitches to be redesignated as mini/junior pitches or to be used as mini pitches at peak time could help to ease the pressure on mini and junior pitches in the area.
- 5.19 To assess the adequacy of the current provision, one of the considerations would be how many of the clubs based within the District’s settlements train outside the area, and vice versa. If too many of the teams have to travel outside the settlement for their training, this may imply that they are experiencing difficulty to find a pitch within their locality.
- 5.20 In 2008/09, there were two clubs based in Rayleigh who had to travel outside the settlement for some of their training – training venues for the two clubs were located in Leigh-on-sea and Hockley.
- 5.21 Poor communication is another issue mentioned by a team playing at John Fisher playing field. They also believed that changes to maintenance and administration methods represented a step backward in terms of quality.


### Accessibility

- 5.22 No issues were raised from any clubs based in Rayleigh in relation to accessibility.


### Access to other outdoor sports facilities

5.23 An Open Space Study was published in January 2010. It consists of a full audit of all open space sites within the District. These included both formal and informal sports provision in the open space.

**Map 5.1 – Outdoor Sports Facilities Provision per Ward (Rayleigh)**



**Map 5.2 – Outdoor Sports Facilities Provision per Settlement Area (Rayleigh)**



- 5.24 Many of the open spaces identified in this assessment have a multifunctional use. According to the Open Space Study, there are 13 outdoor sports sites in the Rayleigh area. Within these are 10 football fields, and there are three cricket grounds, a tennis club and a golf range.
- 5.25 Although sports fields identified in the Open Space Study are different from those in the Playing Pitch Strategy, the graphical representations illustrate in the Open Space Study still provides a picture of the surplus/deficit of provision in the District.
- 5.26 Map 5.1 shows outdoor sports facilities provision per ward. Only provision in Downhall and Rawreth ward was in surplus. Five wards in the area were in deficit, and the Grange and Rayleigh Central wards have no provision within the wards, albeit these are two relatively small wards and having good connectivity to other wards in Rayleigh.
- 5.27 Map 5.2 indicates insufficient outdoor sports facilities in Rayleigh in general.

### Findings for the Hockley Sub-Area

5.28 Three football clubs from Hockley returned the questionnaire.

### Quality of the playing pitches and ancillary facilities

- 5.29 In 2008, Apex Playing Field in Hockley was selected four times in the questionnaire responses as one of “the three best pitches you have played on this season”.
- 5.30 Clements Hall Playing Field, however, was selected four times in the questionnaire as one of the three worst playing pitches in 2008.

### Availability and bookings

- 5.31 Looking at the local demand and supply level, all of the undersupply for mini and junior football pitches falls on Sundays AM and both AM and PM respectively; while there are a small number of surpluses on senior pitches on a Sunday.
- 5.32 For the three clubs that replied to the questionnaire, all three have to travel outside the settlement for some of their training sessions. Training took place on playing pitches in Rayleigh, Rochford and Ashingdon.
- 5.33 All the clubs replied to the questionnaire feel that lack of appropriate local facilities (Q.10) is one of the problematic issues for the club. This issue was also highlighted in the comment section of the questionnaire.
- 5.34 One football club claimed that Hockley/ Hawkwell teams do not have any Council owned mini soccer pitches to hire. The ones in Rayleigh and Great Wakering are occupied by other local clubs; and the one sited in Ashingdon has been removed. The number of members in their club could be increased if there were more mini pitches available.
- 5.35 It seemed that all mini football pitches for hire in Hockley are owned by the School. The possibility to open up some school playing field for public use will be looked at in next chapter. This would provide a better supply of the facilities in the settlement as well as the District as a whole.
- 5.36 Another club mentioned a similar issue that they have to turn away two senior teams as there are no pitches available for hire on a Sundays PM (as required by the local leagues).
- 5.37 One club based in Apex Playing Field had a planning application for development intended to improve the ancillary facilities on their home ground refused.
- 5.38 In general, teams in Hockley have to play outside the settlement regularly and although only three questionnaire responses were received, they reflect a noticeable deficient of the current provision during peak times. The potential needs for playing pitches in Hockley could be higher than identified using the TGR, where mini teams have not been included when assessing the demand.

### Accessibility


- 5.39 No comments have been received in relation to accessibility in Hockley.

### Access to other outdoor sports facilities


- 5.40 The Open Space Study identifies nine outdoor sports facilities in the Hockley area. There are five football fields, a tennis club, a rugby club, a bowling green and a golf range. Some of these open spaces identified in the Open Space Study have a multifunctional use.
- 5.41 Map 5.3 shows outdoor sports facilities provision per ward. Half of the provisions in wards in Hockley were in deficit, and the Hawkwell South ward has no outdoor sports provision within the ward.

5.42 Map 5.4 shows that there is a deficit of outdoor sports provision in Hockley as a settlement.

**Map 5.3 – Outdoor Sports Facilities Provision per Ward (Hockley)**



**Map 5.4 – Outdoor Sports Facilities Provision per Settlement Area (Hockley)**



### Findings for the Hullbridge Sub-Area

5.43 Three football clubs and one cricket club based in Hullbridge returned the questionnaire.

#### Quality of the playing pitches and ancillary facilities

- 5.44 Lack of appropriate local facilities such as floodlit and Astro turf pitches was the only issue raised by one of the football clubs.
- 5.45 Other football clubs believed that lack of funding (internal and external) is a problem and one club also suggested there is lack of assistance to support such a large facility.
- 5.46 One cricket team playing in Hullbridge Sports and Social Club requested an upgrade of facilities to the required level.

#### Availability and bookings

- 5.47 According to the Playing Pitch Model (PPM), only Hullbridge has no surplus or deficit on mini soccer pitches in 2008. However, like all other settlements, Hullbridge experiences a shortage in junior football pitches on Sundays AM and PM.
- 5.48 From the information received, none of the clubs in Hullbridge play outside the settlement.

#### Accessibility


5.49 No comments have been received in relation to accessibility in Hullbridge.

#### Access to other outdoor sports facilities


5.50 According to the Open Space Study, there are seven outdoor sports facilities in Hullbridge which include three football fields, three yacht clubs and a golf club.

- 5.51 The two maps below show the same boundary of Hullbridge as a ward and settlement. Hullbridge is one of the two settlement areas in the District showing a surplus in provision.

**Map 5.5 – Outdoor Sports Facilities Provision per Ward (Hullbridge)**



**Map 5.6 – Outdoor Sports Facilities Provision per Settlement Area (Hullbridge)**



### Findings for the Rochford Sub-Area

- 5.52 Ten questionnaires were received from nine football clubs and one hockey club in Rochford.

#### Quality of the playing pitches and ancillary facilities

- 5.53 Two football fields in Rochford were rated more than once as one of top three pitches in 2008 (Q.17). Ashingdon Recreation Ground was selected as one of the best three in five responses, while Rochford Recreation Ground at Doggetts Close, Stambidge was selected three times.
- 5.54 Notwithstanding this, Ashingdon Recreation Ground was also identified three times in response to the question “what are the three worst pitches you have played on this season”. This may indicate a variation in quality of pitches on the same field.
- 5.55 One football club located in Rayleigh but playing their home games in Rocheway has made a comment regarding the ancillary facilities. They pointed out that their main concern is a lack of storage space for match day equipment – managers have to hand over the equipment to each other every Saturday at training.
- 5.56 One football club playing in various locations in Rochford pointed out that the facilities and ground maintenance are poor: goal posts skewed and damaged, infrequent grass cutting, potholes not being fixed, etc. The club also believed that while the Council pass the responsibility to pitch providers, pitch providers pass the matter back to the Council. Moreover, there was lack of information on changeover of pitch providers. Further comments received are included in the Availability and Bookings section.
- 5.57 One women’s football team based in Ashingdon believed that facilities at pitches are limited and poor. Further comments received are addressed in the next section.

### Availability and bookings

- 5.58 At the local demand/supply level, all of the undersupply for mini and junior football pitches falls on Sundays AM and both AM and PM respectively; conversely there is a surplus on senior pitches on both Sundays AM and PM.
- 5.59 Some football clubs made comments with regard to availability and bookings. All shared the same viewpoint that there is very little information available as how and where pitches can be hired from and what is available. In addition, responses from football clubs have also shown that they consider pitches are expensive to hire.
- 5.60 Two third of the clubs who replied to the questionnaire has either put down 'none' or 'n/a' for their training venue; two put down any available open public space; and only one club was had outdoor training in the Rochford area. Another club who were based outside the District were having their indoor training sessions at King Edmunds School.
- 5.61 Two clubs that train outside the District are playing in Leigh-on-Sea and Basildon.
- 5.62 One of the respondents stated that the football club can only do a short season due to facilities being changed over to cricket, hence they cannot always fulfil home fixtures.
- 5.63 These responses received appear to imply a significant shortage of playing pitches in the Rochford area, several clubs do not have a regular dedicated training ground and are merely able to secure a pitch on the match day. The demand for pitches echoed that shown in the current PPM.
- 5.64 Despite the current PPM identifying a surplus of one hockey pitch, the hockey club claimed that there is a shortage of hockey pitches across the District.
- 5.65 As King Edmund School is the only hockey pitch provider in the District, it is important for the Council to encourage the sign up of a formal community use arrangement to secure the public use of the pitch.


### Accessibility

- 5.66 In Question 4 of the questionnaire, clubs put down which town the majority of their players reside, only half of the clubs based in Rochford stated considered their players are from Rochford/Ashingdon, whilst one believed the majority of their players live in Wickford/ Basildon.
- 5.67 One football club whose players are mainly from Southend notes that they would consider relocation to different premises only if there is an ideal opportunity and/or if there is any problem with leasehold ownership of the pitches.
- 5.68 Due to the high quality of pitches available in Rochford and the close proximity to other administration area i.e. Southend, there seemed to be an imbalance with teams situated within Rochford but playing elsewhere and teams outside the District but playing in Rochford.


### Access to other outdoor sports facilities

- 5.69 There is a good mixture of outdoor sports facilities in Rochford. The Open Space Study has identified 13 outdoor sports facilities in Rochford, Ashingdon and Canewdon, which are all classified as within the Rochford settlement area in the Playing Pitch Strategy. Among those, there are six football fields, two tennis clubs and golf clubs, a rugby club and a yacht club.
- 5.70 Map 5.7 indicates that there are sufficient outdoor sports facilities within the Ashingdon and Canewdon area.

**Map 5.7 – Outdoor Sports Facilities Provision per Ward (Rochford)**



**Map 5.8 – Outdoor Sports Facilities Provision per Settlement Area (Rochford)**



### Findings for the Great Wakering Sub-Area

- 5.71 Six questionnaires were received from football clubs based in Great Wakering.

#### Quality of the playing pitches and ancillary facilities

- 5.72 Cupids Country Club and Great Wakering Recreation Ground in Great Wakering were identified seven times and five times, respectively, as one of the top three pitches in 2008 by those football clubs who replied to the questionnaire.
- 5.73 A football club playing their home games in Cupids Country Club was very positive with the pitch as well as the facilities.
- 5.74 Another club playing in Cupids was pleased with the facilities in general but considered that costs for pitch hire was an issue for them.
- 5.75 The football club playing in Great Wakering Recreation Ground was positive about the management of the pitch, but was disappointed with the ancillary facilities e.g. goal nets, which were considered to be all extremely poor and have not been replaced for at least six seasons (before 2008). In addition, one football club stated that they were ineligible for promotion due to being unable to meet facility requirements set by the Football Association.

## Availability and bookings

- 5.76 Similar to all other settlements in the District, all of the undersupply for mini and junior football pitches falls on Sundays AM and both AM and PM, respectively; but there is a surplus of senior pitches on Sundays AM and PM.
- 5.77 Only three clubs answered the question relating to whether they travel outside the settlement for training sessions. All three clubs trained within the settlement. However only one club did all their training within Great Wakering while the other two clubs stated that they were also have some of their training sessions either outside the settlement area or outside the District, in Hockley and Leigh-on-Sea respectively.


## Accessibility

- 5.78 It was asked in the questionnaire where the majority of the team players reside. All the clubs that replied consider that their players are mainly from Southend, Rochford, Hockley, Rayleigh, with the exception of one club that stated their players mainly reside in Wickford and Basildon. None considered the majority of their players to be from Great Wakering however.
- 5.79 Like Rochford, there seemed to be an imbalance with teams situated within Great Wakering playing elsewhere.


## Access to other outdoor sports facilities

- 5.80 The Open Spaces Study has identified seven outdoor sports facilities in Great Wakering. There are three football pitches, a cricket pitch, a bowling green, a yacht club and a sailing club.
- 5.81 Map 5.9 shows that outdoor sports facilities provision in the Barling and Sutton ward is in deficit, while the Great Wakering and Foulness is in surplus. Map 5.10 shows that the outdoor sports facilities provision in the settlement is in deficit in general terms.

**Map 5.9 – Outdoor Sports Facilities Provision per Ward (Great Wakering)**



**Map 5.10 – Outdoor Sports Facilities Provision per Settlement Area (Great Wakering)**



### School Questionnaire Findings

- 5.82 As mentioned in Chapters 3 and 4, it is important to secure playing pitches for community use. Major pitch providers include local authority, voluntary and private sector and schools.
- 5.83 Schools are important potential pitch providers. All schools have at least one grass field, so if they were to open up some pitches for the community to use, this would undoubtedly ease the pressure for football pitches as well as other sports facilities in the District.
- 5.84 Of the schools that responded, only two confirmed that they have signed up for a formal community use arrangements.
- 5.85 Notwithstanding this, eight more schools have shown an interest and would consider opening up their pitch facilities for community use in the future.
- 5.86 A minimum of 12 football pitches (from mini to adult), four rugby pitches (junior and adult), four artificial wicket cricket pitches, two hockey pitches, two artificial turf pitches and 10 generic grass field can be secured for public use if a formal community use agreement is endorsed.

## Chapter 6 – Analysis and Recommendations

- 6.1 This section evaluates the major issues raised in the above sections and sets out some short and long term solutions to take into account in the decision making process.
- 6.2 At the time of the study, comments have been received from different sport clubs and schools through the questionnaire. A summary of these comments and findings from the previous chapters are grouped and listed in the three main categories below:

**Table 6.1 – Summary of comments/findings**

Main issue	Summary of comments/ findings
Issues in relation to deficiencies	 Poor provision in Rochford
	 Lack of pitches for 10.30 kick off as required by local leagues meant two teams had to be turned away
	 Cannot always fulfil home fixtures due to unavailable pitches
	 Lack of council owned mini soccer pitches in Hockley/Hawkwell – those in Rayleigh/Great Wakering are all used by local teams
	 Shortage of hockey pitches across the District
	 Shortage for mini and junior football pitches will continue. The major shortfall will be on Sunday.
	 The surplus in cricket and rugby pitches shown in the current PPM will turn into a small deficit in the future
	 Imbalance geographical spread – players reside on the western side of the District i.e. Rayleigh, Wickford, Basildon tend to find it difficult to obtain pitches in the local area, thus clubs travel further to the east i.e. Rochford, Great Wakering to use pitches.
Issues in relation to management	 Difficult to find adequate pitches and facilities
	 Lack of information as to where/how pitches can be hired/who from
	 Pitches are expensive
	 Lack of consultation/information on changeover of pitch providers
	 Encountered abusive grounds man
	 Poor communication
	 Changes to maintenance and administration methods are not an improvement
Issues in relation to facilities quality	 Facilities can be poor – toilets locked, grounds staff missing, wonky goal posts, infrequent grass cutting, pot holes
	 Limited facilities and poor quality
	 Hedges require cutting back as balls are lost at Rawreth Lane Playing Field
	 Goal nets are poor – some have not been changed for at least six seasons
	 Uneven playing surface at Rawreth Lane Playing Field
	 In order to move to higher level, certain criteria is received by League – there are no such facilities in Rochford Council pitches.

 Comments made by football club

 Comments made by hockey club

 Issue identified through consultation/study

- 6.3 A number of recommendations are proposed arising from the findings and comment of the assessment.
- 6.4 An Action Plan in Appendix H has been drawn up to address the issues identified above.

### Overcoming sport specific deficiencies and issues

- 6.5 Provide additional pitches to bring supply in line with demand would be the most straight forward solution. However, as this is not always feasible and may take a longer time to plan for and provide, some short to medium terms solutions are identified.
- 6.6 When assessing the future PPM in Chapter 4, it was found that there is currently an oversupply of adult football pitches and an undersupply of junior and mini football pitches, this trend will continue and there is projected to be major shortfall for pitches for Sunday use.
- 6.7 Since these major shortfalls are mainly occurring on a Sundays and on mini and junior soccer pitches, these identified deficits can be largely overcome either by securing community use at school sites and/or re-designation of adult pitches so that they can be used for junior and mini purposes.
- 6.8 Similarly, the surplus in cricket and rugby pitches shown in the current PPM is projected to turn into a small deficit by 2021. The small increase in pitch usage is projected to be on Sundays for both senior and junior teams. This may be resolved by securing community use pitches at school.
- 6.9 As suggested in the previous Playing Pitch Strategy, schools and the wider community tend to require access to sports pitches at different times of the week, there may be scope for better temporal management of school based pitches, *providing* that the pitches themselves are of sufficient quality to accommodate the extra use. The responses from the school questionnaire survey indicated a willingness on the part of some to co-operate with the Council in sports/facility development initiatives of mutual benefit. The development of the dual-use of school playing pitches has the potential to assist in meeting future demand for mini and junior football.
- 6.10 Communications with schools which have already opened or showing an interest in opening up their pitches for community use is crucial. The Council should be more proactive and encourage the education institutions to sign up a formal community use arrangement so that more pitches can be secured and made available for public use.
- 6.11 Another issue identified is the imbalance geographical spread. For pitch sports there is an acceptance that there will be a requirement for players to travel to games, however, it is identified in the survey that players reside on the western side of the District and beyond i.e. Rayleigh, Wickford, Basildon, but tend to travel to use the pitches in the east i.e. Rochford and Great Wakering. More than 50% of the teams playing in the analysis areas of Rochford and Great Wakering were from outside these areas.
- 6.12 When there is the opportunity for the Council to consider new provision for sport pitches, it is recommended that the types and locations for the pitches should be mini and junior football pitches, and on the western side of the District such as Rayleigh.

- 6.13 It is very important to note, during the preparation of this strategy, five new football pitches were opened in Priory Chase, Rayleigh in March, 2011, including three mini football and two junior pitches.
- 6.14 Although these new provisions have not been considered within the study, since the types and locations are as recommended, it is believed that these additional pitches would contribute to the provision in Rayleigh which is currently experiencing an undersupply of 5.3 mini football and 1.8 junior football on Sundays AM and PM.

### Overcoming issues in relation to management

- 6.15 The Council will continue to work closely with other partners to ensure the quality of the pitches within the District.
- 6.16 For those pitches that received negative feedback, there is a need to encourage the contractors/local pitch providers to adopt effective drainage, maintenance and management techniques.
- 6.17 Advice and information on appropriate grounds maintenance and management techniques will be provided and discussed if necessary.
- 6.18 As stated in the Core Strategy, the Council will take a positive approach to the provision of playing pitches i.e. the finished site will be level, free-draining and of a sufficient size to accommodate the proposed uses, as stipulated in Sport England guidance.
- 6.19 Some Councils have devolved the management of some pitch facilities to local sports clubs and Parish Councils, recognising the benefits that result from a greater sense of ownership among user groups; the possibility of this may need to be scrutinized in the future.
- 6.20 In terms of the dual use of school facilities, management issues inherent in formulating and managing can be obtained from **Educational facilities – management of community use** (Sport England, 1995)<sup>16</sup>, which advises on the opportunities to develop community use of school sports facilities, looks at the different management options and offers a practical checklist for managers.

### Overcoming issues in relation to facilities quality

- 6.21 Several issues were identified through the comments. To tackle these issues raised in relation to facilities quality, the Council should secure developer contributions<sup>17</sup> wherever possible to improve the quality of existing playing pitches or to provide additional facilities where possible.

---

<sup>16</sup> The guidance Educational facilities – management of community use can be obtained at [www.sportenglandpublications.org.uk](http://www.sportenglandpublications.org.uk)

<sup>17</sup> Information to assist in securing improved sport and recreation facilities can be obtained through the Planning contributions kitbag [www.sportengland.org/facilities\\_\\_planning/planning\\_tools\\_and\\_guidance/planning\\_kitbag.aspx](http://www.sportengland.org/facilities__planning/planning_tools_and_guidance/planning_kitbag.aspx)

- 6.22 Potential investment in floodlit synthetic turf pitches should also be looked at. The “all weather” pitch not only can be used throughout the year and later in the evenings without the need for rest and recovery periods, but is also suitable for various activities and multiple sports.
- 6.23 As part of the preparation of the London Southend Airport and Environs Joint Area Action Plan, it is understood that there is a possibility that Westcliff rugby club will need to relocate. If relocation were to take place, the two Councils (Rochford District and Southend Borough) should make sure the new rugby pitches and ancillary facilities are made to standard league requirements and on to a fit-for-purpose site.
- 6.24 In addition, it is important to bear in mind the principle suggested in the Core Strategy - **“Opportunities to accommodate playing pitches outside of the Green Belt are welcomed, as this will often provide facilities in more accessible locations, particularly if pitches are accompanying other visitor-generating activities”**.
- 6.25 The quality and facilities specification should also be applied to all other new playing pitches proposed in the future.

## Chapter 7 – Conclusions

- 7.1 The initial survey was carried out in the sports season of 2008/09 and therefore some improvements may have been carried out since. Wherever possible, changes made have been identified.
- 7.2 Despite the period of time lag between the receipt of the questionnaire and the completion of this study, the review and update of this document still provides sound information base and recommendations that the Council can use for decision making.
- 7.3 Recommendations set out in the Playing Pitch SPD should be consistent with the Core Strategy and be used in a practical manner in conjunction with other documents such as Open Space Study and the Play Strategy to aid decision making on planning applications.
- 7.4 In accordance with the PPM projection, the recommended playing pitch provision in the settlements (by 2021) is as follow:

**Table 7.1 – Recommended Playing Pitch Provision by 2021**

Sub-Areas	Required Playing Pitch Provision – available for community use (by 2021)				
	Rayleigh	Hockley	Rochford	Great Wakering	Hullbridge
Senior Football	-9	0	-11	-8	-5
Junior Football	15	11	5	4	3
Mini Soccer	16	10	4	4	2
Cricket	3	2	-2	0	0
Rugby	7	4	-1	2	1
Hockey	0	0	-1	0	0

- 7.5 Should there be any apparent changes in population i.e. proposal for major new development/ regeneration, the Benchmark Standard recommended in the **Open Space Study** should be considered.
- 7.6 The solutions/recommendations to tackle the issues identified in the three main categories are summarised as below.

Medium – Long term:

- Provide additional pitches to bring supply in line with demand
- When providing new provisions for football, they should mainly be mini and junior pitches, and focus should be on providing them on the western side of the District
- Roles and responsibilities to be reviewed and updated in the management contract
- Secure developer contributions wherever possible through planning obligations and/or community infrastructure levy

- Focus investment on floodlit synthetic turf pitches/ Artificial Grass Pitches
- Ensure any relocated pitches are made to standard league requirements and are on a fit-for-purpose site.

Short term:

- Encourage education institutions to sign up a formal community use arrangement for dual use of school facilities
- Redesignate adult pitches to mini/ junior pitches
- Continue to work closely with partners / open space contractors/ organisations to provide better service for the public

7.7 It is important that there is regular monitoring and review against the issues identified in the recommendations. Regular monitoring of key supply and demand data could extend the life of this Strategy. The Council will continue to constantly monitor issues raised by the sport clubs and update the issues identified in the action plan in a regular base.

Appendix A – Playing Pitch Provision in the District

Sub-Area	Site	Address	Category <sup>18</sup>	Senior Football	Junior Football	Mini Football	Cricket	Hockey	Rugby
Great Woking	Great Woking Cricket Ground	Great Woking Primary School, High Street, Great Woking	B				✓		
	Cupids Country Club	Cupids Corner, Great Woking	A(ii)	✓			✓		
	Burroughs Park	Little Woking Hall Lane, Great Woking	A(ii)	✓					
	Great Woking Recreation Ground <sup>19</sup>	High Street, Great Woking	A(i)	✓		✓			
Hockley	Apex Playing Field	Plumberow Avenue, Hockley	A(i)	✓		✓			
	Clements Hall Playing Field	Clements Hall Way, Hawkwell	A(ii)	✓					
	Clements Hall Cricket Ground	Clements Hall Way, Hawkwell	A(i)				✓		

<sup>18</sup> Categories of the playing fields listed in the table were logged as at 2008-09 record, more up-to-date info is available on [Active Places](#) website

<sup>19</sup> Great Woking Leisure Centre became unviable to run and was closed in October 2011. This site, which encompasses both the leisure centre and the playing field, may retain its existing public open space designation.

## Supplementary Planning Document – Playing Pitch Strategy 2011-2026

Sub-Area	Site	Address	Category <sup>18</sup>	Senior Football	Junior Football	Mini Football	Cricket	Hockey	Rugby
	Hockley Community Centre	Westminster Drive, Hockley	A(ii)	✓					
	Plumberow Primary School	Hamilton Gardens, Hockley	A(iii)		✓				
Hullbridge	Hullbridge Sports and Social Club	Lower Road, Hullbridge	A(i)	✓		✓			
	Riverside Infants/Junior School	Ferry Road Hullbridge	A(iii)	✓	✓				
	Hullbridge Playing Field	Pooles Lane, Hullbridge	A(i)	✓					
	Hullbridge Sports and Social Cricket Ground	Lower Road, Hullbridge	A(ii)				✓		
Rayleigh	St John Fisher Playing Field	Little Wheatley Chase, Rayleigh	A(i)	✓					
	Rayleigh Leisure Centre	Priory Chase, Rayleigh	A(ii)			✓			
	Rayleigh Cricket Club	Rawreth Lane, Rayleigh	A(ii)				✓		
	King George V Playing Field	Eastwood Road, Rayleigh	A(i)	✓					
	Fairview Playing Field	Victoria Road, Rayleigh	A(i)	✓					

## Supplementary Planning Document – Playing Pitch Strategy 2011-2026

Sub-Area	Site	Address	Category <sup>18</sup>	Senior Football	Junior Football	Mini Football	Cricket	Hockey	Rugby
	Grove Road Playing Field	Grove Road, Rayleigh	A(i)	✓	✓	✓			
	Down Hall Primary School	Brooklyn Drive, Rayleigh	B			✓			
	Rawreth Lane Playing Field	Rawreth Lane, Rayleigh	A(i)	✓					
	Rayleigh Sports & Social Club	London Road, Rayleigh	A(ii)	✓					
	Vincent Valley Playing Field	Trenders Avenue, Rayleigh	A(ii)	✓					
	St. Nicholas C of E Primary School	Priory Chase, Rayleigh	A(iii)		✓				
	Grove Wood Primary School	Grove Road, Rayleigh	B		✓	✓			
	The Sweyne Park School	Sir Walter Raleigh Drive, Rayleigh	B	✓			✓		✓
Rochford	Rochford Recreation Ground	Stambridge Road, Rochford	A(i)	✓					
	Castle Point and Rochford Adult Community College	Rocheway, Rochford	A(ii)	✓	✓	✓			

## Supplementary Planning Document – Playing Pitch Strategy 2011-2026

Sub-Area	Site	Address	Category <sup>18</sup>	Senior Football	Junior Football	Mini Football	Cricket	Hockey	Rugby
	Ashingdon Recreation Ground	Ashingdon Road, Rochford	A(i)	✓					
	Stambridge Memorial Ground	Stambridge Road, Rochford	A(i)	✓					
	Westcliff Rugby Club	Aviation Way, Southend	A(ii)						✓
	Rochford Hundred Rugby Club	Magnolia Road, Rochford	A(ii)						✓
	Broomhills Cricket Ground	Stambridge Mills, Rochford	A(ii)				✓		
	Cherry Orchard Way Playing Field	Cherry Orchard Way, Rochford	A(i)	✓					
	Canewdon Recreation Ground	Althorne Way, Canewdon	A(i)	✓					
	Canewdon Cricket Ground	Althorne Way, Canewdon	A(i)				✓		
	King Edmund School	Vaughan Close, Rochford	B	✓			✓	✓	✓

## Appendix B – Planning Applications Related to Playing Fields

Available from [http://www.sportengland.org/table\\_1.doc](http://www.sportengland.org/table_1.doc)

	2001/02		2002/03		2003/04		2004/05		2005/06	
	Total	%	Total	%	Total	%	Total	%	Total	%
Total Number of Applications	<b>985</b>		<b>1297</b>		<b>1413</b>		<b>1271</b>		<b>1306</b>	
Number of approved applications	695	71	807	62	959	68	910	72	986	75
Rejected or withdrawn	161	16	148	11	122	9	177	14	230	18
Applications yet to be decided	129	13	342	26	332	23	184	14	90	7
<b>Total</b>	<b>985</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>1297</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>1413</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>1271</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>1306</b>	<b>100</b>

Appendix C – Playing Pitch Questionnaire for the Sport Clubs



**A Playing Pitch Strategy for Rochford District**

\*Please refer to the back page of this questionnaire for guidance notes and attach additional pages if necessary\*

**Q1. Please state the full name of your sports club:**

**Q2. Which sport(s) does your club participate in?**

Football	<input type="checkbox"/>	Rugby League	<input type="checkbox"/>	Hockey	<input type="checkbox"/>	American Football	<input type="checkbox"/>
Cricket	<input type="checkbox"/>	Rugby Union	<input type="checkbox"/>	Lacrosse	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other(s):	<input style="width: 150px;" type="text"/>
							(Please state)

**Q3. How many members does your club have?**

	Junior (under 18)	Adult	Veteran (over 40)	Social/ non-playing
Male	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Female	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

**Q4. In which town/ village do the majority of your players reside?**

**Q5. Over the last 5 years has membership....**

Increased     Decreased     Remained static

**Q6. How many teams does your club have?**

	Mini	Junior (under 18)	Senior	Veteran (over 40)
Male	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Female	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Mixed	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

**Q7. Which leagues / competitions do your teams participate in? (If possible, please attach a fixture list)**

**Q8. Please give a contact name and telephone number for the above league/ competition organiser:**

**Q9. Does your club currently have a written development plan?**

Yes  (Please enclose a copy)  
 No

**Q10. Which of the following issues are currently problematic for your club? (Please tick all that apply)**

Lack of internal funding (subs/ fund-raising)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Lack of external funding (parish council, governing bodies etc)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Lack of appropriate local facilities	<input type="checkbox"/>
Access difficulties for members (cost, lack of public transport etc)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Lack of information about local facilities/ services	<input type="checkbox"/>
Poor/ No relationship with local clubs (facility usage/ exit routes etc)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Lack of voluntary assistance (committee members/ coaches etc)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Membership recruitment/ retention	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other (Please specify)	<input style="width: 150px;" type="text"/>

Q11. Please state the duration of your clubs season for 2008/2009:

Q12. Please complete the table below, listing the venue(s) that your club uses for home matches and training OR attach a timetable if available: (Example is shown in *italic*)

**MATCHDAY VENUES**

Name and address	Postcode	Facility details (size/ surface/ ancillary)	Hired/ leased/ owned	If hired/ leased, from who?	Days/ times when used
<i>Alton Recreation Ground, Kings Road, Alton</i>	<i>GU99 1AB</i>	<i>2 junior grass football pitch, with changing rooms</i>	<i>Leased</i>	<i>Alton Parish Council</i>	<i>Sunday 10-12am and Tuesday 6-7pm</i>
1					
2					
3					
4					
5					

**OUTDOOR TRAINING VENUES**

Name and address	Postcode	Facility details (size/ surface/ ancillary)	Hired/ leased/ owned	If hired/ leased, from who?	Days/ times when used
<i>Alton School, Queens Road, Alton</i>	<i>GU99 1CD</i>	<i>1 junior grass football pitch, no changing rooms</i>	<i>Hired</i>	<i>Alton School</i>	<i>Tuesday 6-7pm</i>
1					
2					
3					
4					
5					

**INDOOR TRAINING VENUES**

Name and address	Postcode	Facility details (size/ surface/ ancillary)	Hired/ leased/ owned	If hired/ leased, from who?	Days/ times when used
<i>Alton Leisure Centre, Prince Road, Alton</i>	<i>GU99 1EF</i>	<i>3 court sports hall, with changing</i>	<i>Hired</i>	<i>Alton Leisure Centre</i>	<i>Thursdays 8-10pm</i>
1					
2					
3					
4					
5					

Q13. Are the matchday pitches listed in Q9 your preferred location to play home matches?

Yes

No

If NO, please state your preferred location (site name and address)

Q14. How many matches do you play on your main pitch each season?

Q15. How many games were cancelled due to the pitch condition last season (excluding frozen pitches)?

Q16. Does your club train on your main match pitch?

Yes

No

If YES, for how many hours per week?

If NO, do you train on another grass pitch? If so, where:

**Q17. What are the three BEST pitches you have played on this season (home or away)? Please state site name and address:**

1	
2	
3	

**Q18. What are the three WORST pitches you have played on this season (home or away)? Please state site name and address:**

1	
2	
3	

**Q19. Please rate the following aspects of your main match pitch:**

	Good	Acceptable	Poor	N/A
Firmness of surface				
Grip underfoot				
Bounce of ball on pitch				
Evenness of pitch				
Length of grass				
Grass cover				
Posts and sockets				
Line markings				
Free from litter, dog fouling etc				
Changing facilities				
Showers - clean, hot, plenty of water				
Parking				
Value for money				
Overall quality of pitch				

**Q20. What future plans does your club have?**

Increase the number of members	<input type="checkbox"/>
Expand the range of facilities provided	<input type="checkbox"/>
Refurbish existing facilities	<input type="checkbox"/>
Relocation to different premises	<input type="checkbox"/>
None	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other - please state	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Q21. If you have any further comments or views concerning playing pitch provision in the Rochford District, please use the space provided below:**

Please return this questionnaire in the **FREEPOST** envelope provided,  
by no later than 7<sup>th</sup> July 2008.  
Should you have any queries regarding this questionnaire, please contact  
Natalie Hayward on 01702 318101 or Velda Wong on 01702 318002.

**Many thanks for your assistance.**

Appendix D – Playing Pitch Questionnaire for the School



**A Playing Pitch Strategy for Rochford District**

Q1. Please state the full name of your school:

Q2. How many pupils does your school have? Boys  Girls

Q3. What is the age range of pupils at your school?

Q4. Which of the following pitches does your school own? (Please state number)

Mini-soccer pitch	<input style="width: 50px; height: 25px;" type="text"/>	Cricket pitch (grass wicket)	<input style="width: 50px; height: 25px;" type="text"/>
Junior football pitch	<input style="width: 50px; height: 25px;" type="text"/>	Cricket pitch (artificial wicket)	<input style="width: 50px; height: 25px;" type="text"/>
Adult football pitch	<input style="width: 50px; height: 25px;" type="text"/>	Grass hockey pitch	<input style="width: 50px; height: 25px;" type="text"/>
Junior rugby pitch	<input style="width: 50px; height: 25px;" type="text"/>	Artificial turf pitch	<input style="width: 50px; height: 25px;" type="text"/>
Adult rugby pitch	<input style="width: 50px; height: 25px;" type="text"/>	Generic grass field	<input style="width: 50px; height: 25px;" type="text"/>

Q5. Which (if any) of the above pitches are used regularly by community sports teams?

Q6. If applicable, at what times and on what days are the above facilities used by community sports teams?

Q7. If applicable, please list the teams that use your pitches:

Q8. Does your school have any community use\*/dual-use agreement for use of your pitches? Yes  No

\* Pitches in Secured Community Use are pitches which are available for use by community teams and whose future use is secured for the following seasons by one or more of the following:

- A formal community use agreement
- A leasing / management arrangement between the School and LEA requiring the pitch(es) to be available to community teams
- A policy of community use minuted by the School or LEA, including tariff of charges, etc
- Minutes of the Board of School Governors allowing use of pitches by community teams; or
- Written commitment from the School to the current community team(s) using the pitch(es).

and, It is the intention of the School to maintain access for community teams to its pitch(es) at peak times (i.e. evenings, weekends and/or school holidays) for the next 2 or more years.

Q9. Would your school consider opening up your pitch facilities for community use in the future? Yes  No

Q10. Does your school use any additional pitches that you do not own? If so, please state the name and location of the pitches your school uses, the landowner, the sports played and the frequency of use:

Q11. Please rate the following aspects of the pitch(es) at your site:

	Good	Acceptable	Poor	N/A
Firmness of surface				
Grip underfoot				
Bounce of ball on pitch				
Evenness of pitch				
Length of grass				
Grass cover				
Posts and sockets				
Line markings				
Free from litter, dog fouling etc				
Changing facilities				
Showers - clean, hot, plenty of water				
Parking				
Value for money				
Overall quality of pitch				

Q12. Does your school have any future plans to develop or expand its sports facilities?

Yes  No

Q13. If YES, please give details:

Q14. If you have any further comments or views concerning playing pitch provision in the Rochford District, please use the space provided below:

Thank you for your participation. Please return this questionnaire in the FREEPOST envelope provided, by no later than 30<sup>th</sup> June 2008. Should you have any queries regarding this questionnaire, please contact Natalie Hayward on 01702 318101 or Velda Wong on 01702 318002.

**Many thanks for your assistance.**

Appendix E – Team Generation Rates for completed Playing Pitch Strategies

Available from [http://www.sportengland.org/kitbag\\_assessing\\_tgr\\_database.xls](http://www.sportengland.org/kitbag_assessing_tgr_database.xls)

Local Authority	Date	Family	Group	Cluster	Mini –Soccer 6-9yrs		Junior Boys 10-15yrs		Junior Girls 10-15yrs		Senior Women 16-45yrs		Senior Men 16-45 yrs	
					Teams per 1000 pop	Population per Team								
Bradford	3-Mar-2003	V	K	18	4.90	204	9.62	104	1.44	696	0.03	32364	2.69	372
Leeds	3-Mar-2003	III	G	11	2.56	390	8.06	124	0.55	1818	0.03	31112	2.17	460
Solihull	3-Mar-2003	IV	H	12	2.27	440	15.63	64	0.89	1123	0.05	18421	3.41	293
Rutand	1-Jan-2003	IV	H	13	0.99	1008	7.75	129	-	-	-	-	1.35	739
Melton	1-Jan-2003	IV	H	12	3.60	278	9.26	108	1.34	749	-	-	2.91	344
Charnwood	1-Jan-2003	IV	H	12	5.81	172	16.39	61	1.44	694	0.12	8062	3.05	328
Harborough	1-Jan-2003	IV	H	13	4.07	246	15.15	66	0.42	2397	0.14	7395	2.22	451
Hinckley & Bosworth	1-Jan-2003	IV	H	12	-	-	9.43	106	-	-	-	-	1.68	597
Oadby & Wigston	1-Jan-2003	IV	H	12	4.74	211	10.87	92	-	-	-	-	3.37	297
Boston Borough	1-Mar-2003	I	B	3	5.46	183	13.70	73	-	-	-	-	6.10	164
East Linsey	2-Mar-2003	I	B	2	4.15	241	11.11	90	-	-	-	-	2.27	441
Lincoln City	3-Mar-2003	III	G	11	4.00	250	14.49	69	-	-	-	-	4.59	218
North Kesteven	4-Mar-2003	I	A	1	10.00	100	22.22	45	-	-	-	-	4.00	250
South Holland	5-Mar-2003	I	B	2	6.67	150	18.18	55	-	-	-	-	2.26	442
South Kesteven	6-Mar-2003	IV	H	12	9.62	104	18.87	53	-	-	-	-	3.68	272

## Supplementary Planning Document – Playing Pitch Strategy 2011-2026

Local Authority	Date	Family	Group	Cluster	Mini –Soccer 6-9yrs		Junior Boys 10-15yrs		Junior Girls 10-15yrs		Senior Women 16-45yrs		Senior Men 16-45 yrs	
					Teams per 1000 pop	Population per Team								
West Lindsey	7-Mar-2003	I	B	2	5.35	187	17.24	58	-	-	-	-	4.44	225
Peterborough	8-Mar-2003	III	D	5	8.55	117	9.71	103	-	-	-	-	3.72	269
Walsall	9-Apr-2003	V	K	18	2.93	341	13.16	76	0.49	2050	0.06	16838	2.22	451
Derwentside	1-Oct-2002	V	J	17	1.68	596	9.43	106	-	-	-	-	3.19	313
Southampton	1-May-2003	III	G	11	3.01	332	2.14	468	-	-	-	-	1.83	545
Knowsley	1-Apr-2003	V	L	20	6.33	158	7.04	142	0.29	3432	-	-	1.90	527
Telford & Wrekin	1-May-2003	II	D	5	4.88	205	12.82	78	-	-	0.07	15373	3.18	314
Maidstone	1-May-2003	IV	H	12	-	-	21.74	46	1.00	1000	0.11	9246	2.26	442
Stoke	1-May-2003	V	J	15	4.27	234	12.20	82	0.31	3211	0.09	11472	2.40	416
Taunton Deane	1-May-2003	I	A	1	5.71	175	9.71	103	0.52	1934	-	-	4.00	250
Caradon	1-Jul-2003	III	F	10	2.71	369	6.21	161	-	-	-	-	2.67	375
Ashfield	1-Jul-2003	II	C	4	2.10	476	5.65	177	-	-	-	-	1.93	519
Bassetlaw	1-Jul-2003	II	C	4	2.57	389	5.46	183	-	-	-	-	1.26	791
Broxtowe	1-Jul-2003	II	E	7	2.69	372	7.35	136	1.03	975	-	-	1.45	688
Gedling	1-Jul-2003	II	E	7	5.43	184	15.15	66	3.06	327	0.13	7475	2.82	354
Mansfield	1-Jul-2003	V	J	16	5.52	181	9.09	110	0.51	1951	-	-	3.80	263
Newark	1-Jul-2003	II	C	4	9.71	103	7.94	126	0.72	1383	0.15	6762	2.86	350
Nottingham	1-Jul-2003	V	L	19	2.56	390	5.13	195	0.37	2670	0.03	31380	2.05	487
Rushcliffe	1-Jul-2003	IV	I	14	5.10	196	14.93	67	2.62	382	0.09	10609	3.16	316

## Supplementary Planning Document – Playing Pitch Strategy 2011-2026

Local Authority	Date	Family	Group	Cluster	Mini –Soccer 6-9yrs		Junior Boys 10-15yrs		Junior Girls 10-15yrs		Senior Women 16-45yrs		Senior Men 16-45 yrs	
					Teams per 1000 pop	Population per Team								
Blackburn & Darwin	Jul-03	V	K	18	-	-	10.00	100	1.74	574	0.14	7214	2.49	401
Rochdale	1-Aug-2003	V	K	18	8.77	114	9.43	106	0.34	2963	0.07	14226	2.93	341
Dover	1-Aug-2003	III	F	10	4.29	233	7.41	135	0.24	4117	0.10	9793	5.62	178
Reading	1-Oct-2003	II	D	6	3.24	309	7.94	126	0.20	4950	0.06	17252	2.01	497
Gt Yarmouth	30-Oct-2003	III	F	10	8.06	124	13.33	75	-	-	-	-	3.69	271
Birmingham City	1-Sep-2003	V	K	18	2.01	498	2.53	396	0.30	3368	0.03	30648	1.19	841
Hastings	1-Mar-2003	III	G	11	0.51	1977	0.49	2024	0.04	28300	0.05	21250	0.62	1604
Rushmoor	1-Apr-2003	II	D	6	0.21	4787	0.53	1895	0.03	30317	0.01	90952	0.65	1542
Medway	1-Jul-2003	II	D	5	1.36	736	21.74	46	-	-	-	-	5.10	196
Milton Keynes	1-Jun-2004	II	D	5	4.39	228	15.15	66	0.58	1718	0.07	14327	2.29	437
Dudley	3-Oct-2003	II	C	4	8.62	116	12.82	78	0.53	1887	0.05	20062	2.07	483
Hartlepool	1-Mar-2004	V	J	15	2.01	498	14.93	67	0.79	1260	-	-	4.27	234
Easington	1-Jan-2004	V	J	17	2.97	337	10.99	91	-	-	0.11	9467	4.59	218
North Northumberland	1-Aug-2003	I	B	3	31.25	32	10.53	95	-	-	0.22	4485	2.29	437
Gateshead	1-Mar-2003	V	L	19	6.33	158	6.99	143	-	-	-	-	3.41	293
Barnsley	1-Mar-2004	V	J	16	6.10	164	11.49	87	-	-	-	-	3.57	280
Oldham	1-Jan-2004	V	K	18	0.48	2084	7.81	128	0.11	9081	-	-	2.84	352

## Supplementary Planning Document – Playing Pitch Strategy 2011-2026

Local Authority	Date	Family	Group	Cluster	Mini –Soccer 6-9yrs		Junior Boys 10-15yrs		Junior Girls 10-15yrs		Senior Women 16-45yrs		Senior Men 16-45 yrs	
					Teams per 1000 pop	Population per Team								
Rotherham	1-Mar-2004	V	J	16	3.76	266	11.76	85	0.40	2475	0.04	25106	3.83	261
Shepway	1-Mar-2004	III	F	10	2.03	493	7.94	126	-	-	-	-	1.55	646
Hyndburn	1-Mar-2004	V	K	18	4.83	207	11.90	84	1.51	663	0.06	16448	2.29	437
Torbay	1-Mar-2003	III	F	10	3.82	262	5.85	171	0.25	4040	0.13	7739	2.11	474
Chelmsford		IV	H	13	7.09	141	17.54	57	1.10	905	0.03	33136	4.03	248
Lewes		III	F	9	6.06	165	4.78	209	3.88	258	0.25	4062	3.21	312
Halton		V	J	15	6.49	154	14.08	71	-	-	-	-	2.55	392
Northampton	1-Apr-2002				5.05	198	9.71	103	0.87	1148	0.07	14691	3.38	296
Canterbury	1-Sep-2003	III	F	9	5.65	177	9.17	109	0.18	5432	0.49	2029	4.33	231
Blackpool	1-Mar-2003	III	F	10	-	-	6.10	164	0.40	2524	0.11	8937	2.39	419
West Lancs	1-Oct-2003	II	E	7	25.00	40	22.22	45	0.23	4406	0.14	7236	3.25	308
Sedgemoor	1-Apr-2004	I	B	2	6.13	163	12.99	77	4.85	206	0.10	9767	2.67	375
Waltham Forest	1-Jan-2004	VI	M	23	4.00	250	5.13	195	1.64	609	0.11	9042	1.57	636
Test Valley		IV	H	13	2.30	435	16.39	61	0.65	1533	0.05	22069	3.83	261

Appendix F – Playing Pitch Methodology Current Year

	Stage 1		Stage 2		Stage 3		Stage 4											
	Nr of teams		Ratio		(S1 x S2)		Percentage split across days of the week											
Football	Adult teams (senior)	Junior teams (junior)	Games per week (senior)	Games per week (junior)	Games per week (senior)	Games per week (junior)	Saturday AM (senior)	Saturday PM (senior)	Saturday AM (junior)	Saturday PM (junior)	Sunday AM (senior)	Sunday PM (senior)	Sunday AM (junior)	Sunday PM (junior)	Mid Week 1 Tuesday (senior)	Mid Week 1 Tuesday (junior)	Mid Week 2 Thursday (senior)	Mid Week 2 Thursday (junior)
<b>Total</b>	<b>126</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>0.24</b>	<b>0.21</b>	<b>30.2</b>	<b>15.3</b>	0%	38%	0%	0%	52%	10%	31%	69%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Rayleigh	46	19	0.24	0.21	11	3.99	0%	38%	0%	0%	52%	10%	31%	69%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Hockley	9	13	0.24	0.21	2.16	2.73	0%	38%	0%	0%	52%	10%	31%	69%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Rochford	29	23	0.24	0.21	6.96	4.83	0%	38%	0%	0%	52%	10%	31%	69%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Great Wakering	31	9	0.24	0.21	7.44	1.89	0%	38%	0%	0%	52%	10%	31%	69%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Hullbridge	11	9	0.24	0.21	2.64	1.89	0%	38%	0%	0%	52%	10%	31%	69%	0%	0%	0%	0%

## Supplementary Planning Document – Playing Pitch Strategy 2011-2026

Football	Stage 5 (S3 x S4)												Stage 6		Stage 7 (S6-S5)											
	Average nr of games per day												Adult		Shortfall or surplus											
	Saturday AM (senior)	Saturday PM (senior)	Saturday AM (junior)	Saturday PM (junior)	Sunday AM (senior)	Sunday PM (senior)	Sunday AM (junior)	Sunday PM (junior)	Mid Week 1 Tuesday (senior)	Mid Week 1 Tuesday (junior)	Mid Week 2 Thursday (senior)	Mid Week 2 Thursday (junior)	Nr of pitches (senior)	Nr of pitches (junior)	Saturday AM (senior)	Saturday PM (senior)	Saturday AM (junior)	Saturday PM (junior)	Sunday AM (senior)	Sunday PM (senior)	Sunday AM (junior)	Sunday PM (junior)	Mid Week 1 Tuesday (senior)	Mid Week 1 Tuesday (junior)	Mid Week 2 Thursday (senior)	Mid Week 2 Thursday (junior)
<b>Total</b>	0.0	11.5	0.0	0.0	15.7	3.0	4.8	10.6	0	0	0	0	<b>58</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>58.0</b>	<b>46.5</b>	<b>2.0</b>	<b>2.0</b>	<b>42.3</b>	<b>55.0</b>	<b>-2.8</b>	<b>-8.6</b>	<b>58.0</b>	<b>2.0</b>	<b>58.0</b>	<b>2.0</b>
Rayleigh	0.0	4.2	0.0	0.0	5.7	1.1	1.2	2.8	0	0	0	0	19	1	19.0	14.8	1.0	1.0	13.3	17.9	-0.2	-1.8	19.0	1.0	19.0	1.0
Hockley	0.0	0.8	0.0	0.0	1.1	0.2	0.8	1.9	0	0	0	0	7	0	7.0	6.2	0.0	0.0	5.9	6.8	-0.8	-1.9	7.0	0.0	7.0	0.0
Rochford	0.0	2.6	0.0	0.0	3.6	0.7	1.5	3.3	0	0	0	0	15	1	15.0	12.4	1.0	1.0	11.4	14.3	-0.5	-2.3	15.0	1.0	15.0	1.0
Great Wakering	0.0	2.8	0.0	0.0	3.9	0.7	0.6	1.3	0	0	0	0	10	0	10.0	7.2	0.0	0.0	6.1	9.3	-0.6	-1.3	10.0	0.0	10.0	0.0
Hullbridge	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	1.4	0.3	0.6	1.3	0	0	0	0	7	0	7.0	6.0	0.0	0.0	5.6	6.7	-0.6	-1.3	7.0	0.0	7.0	0.0

Supplementary Planning Document – Playing Pitch Strategy 2011-2026

Mini Soccer	Stage 1		Stage 2		Stage 3		Stage 4				
	Nr of teams		Ratio		(S1 x S2)		Percentage split across days of the week				
	Teams	Team equivalents	Games per week	Games per week	Equivalent games per week	Saturday AM	Saturday PM	Sunday AM	Sunday PM	Mid Week 1	Mid Week 2
<b>Total</b>	74	2.64	0.33	24.4	0.87	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%
Rayleigh	25	0.89	0.33	8.25	0.29	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%
Hockley	14	0.5	0.33	4.62	0.17	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%
Rochford	21	0.75	0.33	6.93	0.25	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%
Great Wakering	8	0.29	0.33	2.64	0.09	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%
Hullbridge	6	0.21	0.33	1.98	0.07	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%

Supplementary Planning Document – Playing Pitch Strategy 2011-2026

Mini soccer	Stage 5 (S3xS4)					Stage 6			Stage 7 (S6-S5)					
	Average nr of games per day					Audit			Shortfall or surplus					
	Saturday AM	Saturday PM	Sunday AM	Sunday PM	Mid Week 1	Mid Week 2	Nr of mini pitches	Nr of pitches (adult equiv)	Saturday AM	Saturday PM	Sunday AM	Sunday PM	Mid Week 1	Mid Week 2
<b>Total</b>	0.0	0.0	24.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	12	6	12.0	12.0	-12.4	12.0	12.0	12.0
Rayleigh	0.0	0.0	8.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	3	1.5	3.0	3.0	-5.3	3.0	3.0	3.0
Hockley	0.0	0.0	4.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	3	1.5	3.0	3.0	-1.6	3.0	3.0	3.0
Rochford	0.0	0.0	6.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	3	1.5	3.0	3.0	-3.9	3.0	3.0	3.0
Great Wakering	0.0	0.0	2.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	1	0.5	1.0	1.0	-1.6	1.0	1.0	1.0
Hullbridge	0.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2	1	2.0	2.0	0.0	2.0	2.0	2.0

Supplementary Planning Document – Playing Pitch Strategy 2011-2026

Cricket	Stage 1		Stage 2		Stage 3		Stage 4											
	Nr of teams		Ratio		(S1 x S2)		Percentage split across days of the week											
	Adult teams (senior)	Junior teams (junior)	Games per week(senior)	Games per week(junior)	Games per week(senior)	Games per week(junior)	Saturday AM (senior)	Saturday PM (senior)	Saturday AM (Junior)	Saturday PM (Junior)	Sunday AM (senior)	Sunday PM (senior)	Sunday AM (junior)	Sunday PM (junior)	Mid Week 1 Tuesday (senior)	Mid Week 1 Tuesday (junior)	Mid Week 2 Thursday (senior)	Mid Week 2 Thursday (junior)
<b>Total</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>0.45</b>	<b>0.36</b>	<b>9.9</b>	<b>4.32</b>	0%	72%	0%	0%	0%	18%	83%	0%	5%	17%	5%	0%
Rayleigh	10	9	0.45	0.36	4.5	3.24	0%	72%	0%	0%	0%	18%	83%	0%	5%	17%	5%	0%
Hockley	5	0	0.36	0.36	1.8	0	0%	72%	0%	0%	0%	18%	83%	0%	5%	17%	5%	0%
Rochford	4	3	0.36	0.36	1.44	1.08	0%	72%	0%	0%	0%	18%	83%	0%	5%	17%	5%	0%
Great Wakering	1	0	0.36	0.36	0.36	0	0%	72%	0%	0%	0%	18%	83%	0%	5%	17%	5%	0%
Hullbridge	2	0	0.36	0.36	0.72	0	0%	72%	0%	0%	0%	18%	83%	0%	5%	17%	5%	0%

## Supplementary Planning Document – Playing Pitch Strategy 2011-2026

Cricket	Stage 5 (S3 x S4)												Stage 6		Stage 7 (S6- S5)											
	Average nr of games per day												Audit		Shortfall or surplus											
	Saturday AM (senior)	Saturday PM (senior)	Saturday AM (junior)	Saturday PM (junior)	Sunday AM (senior)	Sunday PM (senior)	Sunday AM (junior)	Sunday PM (junior)	Mid Week 1 Tuesday (senior)	Mid Week 1 Tuesday (junior)	Mid Week 2 Thursday (senior)	Mid Week 2 Thursday (junior)	Nr of pitches		Saturday AM (senior)	Saturday PM (senior)	Saturday AM (junior)	Saturday PM (junior)	Sunday AM (senior)	Sunday PM (senior)	Sunday AM (junior)	Sunday PM (junior)	Mid Week 1 Tuesday (senior)	Mid Week 1 Tuesday (junior)	Mid Week 2 Thursday (senior)	Mid Week 2 Thursday (junior)
<b>Total</b>	0.0	7.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.8	3.6	0.0	0.4	0.7	0.4	0.0	<b>8</b>		<b>8.0</b>	<b>0.9</b>	<b>8.0</b>	<b>8.0</b>	<b>8.0</b>	<b>6.2</b>	<b>4.4</b>	<b>8.0</b>	<b>7.6</b>	<b>7.3</b>	<b>7.6</b>	<b>8.0</b>
Rayleigh	0.0	3.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.8	2.7	0.0	0.2	0.6	0.2	0.0	2		2.0	-1.2	2.0	2.0	2.0	1.2	-0.7	2.0	1.8	1.4	1.8	2.0
Hockley	0.0	1.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.0	1		1.0	-0.3	1.0	1.0	1.0	0.7	1.0	1.0	0.9	1.0	0.9	1.0
Rochford	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.9	0.0	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.0	3		3.0	2.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.7	2.1	3.0	2.9	2.8	2.9	3.0
Great Wakering	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1		1.0	0.7	1.0	1.0	1.0	0.9	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Hullbridge	0.0	0.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1		1.0	0.5	1.0	1.0	1.0	0.9	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0

## Supplementary Planning Document – Playing Pitch Strategy 2011-2026

	Stage 1		Stage 2		Stage 3		Stage 4											
	Nr of teams		Ratio		(S1 x S2)		Percentage split across days of the week											
	Adult teams (senior)	Junior teams (junior)	Games per week (senior)	Games per week (junior)	Games per week (senior)	Games per week (junior)	Saturday AM (senior)	Saturday PM (senior)	Saturday AM (junior)	Saturday PM (junior)	Sunday AM (senior)	Sunday PM (senior)	Sunday AM (junior)	Sunday PM (junior)	Mid Week 1 Tuesday (senior)	Mid Week 1 Tuesday (junior)	Mid Week 2 Thursday (senior)	Mid Week 2 Thursday (junior)
<b>Rugby Union</b>																		
<b>Total</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>0.5</b>	<b>0.29</b>	<b>4.5</b>	<b>3.48</b>	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	83%	17%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Rayleigh	0	0	0.5	0.29	0	0	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	83%	17%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Hockley	4	7	0.5	0.29	2	2.03	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	83%	17%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Rochford	5	5	0.5	0.29	2.5	1.45	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	83%	17%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Great Waking	0	0	0.5	0.29	0	0	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	83%	17%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Hullbridge	0	0	0.5	0.29	0	0	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	83%	17%	0%	0%	0%	0%

## Supplementary Planning Document – Playing Pitch Strategy 2011-2026

Rugby Union	Stage 5 (S3 x S4)														Stage 6						Stage 7 (S6- S5)						
					Average nr of games per day												Audit					Shortfall or surplus					
	Saturday AM (senior)	Saturday PM (senior)	Saturday AM (junior)	Saturday PM (junior)	Sunday AM (senior)	Sunday PM (senior)	Sunday AM (junior)	Sunday PM (junior)	Mid Week 1 Tuesday (senior)	Mid Week 1 Tuesday (junior)	Mid Week 2 Thursday (senior)	Mid Week 2 Thursday (junior)	Nr of pitches (senior)	Nr of pitches (junior)	Saturday AM (senior)	Saturday PM (senior)	Saturday AM (junior)	Saturday PM (junior)	Sunday AM (senior)	Sunday PM (senior)	Sunday AM (junior)	Sunday PM (junior)	Mid Week 1 Tuesday (senior)	Mid Week 1 Tuesday (junior)	Mid Week 2 Thursday (senior)	Mid Week 2 Thursday (junior)	
<b>Total</b>	0.0	4.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.9	0.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	7	3	7.0	2.5	3.0	3.0	7.0	7.0	0.1	2.4	7.0	3.0	7.0	3.0	
Rayleigh	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Hockley	0.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.7	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	3	0	3.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	3.0	3.0	-1.7	-0.3	3.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	
Rochford	0.0	2.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.2	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	4	3	4.0	1.5	3.0	3.0	4.0	4.0	1.8	2.8	4.0	3.0	4.0	3.0		
Great Wakering	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Hullbridge	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	

Supplementary Planning Document – Playing Pitch Strategy 2011-2026

Hockey	Stage 1		Stage 2		Stage 3		Stage 4											
	Nr of teams		Ratio		(S1 x S2)		Percentage split across days of the week											
	Adult teams (senior)	Junior teams (junior)	Games per week (senior)	Games per week (junior)	Games per week (senior)	Games per week (junior)	Saturday AM (senior)	Saturday PM (senior)	Saturday AM (junior)	Saturday PM (junior)	Sunday AM (senior)	Sunday PM (senior)	Sunday AM (junior)	Sunday PM (junior)	Mid Week 1 Tuesday (senior)	Mid Week 1 Tuesday (junior)	Mid Week 2 Thursday (senior)	Mid Week 2 Thursday (junior)
<b>Total</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.45</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.45</b>	<b>0</b>	0%	33%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	67%	0%	0%	0%
Rayleigh	0	0	0.45	0	0	0	0%	33%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	67%	0%	0%	0%
Hockley	0	0	0.45	0	0	0	33%	33%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	67%	0%	0%	0%
Rochford	1	0	0.45	0	0.45	0	33%	33%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	67%	0%	0%	0%
Great Wakering	0	0	0.45	0	0	0	33%	33%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	67%	0%	0%	0%
Hullbridge	0	0	0.45	0	0	0	33%	33%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	67%	0%	0%	0%

Supplementary Planning Document – Playing Pitch Strategy 2011-2026

Hockey	Stage 5 (S3 x S4)												Stage 6		Stage 7 (S6- S5)												
	Average nr of games per day												Audit		Shortfall or surplus												
	Saturday AM (senior)	Saturday PM (senior)	Saturday AM (junior)	Saturday PM (junior)	Sunday AM (senior)	Sunday PM (senior)	Sunday AM (junior)	Sunday PM (junior)	Mid Week 1 Tuesday (senior)	Mid Week 1 Tuesday (junior)	Mid Week 2 Thursday (senior)	Mid Week 2 Thursday (junior)	Nr of pitches		Saturday AM (senior)	Saturday PM (senior)	Saturday AM (junior)	Saturday PM (junior)	Sunday AM (senior)	Sunday PM (senior)	Sunday AM (junior)	Sunday PM (junior)	Mid Week 1 Tuesday (senior)	Mid Week 1 Tuesday (junior)	Mid Week 2 Thursday (senior)	Mid Week 2 Thursday (junior)	
<b>Total</b>	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	1		1.0	0.9	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Rayleigh	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Hockley	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Rochford	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	1		0.9	0.9	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	0.7	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Great Wakering	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Hullbridge	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Appendix G – Playing Pitch Methodology – Future

Football Future Year	Nr of teams calculated from TGR (adult + junior)	Growth factor	New number of teams	Stage 1		Stage 2		Stage 3		Stage 4											
				Nr of teams	Ratio	(S1 x S2)		Percentage split across days of the week													
				Adult teams (senior)	Junior teams (junior)	Games per week (senior)	Games per week (junior)	Games per week (senior)	Games per week (junior)	Saturday AM (senior)	Saturday PM (senior)	Saturday AM (junior)	Saturday PM (junior)	Sunday AM (senior)	Sunday PM (senior)	Sunday AM (junior)	Sunday PM (junior)	Mid Week 1 Tuesday (senior)	Mid Week 1 Tuesday (junior)	Mid Week 2 Thursday (senior)	
<b>Total</b>	<b>504.7</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>555.1</b>	<b>277.6</b>	<b>277.6</b>	<b>0.24</b>	<b>0.21</b>	<b>66.6</b>	<b>58.3</b>	0%	38%	0%	0%	52%	10%	31%	69%	0%	0%	0%	
Rayleigh	200.6	10%	220.67	110.3	110.3	0.24	0.21	26.5	23.2	0%	38%	0%	0%	52%	10%	31%	69%	0%	0%	0%	
Hockley	143.1	10%	157.43	78.7	78.7	0.24	0.21	18.9	16.5	0%	38%	0%	0%	52%	10%	31%	69%	0%	0%	0%	
Rochford	71.2	10%	78.33	39.2	39.2	0.24	0.21	9.4	8.2	0%	38%	0%	0%	52%	10%	31%	69%	0%	0%	0%	
Great Wakering	48.3	10%	53.127	26.6	26.6	0.24	0.21	6.4	5.6	0%	38%	0%	0%	52%	10%	31%	69%	0%	0%	0%	
Hullbridge	41.4	10%	45.573	22.8	22.8	0.24	0.21	5.5	4.8	0%	38%	0%	0%	52%	10%	31%	69%	0%	0%	0%	
Assume				50%	50%																
				Adult	Junior																

## Supplementary Planning Document – Playing Pitch Strategy 2011-2026

Football Future Year	Stage 5 (S3 x S4)												Stage 6		Stage 7 (S6- S5)											
	Average nr of games per day												Audit		Shortfall or surplus											
	Saturday AM (senior)	Saturday PM (senior)	Saturday AM (junior)	Saturday PM (junior)	Sunday AM (senior)	Sunday PM (senior)	Sunday AM (junior)	Sunday PM (junior)	Mid Week 1 Tuesday (senior)	Mid Week 1 Tuesday (junior)	Mid Week 2 Thursday (senior)	Mid Week 2 Thursday (junior)	Nr of pitches (senior)	Nr of pitches (junior)	Saturday AM (senior)	Saturday PM (senior)	Saturday AM (junior)	Saturday PM (junior)	Sunday AM (senior)	Sunday PM (senior)	Sunday AM (junior)	Sunday PM (junior)	Mid Week 1 Tuesday (senior)	Mid Week 1 Tuesday (junior)	Mid Week 2 Thursday (senior)	Mid Week 2 Thursday (junior)
<b>Total</b>	0.0	25.3	0.0	0.0	34.6	6.7	18.1	40.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	<b>58</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>58.0</b>	<b>32.7</b>	<b>2.0</b>	<b>2.0</b>	<b>23.4</b>	<b>51.3</b>	<b>-16.1</b>	<b>-38.2</b>	<b>58.0</b>	<b>2.0</b>	<b>58.0</b>	<b>2.0</b>
Rayleigh	0.0	10.1	0.0	0.0	13.8	2.6	7.2	16.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	19	1	19.0	8.9	1.0	1.0	5.2	16.4	-6.2	-15.0	19.0	1.0	19.0	1.0
Hockley	0.0	7.2	0.0	0.0	9.8	1.9	5.1	11.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	7	0	7.0	-0.2	0.0	0.0	-2.8	5.1	-5.1	-11.4	7.0	0.0	7.0	0.0
Rochford	0.0	3.6	0.0	0.0	4.9	0.9	2.5	5.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	15	1	15.0	11.4	1.0	1.0	10.1	14.1	-1.5	-4.7	15.0	1.0	15.0	1.0
Great Wakering	0.0	2.4	0.0	0.0	3.3	0.6	1.7	3.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10	0	10.0	7.6	0.0	0.0	6.7	9.4	-1.7	-3.8	10.0	0.0	10.0	0.0
Hullbridge	0.0	2.1	0.0	0.0	2.8	0.5	1.5	3.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	7	0	7.0	4.9	0.0	0.0	4.2	6.5	-1.5	-3.3	7.0	0.0	7.0	0.0

Supplementary Planning Document – Playing Pitch Strategy 2011-2026

Mini Soccer Future Year	Teams		Stage 1	Stage 2	Stage 3	Stage 4							
	Nr of teams calculated from TGR	Growth factor	Nr of teams		Ratio	(S1 x S2)		Percentage split across days of the week					
			New number of mini teams	New team equivalents	Games per week	Games per week	Equivalent Games per week	Saturday AM	Saturday PM	Sunday AM	Sunday PM	Mid Week 1	Mid Week 2
<b>Total</b>	<b>130.4</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>143.5</b>	<b>5.1</b>	<b>0.33</b>	<b>47.4</b>	<b>1.7</b>	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%
Rayleigh	51.9	10%	57.0	<b>2.0</b>	0.33	18.8	0.7	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%
Hockley	37.0	10%	40.7	<b>1.5</b>	0.33	13.4	0.5	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%
Rochford	18.4	10%	20.2	<b>0.7</b>	0.33	6.7	0.2	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%
Great Wakering	12.5	10%	13.7	<b>0.5</b>	0.33	4.5	0.2	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%
Hullbridge	10.7	10%	11.8	<b>0.4</b>	0.33	3.9	0.1	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%

## Supplementary Planning Document – Playing Pitch Strategy 2011-2026

Mini Soccer Future Year	Stage 5 (S3 x S4)						Stage 6		Stage 7 (S6- S5)					
	Average nr of games per day						Audit		Shortfall or surplus					
	Saturday AM	Saturday PM	Sunday AM	Sunday PM	Mid Week 1	Mid Week 2	Nr of mini pitches	Nr of pitches (adult equiv)	Saturday AM	Saturday PM	Sunday AM	Sunday PM	Mid Week 1	Mid Week 2
<b>Total</b>	0.0	0.0	47.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	12	6	12.0	12.0	-35.4	12.0	12.0	12.0
Rayleigh	0.0	0.0	18.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	3	1.5	3.0	3.0	-15.8	3.0	3.0	3.0
Hockley	0.0	0.0	13.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	3	1.5	3.0	3.0	-10.4	3.0	3.0	3.0
Rochford	0.0	0.0	6.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	3	1.5	3.0	3.0	-3.7	3.0	3.0	3.0
Great Wakering	0.0	0.0	4.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	1	0.5	1.0	1.0	-3.5	1.0	1.0	1.0
Hullbridge	0.0	0.0	3.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	2	1	2.0	2.0	-1.9	2.0	2.0	2.0

## Supplementary Planning Document – Playing Pitch Strategy 2011-2026

Cricket Future Year	Nr of teams calculated from TGR	Growth factor	New number of teams	Stage 1		Stage 2		Stage 3		Stage 4											
				Nr of teams		Ratio		(S1 x S2)		Percentage split across days of the week											
				Adult teams	Junior teams	Games per week(senior)	Games per week(junior)	Games per week(senior)	Games per week(junior)	Saturday AM (senior)	Saturday PM (senior)	Saturday AM (junior)	Saturday PM (junior)	Sunday AM (senior)	Sunday PM (senior)	Sunday AM (junior)	Sunday PM (junior)	Mid Week 1 Tuesday (senior)	Mid Week 1 Tuesday (junior)	Mid Week 2 Thursday (senior)	Mid Week 2 Thursday (junior)
<b>Total</b>	<b>66.7</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>73.353</b>	<b>36.7</b>	<b>36.7</b>	<b>0.45</b>	<b>0.36</b>	<b>16.5</b>	<b>13.2</b>	0%	72%	0%	0%	0%	18%	83%	0%	5%	17%	5%	0%
Rayleigh	26.5	10%	29.158	14.579	14.579	0.45	0.36	6.6	5.2	0%	72%	0%	0%	0%	18%	83%	0%	5%	17%	5%	0%
Hockley	18.9	10%	20.803	10.401	10.401	0.36	0.36	3.7	3.7	0%	72%	0%	0%	0%	18%	83%	0%	5%	17%	5%	0%
Rochford	9.4	10%	10.35	5.1751	5.1751	0.36	0.36	1.9	1.9	0%	72%	0%	0%	0%	18%	83%	0%	5%	17%	5%	0%
Great Wakering	6.4	10%	7.02	3.51	3.51	0.36	0.36	1.3	1.3	0%	72%	0%	0%	0%	18%	83%	0%	5%	17%	5%	0%
Hullbridge	5.5	10%	6.0218	3.0109	3.0109	0.36	0.36	1.1	1.1	0%	72%	0%	0%	0%	18%	83%	0%	5%	17%	5%	0%
Assume				50%	50%																
				Adult	Junior																

## Supplementary Planning Document – Playing Pitch Strategy 2011-2026

Cricket Future Year	Stage 5 (S3 x S4)												Stage 6		Stage 7 (S6- S5)											
	Average nr of games per day												Audit		Shortfall or surplus											
	Saturday AM (senior)	Saturday PM (senior)	Saturday AM (junior)	Saturday PM (junior)	Sunday AM (senior)	Sunday PM (senior)	Sunday AM (junior)	Sunday PM (junior)	Mid Week 1 Tuesday (senior)	Mid Week 1 Tuesday (junior)	Mid Week 2 Thursday (senior)	Mid Week 2 Thursday (junior)	Nr of pitches		Saturday AM (senior)	Saturday PM (senior)	Saturday AM (junior)	Saturday PM (junior)	Sunday AM (senior)	Sunday PM (senior)	Sunday AM (junior)	Sunday PM (junior)	Mid Week 1 Tuesday (senior)	Mid Week 1 Tuesday (junior)	Mid Week 2 Thursday (senior)	Mid Week 2 Thursday (junior)
<b>Total</b>	0.0	11.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.0	11.0	0.0	0.7	2.2	0.7	0.0	<b>8</b>		<b>8.0</b>	<b>-3.9</b>	<b>8.0</b>	<b>8.0</b>	<b>8.0</b>	<b>5.0</b>	<b>-3.0</b>	<b>8.0</b>	<b>7.3</b>	<b>5.8</b>	<b>7.3</b>	<b>8.0</b>
Rayleigh	0.0	4.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.2	4.4	0.0	0.3	0.9	0.3	0.0	2		2.0	<b>-2.7</b>	2.0	2.0	2.0	0.8	<b>-2.4</b>	2.0	1.7	1.1	1.7	2.0
Hockley	0.0	2.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.7	3.1	0.0	0.2	0.6	0.2	0.0	1		1.0	<b>-1.7</b>	1.0	1.0	1.0	0.3	<b>-2.1</b>	1.0	0.8	0.4	0.8	1.0
Rochford	0.0	1.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.3	1.5	0.0	0.1	0.3	0.1	0.0	3		3.0	1.7	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.7	1.5	3.0	2.9	2.7	2.9	3.0
Great Wakering	0.0	0.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2	1.0	0.0	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.0	1		1.0	0.1	1.0	1.0	1.0	0.8	<b>-0.0</b>	1.0	0.9	0.8	0.9	1.0
Hullbridge	0.0	0.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.9	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.0	1		1.0	0.2	1.0	1.0	1.0	0.8	0.1	1.0	1.0	0.8	1.0	1.0

## Supplementary Planning Document – Playing Pitch Strategy 2011-2026

Rugby Union Future Year	Nr of teams calculated from TGR	Growth factor	New number of teams	Stage 1		Stage 2	Stage 3		Stage 4												
				Nr of teams		Ratio	(S1 x S2)		Percentage split across days of the week												
				Adult teams (senior)	Junior teams (junior)	Games per week (senior)	Games per week (junior)	Games per week (senior)	Games per week (junior)	Saturday AM (senior)	Saturday PM (senior)	Saturday AM (junior)	Saturday PM (junior)	Sunday AM (senior)	Sunday PM (senior)	Sunday AM (junior)	Sunday PM (junior)	Mid Week 1 Tuesday (senior)	Mid Week 1 Tuesday (junior)	Mid Week 2 Thursday (senior)	Mid Week 2 Thursday (junior)
<b>Total</b>	<b>61.1</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>67.2</b>	<b>33.6</b>	<b>33.6</b>	<b>0.5</b>	<b>0.29</b>	<b>16.796</b>	<b>9.741</b>	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	83%	17%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Rayleigh	24.3	10%	26.705	13.4	13.4	0.5	0.29	6.6763	3.872	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	83%	17%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Hockley	17.3	10%	19.053	9.5	9.5	0.5	0.29	4.7632	2.763	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	83%	17%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Rochford	8.6	10%	9.4796	4.7	4.7	0.5	0.29	2.3699	1.375	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	83%	17%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Great Wakering	5.8	10%	6.4294	3.2	3.2	0.5	0.29	1.6074	0.932	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	83%	17%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Hullbridge	5.0	10%	5.5152	2.8	2.8	0.5	0.29	1.3788	0.8	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	83%	17%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Assume				50%	50%																
				Adult	Junior																

## Supplementary Planning Document – Playing Pitch Strategy 2011-2026

Rugby Union Future Year	Stage 5 (S3 x S4)												Stage 6		Stage 7 (S6- S5)												
	Average nr of games per day												Audit		Shortfall or surplus												
	Saturday AM (senior)	Saturday AM (senior)	Saturday PM (senior)	Saturday AM (junior)	Saturday PM (junior)	Sunday AM (senior)	Sunday PM (senior)	Sunday AM (junior)	Sunday PM (junior)	Mid Week 1 Tuesday (senior)	Mid Week 1 Tuesday (junior)	Mid Week 2 Thursday (senior)	Mid Week 2 Thursday (junior)	Nr of pitches (senior)	Nr of pitches (junior)	Saturday AM (senior)	Saturday PM (senior)	Saturday AM (junior)	Saturday PM (junior)	Sunday AM (senior)	Sunday PM (senior)	Sunday AM (junior)	Sunday PM (junior)	Mid Week 1 Tuesday (senior)	Mid Week 1 Tuesday (junior)	Mid Week 2 Thursday (senior)	Mid Week 2 Thursday (junior)
<b>Total</b>	0.0	0.0	16.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.1	1.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	7	3	7.0	-9.8	3.0	3.0	7.0	7.0	-5.1	1.3	7.0	3.0	7.0	3.0
Rayleigh	0.0	0.0	6.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.5	1.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0	0.0	-6.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-5.5	-1.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Hockley	0.0	0.0	4.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.0	0.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3	0	3.0	-1.8	0.0	0.0	3.0	3.0	-4.0	-0.8	3.0	0.0	3.0	0.0
Rochford	0.0	0.0	2.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.0	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4	3	4.0	1.6	3.0	3.0	4.0	4.0	1.0	2.6	4.0	3.0	4.0	3.0
Great Wakering	0.0	0.0	1.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.3	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0	0.0	-1.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-1.3	-0.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Hullbridge	0.0	0.0	1.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.1	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0	0.0	-1.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-1.1	-0.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Supplementary Planning Document – Playing Pitch Strategy 2011-2026

Hockey Future Year	Nr of teams calculated from TGR	Growth factor	New number of teams	Stage 1		Stage 2		Stage 3		Stage 4											
				Nr of teams		Ratio		(S1 x S2)		Percentage split across days of the week											
				Adult teams (senior)	Junior teams (junior)	Games per week (senior)	Games per week (junior)	Games per week (adult)	Games per week (junior)	Saturday AM (senior)	Saturday PM (senior)	Saturday AM (junior)	Saturday PM (junior)	Sunday AM (senior)	Sunday PM (senior)	Sunday AM (junior)	Sunday PM (junior)	Mid Week 1 Tuesday (senior)	Mid Week 1 Tuesday (junior)	Mid Week 2 Thursday (senior)	Mid Week 2 Thursday (junior)
<b>Total</b>	<b>2.7</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>3.0</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>0.45</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.6657</b>	<b>0</b>	0%	33%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	67%	0%	0%	0%
Rayleigh	1.1	10%	1.2	0.6	0.6	0.45	0	0.2646	0	0%	33%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	67%	0%	0%	0%
Hockley	0.8	10%	0.8	0.4	0.4	0.45	0	0.1888	0	0%	33%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	67%	0%	0%	0%
Rochford	0.4	10%	0.4	0.2	0.2	0.45	0	0.0939	0	0%	33%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	67%	0%	0%	0%
Great Wakering	0.3	10%	0.3	0.1	0.1	0.45	0	0.0637	0	0%	33%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	67%	0%	0%	0%
Hullbridge	0.2	10%	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.45	0	0.0546	0	0%	33%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	67%	0%	0%	0%
Assume				50%	50%																
				Adult	Junior																

## Supplementary Planning Document – Playing Pitch Strategy 2011-2026

Hockey Future Year	Stage 5 (S3 x S4)												Stage 6		Stage 7 (S6- S5)													
	Average nr of games per day												Audit		Shortfall or surplus													
	Saturday AM (senior)	Saturday PM (senior)	Saturday AM (junior)	Saturday PM (junior)	Sunday AM (senior)	Sunday PM (senior)	Sunday AM (junior)	Sunday PM (junior)	Mid Week 1 Tuesday (senior)	Mid Week 1 Tuesday (junior)	Mid Week 2 Thursday (senior)	Mid Week 2 Thursday (junior)	Nr of pitches		Saturday AM (senior)	Saturday PM (senior)	Saturday AM (junior)	Saturday PM (junior)	Sunday AM (senior)	Sunday PM (senior)	Sunday AM (junior)	Sunday PM (junior)	Mid Week 1 Tuesday (senior)	Mid Week 1 Tuesday (junior)	Mid Week 2 Thursday (senior)	Mid Week 2 Thursday (junior)		
<b>Total</b>	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	1		1.0	0.8	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	0.6	1.0	1.0	1.0
Rayleigh	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0		0.0	-0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-0.2	0.0	0.0	0.0
Hockley	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0		0.0	-0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
Rochford	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	1		1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	0.9	1.0	1.0	1.0	
Great Wakering	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0		0.0	-0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Hullbridge	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0		0.0	-0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

## Appendix H – Action Plan of Recommendations for Rochford

In the main report, the Council has introduced a list of solutions/recommendations to tackle the issues identified. In many cases, there is more than one solution to the issues identified. Where there is more than one action that is applicable, and the action(s) is/are already covered in the list below, you will find the numbers representing the solutions appear in the 'Action required' section on the table from page 2.

### Short term:

- (i) Encourage education institutions to sign up a formal community use arrangement for dual use of school facilities.
- (ii) Redesignate adult pitches to mini/junior pitches.
- (iii) Continue to work closely with partners/open space contractors/organisations to provide better service for the public.

### Medium – Long term:

- (i) Provide additional pitches to bring supply in line with demand
- (ii) When providing new provisions for football, they should mainly be mini and junior pitches, and focus should be on providing them on the western side of the District
- (iii) Roles and responsibilities to be reviewed and updated in the management contract
- (iv) Secure developer contributions wherever through planning obligations and/or community infrastructure levy
- (v) Focus investment in floodlit synthetic turf pitches/Artificial Grass Pitches
- (vi) Ensure the relocated pitches are made to standard league requirements and on a fit-for-purpose site.

**Action Plan of Recommendations for Rochford**

Issue identified through consultation/study	Action	Location	Lead/ Partner	Timescale
Concern expressed by clubs regarding poor provision	Short-medium term: (i), (iii) Long term: (i), (v)	Rochford	Environmental Services/ Open spaces contractor/ Leisure Department/Sport clubs	Short-medium Term Long Term
Some clubs have expressed difficulty in obtaining information as to the availability of pitches, and information as to where/how/ who from pitches can be hired.	Improve communication methods – consider using alternatives methods such as emails, SMS, social networking websites	All	Environmental Services/ Open spaces contractor/ Communication department	Ongoing
There is potentially high latent demand for artificial hockey pitches	Short-medium term: (i), (iii) Long term: (i), (v)	All	Environmental Services/ Leisure Department/ Sport clubs	Short-medium Term Long Term
Shortage for mini and junior football pitches will continue <sup>20</sup> in the long term. The major shortfall will be on Sunday	Short-medium term: (i), (ii), (iii) Long term: (i), (iv), (v)	All	Environmental Services/ Leisure Department/ Planning Department/ Sport clubs	Short-medium Term Long Term

<sup>20</sup> To date, it was advised that the pitch hiring rate for mini and junior football pitches is relatively low in 2010/11, which does not seem to reflecting the projection in the study yet.

**Action Plan of Recommendations for Rochford**

Issue identified through consultation/study	Action	Location	Lead/ Partner	Timescale
The surplus in cricket and rugby pitches shown in the current PPM will turn into a small deficit in the future	Short-medium term: (i) Long term: (i), (iv)	Cricket: Rayleigh and Hockley;  Rugby: Rayleigh, Hockley, Great Wakering and Hullbridge	Environmental Services/ Leisure Department/ Planning Department/ Sport clubs	Short-medium term  Long term
Imbalanced geographical spread – players reside on the western side of the District (e.g. Rayleigh, Wickford, Basildon) tend to find it difficult to obtain pitches in the local area, thus clubs travel further to the east (e.g. Rochford, Great Wakering) to use pitches	Short-medium term: (i), (iii) Long term: (i), (v)i	All	Rochford District Council and Neighbouring Councils/Sport clubs	Short-medium term  Long term
Pitches are considered by some to be expensive	Regular evaluation on price.  However, it is important to note that the pitch hiring price in Rochford is considered affordable in comparing with our neighbouring authorities.	Not specified	Environmental Services/ Open spaces contractor	Medium-long term

**Action Plan of Recommendations for Rochford**

Issue identified through consultation/study	Action	Location	Lead/ Partner	Timescale
Concern express regarding lack of consultation/ information on changeover of pitch providers	Short-medium term: (iii)	N/A	Environmental Services/ Communications Department	Medium term
One respondent stated they had encountered abusive grounds staff	Complaints procedure already in place. Council to promote use of this procedure	Rochford – Not specified	Rochford District Council	Ongoing
One respondent state that changes to maintenance and administration methods are not an improvement	Short-medium term: (iii) Long term: (iii)	N/A	Environmental Services/ Open spaces contractor/ Sport clubs	Short-medium term Long term
A club expressed concern regarding poor facilities – toilets locked, grounds staff missing, wonky goal posts, infrequent grass cutting, pot holes	Improvement in maintenance/ upkeep required Short-medium term: (iii)	Rochford – Not specified	Environmental Services/ Open spaces contractor/ Sport clubs	Short-medium term
It is considered that there is limited facilities and they are in poor condition	Short-medium term: (iii) Long term: (iii), (iv), (vi)	Rochford – Not specified	Environmental Services/ Planning Department/ Open spaces contractors/ Sport clubs	Short-medium term Long term

**Action Plan of Recommendations for Rochford**

	<b>Action</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Lead/ Partner</b>	<b>Timescale</b>
One Sport clubs suggested that hedges require cutting back as balls are lost at Rawreth Lane Playing Field	Improvement in maintenance/ upkeeping required.  Notwithstanding this, removal of hedges is required to be in accordance with the Hedgerow Regulations 1997 which designed to give protection to important hedgerows in England and Wales.	Rawreth Lane Playing Field	Environmental Services/ Open spaces contractors	Short-medium term
One respondent suggested that goal nets are poor – some have not been changed for at least six seasons	To review quality of facilities on a regular basis	Great Wakering Recreation Ground	Environmental Services/ Open spaces contractors	Short-medium term
It is suggested that in order to move to higher level of the league, certain criteria should be met, however, Rochford Council pitches have no such facilities.	Long term: (iv)	Not specified	Environmental Services/ Leisure Department/ Planning Department/ Open spaces contractors/ Sport clubs	Long term





**Rochford District Council**  
Council Offices South Street  
Rochford Essex SS4 1BW  
Phone: 01702 546366  
customerservices@rochford.gov.uk  
Website: www.rochford.gov.uk



**INVESTORS  
IN PEOPLE** | Gold