

CHERWELL DISTRICT COUNCIL
GREEN SPACES STRATEGY
BACKGROUND DOCUMENT
JULY 2008

CONTENTS

	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
I	INTRODUCTION	12
II	STRATEGIC VISION AND POLICY OVERLAY	18
III	THE POLICY CONTEXT	23
IV	THE DISTRICT CONTEXT	38
V	CURRENT PROVISION OF GREEN SPACES	45
VI	THE APPLICATION OF STANDARDS	59
VII	ACTION PLAN	91
APPENDIX I	GREEN SPACES IN CHERWELL	110
APPENDIX II	DATA COMPILATION AND CONSULTATION	130

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Introduction

- 1) **The strategy:** This document comprises the background evidence document for the Cherwell Green Spaces Strategy and builds upon the recently completed study of open space, sport and recreation in the district, undertaken in line with Planning Policy Guidance Note 17 (PPG17).
- 2) **The green space included:** The types of green space that are included in the strategy are those covered by the PPG17 study and are as follows:
 - a) Parks and gardens.
 - b) Natural and semi-natural green space.
 - c) Amenity green space.
 - d) Provision for children and young people.
 - e) Outdoor sports facilities.
 - f) Allotments and community gardens.
 - g) Cemeteries and churchyards.
 - h) Green corridors.
 - i) Civic spaces.

Vision and policy overlay

- 3) **Vision:** The vision for green spaces in Cherwell is *‘to provide, safeguard and develop a network of safe, accessible and attractive green spaces that are valued, well managed and maintained and enhance the quality of life, sense of well-being, health and learning opportunities of all sections of the community’*.
- 4) **Policy overlay:** In support of the vision, the following policies are reflected in the assessment of green spaces provision in the strategy:
 - a) **Locally derived standards of provision:** Planning Policy Guidance 17 ‘Open Space, Sport and Recreation’ (PPG17) states that ‘the Government believes that open space, sport and recreation standards are best set locally. Local authorities should use the information gained from their assessments of needs and opportunities to set robust local standards. These should form the basis for redressing quantitative and qualitative deficiencies through the planning process’. The standards of provision proposed in the Cherwell Green Spaces Strategy are therefore based upon a detailed assessment of local needs. In most cases this has involved:
 - Identifying the highest levels of green space provision per capita in six designated ‘sub-areas’ of the district.

- Consulting with local communities to seek their views on the current adequacy of provision.
 - Setting a districtwide standard that in most cases relates to the highest levels of provision at present, where local people feel that the quantity of green space is ‘about right’.
- b) ***Minimum standards of provision:*** The standards of provision for green spaces should be regarded as the minimum levels required to meet existing needs. This means that it will be appropriate to:
- Seek higher levels of provision in appropriate circumstances where opportunities permit it.
 - Regularly review and amend the standards as needs like increased rates of physical activity evolve over time.
- c) ***Urban and rural differences:*** PPG17 states that ‘residents in rural areas cannot realistically expect to have the same level of access to the full range of different types of green spaces that are generally available in the more densely populated urban areas. Equally, if the total amount of open space in rural areas is assessed against an ‘urban’ provision standard, there might appear to be a surplus. This means that some local authorities may require both urban and rural standards’. For this reason, the standard of provision and associated assessment of natural and semi-natural greenspace and amenity green space in Cherwell includes differential urban and rural standards. For clarity, it should be noted that developments on ‘brownfield’ sites in urban areas will be subject to the urban standard, however the rural standard will be applied to edge of town or urban extension developments.
- d) ***Existing and new developments:*** In some of the more densely populated urban parts of the district, opportunities for meeting identified deficiencies in green spaces are limited by the absence of opportunities in such built-up areas. Similarly, in some rural areas where most land is in private ownership, securing public access to green spaces may not be possible. However, the opportunities presented by new residential developments may offer the flexibility to achieve enhanced levels of greenspace provision, recognising that the current standards represent an assessment of the minimum amounts that are needed.
- e) ***Quality of provision:*** Quality criteria were set in consultation with local communities, to define the condition to which each green space in the district should aspire. The quality of each site was assessed in relation to a set of objective criteria relating to wider norms and over time all identified qualitative deficiencies will be addressed progressively as resources and opportunities allow.

- f) ***Multi-functionality:*** The form of assessment advocated by PPG17 requires green spaces to be categorised in relation to their primary function only. The advantage of this is that there is no ‘double counting’ of sites, but the disadvantage is that the multi-function nature of many sites is downplayed. As an example, an area designated as a playing pitch may be used for its primary function for only 1.5 hours per week and as amenity greenspace for the remainder of the time, but the latter function will not be included in the formal assessment. For this reason, combined standards of provision for the following collective types of greenspace provision will be applied to new developments:
- General greenspace (combining parks and gardens, natural and semi-natural greenspace and amenity greenspace).
 - Playspace (combining provision for younger and older children).
 - Outdoor sports provision (combining tennis courts, bowling greens, golf courses and playing pitches).
 - Allotments.
- g) ***Environmental sustainability:*** To reflect the principles of environmental sustainability, green space provision will normally be made within walking distance catchments, the details of which will reflect local travel time tolerances. New areas of greenspace will therefore be located wherever possible to maximise their accessibility by non-vehicular forms of transport.
- h) ***Provision relating to new developments:*** The following principles will apply:
- All new dwellings should contribute towards the provision of green spaces. For smaller developments where on-site provision is not achievable, a financial contribution will be sought from developers towards the improvement of provision elsewhere, where appropriate schemes can be identified within the defined catchment.
 - On-site provision of greenspace will be sought on developments of ten dwellings or more in urban areas and six dwellings or more in rural areas.
 - The precise nature, composition and size of greenspace provision in new developments will be determined in relation to the overall size of the development and with reference to the minimum standards of provision.
 - The identification of schemes in each defined catchment area for which financial contributions will be sought will be defined in the Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document, to be progressed in tandem with the Core Strategy and Delivery Development Plan Documents. In some cases the catchment areas will relate to wards, in some to villages and in others to clusters of villages, but in each case will take account of the likelihood of development coming forward at a rate sufficient to provide the identified schemes.
 - Financial contributions will relate to the size of each dwelling and their

anticipated occupancy rates.

- i) **'Surplus' provision:** In some instances the application of districtwide standards at ward or parish level produces an apparent 'surplus' of greenspace provision. However, this should not be interpreted as signifying that the 'surplus' could be disposed of because:
- The standards against which the 'surplus' was assessed are the minimum that are required to meet current local needs. Local concentrations of existing demand and future increases in greenspace usage will both inflate the amount of provision needed to levels well above the minimum stipulation.
 - An apparent 'surplus' in one form of greenspace will often compensate for shortfalls in other types of provision locally.
 - Some of the larger areas of greenspace serve wider than local needs, with usage catchments well beyond the immediate boundaries of the parish or ward in which they are located. In such cases, it is clearly inappropriate to assess the adequacy of provision solely in relation to the size of the local population.
- j) **Community involvement:** In determining the precise nature of new and improved greenspace in each locality, Cherwell District Council will:
- Consult with those with a specific interest in the use of the greenspace (such as young people with play provision), to ensure that wherever possible the new provision meets their needs.
 - Involve town and parish councils in confirming local needs and the optimum way of meeting them, both in terms of additional provision and its ongoing management.

National and regional policy

- 5) **National green space policy:** Government policy emphasises the value of green space for:
- a) Social inclusion and community cohesion.
 - b) Environmental benefits and biodiversity.
 - c) Health and well being.
 - d) Sustainable development.
 - e) Social and economic regeneration.
- 6) **National planning policy:** Local authorities are encouraged to:
- Assess local green space needs and opportunities.
 - Set local green space standards.
 - Maintain an adequate supply of green spaces.

- Plan for new green spaces.
- 7) **District policy:** The Community Plan identifies several policy areas where green space provision can contribute to wider policy agendas, in particular improving health and well-being.
 - 8) **District planning policy:** The Local Plan has a range of policies to protect and enhance green space provision.
 - 9) **Guidance note on open space provision:** The Guidance Note establishes key principles and procedures by which open space, sport and recreation provision will be made and subsequently managed in new residential developments.
 - 10) **District environmental policies:** The Environment Strategy embeds environmental principles in all other planning areas.

The district context

- 11) **Population profile:** The current population of the district is 131,785. The relatively young age profile of the district population means that proportionately more people are in the age groups with higher demand rates for outdoor sports facilities and children’s play provision.
- 12) **Demography:** The population is relatively affluent, healthy and has high levels of personal mobility (car ownership). All these features are associated with higher than average use of green space provision.
- 13) **Population increases:** A 4.9% growth in population is forecast between 2001 and 2016, but is concentrated in specific geographical areas, particularly Banbury and Bicester. Demand for green space in these areas is therefore likely to rise proportionate to the population. In the longer term, a 14.6% increase in population is projected between 2007 and 2026, with the strongest growth in the numbers of people aged over 50.
- 14) **Landscape character:** Many of the district’s green spaces are part of a high quality landscape network.

Current provision of greenspace

- 15) **Standards of provision:** The PPG17 study identified standards of provision for the district, based upon community consultation and analysis of the current position.

<i>Type of greenspace</i>	<i>Standard</i>
Parks and gardens	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quantity: 0.48 hectares of parks and gardens per 1,000 urban residents, equivalent to the highest existing levels of provision in the district. • Quality: ‘A welcoming, clean, well maintained site that is free from vandalism and graffiti and provides a range of facilities for all users, with a good variety of well kept flowers, trees and shrubs and ancillary facilities that will enhance the user’s visit and feeling of safety. The site should reflect local traditions and allow for the viewing of public art’. • Accessibility: 15 minutes walking time (1,200m).

<i>Type of greenspace</i>	<i>Standard</i>
Natural/semi-natural greenspace	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quantitative standard: This was set as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In urban areas, 0.57 ha. per 1,000 people (equivalent to highest levels of provision in urban parts of the district at present). - In rural areas, 9.08 ha. per 1,000 people (equivalent to highest levels of provision in rural parts of the district at present). • Quality: 'A publicly accessible, spacious, clean and litter free site with clear pathways and natural features that encourage wildlife conservation and biodiversity. Sites should be maintained to protect nature conservation interest, with interpretive signage and safety features where appropriate'. • Accessibility: 15 minutes walking time (1,200m).
Amenity greenspace	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quantitative standard: This was set as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In urban areas, 0.5 ha. per 1,000 people (slightly above the highest levels of provision in urban parts of the district at present, to achieve equality of provision between the three urban areas). - In rural areas, 0.75 ha. per 1,000 people (equivalent to highest levels of provision in rural parts of the district at present). • Quality: 'A clean and well-maintained green space site with well kept grass and varied vegetation and large enough to accommodate informal play. Sites should have appropriate ancillary facilities (benches, litter bins) and landscaping in the right places, providing a spacious outlook and overall enhancing the appearance of the local environment'. • Accessibility: 5 minutes walking time (240m).
Play provision	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quantitative standard: This was set as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - For younger children, 0.59 ha. per 1,000 people. - For older children, 0.19 ha. per 1,000 people. • Quality: 'A site providing a suitable mix of well-maintained formal equipment and an enriched play environment to encourage informal play and recreation by children and young people. A safe and secure location with good access to the site that includes ancillary facilities such as teen shelters, seating where appropriate'. • Accessibility: 5 minutes walking time (480m) for younger children's play facilities and 15 minutes walking time (1,200m) for older children's provision.
Outdoor sports	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quantitative standard: This was set as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - For urban areas, 1.50 ha. per 1,000 people. - For rural areas, 3.62 ha. per 1,000 people (excluding any future golf courses). • Quality: 'All sports facility sites should be free from dog fouling, vandalism, graffiti and litter, with level, well-drained and good quality surfaces. Sites should provide good quality ancillary facilities, where appropriate, including changing accommodation, toilets, car parking and facilities for a range of age groups. The maintenance and management of the sites should continue to ensure safety and effective usage'. • Accessibility: 15 minutes walking time (1,200m).
Allotments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quantitative standard: This was set as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In urban areas, 0.23 ha. per 1,000 people (equivalent to highest levels of provision in urban parts of the district at present). - In rural areas, 0.62 ha. per 1,000 people (equivalent to highest levels of provision in rural parts of the district at present). • Quality: 'A clean, well kept and secure site that encourages sustainable communities, biodiversity and healthy living with appropriate ancillary facilities to meet local needs, clearly marked pathways to and within the site'. • Accessibility: 10 minutes walking time (800m).
Churchyards/ cemeteries	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quantitative standard: No standard set. • Quality: 'A well maintained, clean and safe site with the provision of seating areas, clear footpaths and car parking either on site or nearby. The site will encourage biodiversity by providing varied vegetation and aim to be an oasis for quiet contemplation'. • Accessibility: No standard set.

<i>Type of greenspace</i>	<i>Standard</i>
Green corridors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quantitative standard: No standard set. • Quality: ‘Clean, well maintained safe and secure routes with clear, level and well drained paths, which are provided by the protection and reinforcement of existing vegetation. The green corridor should provide links to major open spaces, urban areas and community facilities. Sites should provide a natural wildlife habitat, cyclist provision and ancillary accommodation such as seating and toilets where appropriate’. • Accessibility: No standard set.
Civic spaces	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quantitative standard: No standard set. • Quality: ‘A clean, safe, litter and graffiti free community site which encourages a sense of place where local distinctiveness and traditions can be celebrated. The civic space will provide public art and ancillary facilities, where appropriate, to accommodate a wide range of users’. • Accessibility: No standard set.

14) A review of the PPG17 standards led to the production of the following revisions:

<i>Type of greenspace</i>	<i>Revised Standard</i>
Natural/semi-natural greenspace	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quantitative standard: Urban and rural standards for existing provision were set as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In urban areas, 0.53ha. per 1,000 people (equivalent to the average levels of provision in urban parts of the district at present). - In rural areas, 3.74ha. per 1,000 people (equivalent to the average levels of provision in rural parts of the district at present). For future provision: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In urban areas, 0.53ha. per 1,000 people (equivalent to the average levels of provision in urban parts of the district at present). - In rural areas, 1.55ha. per 1,000 people (equivalent to the average levels of provision for the district as a whole at present). • Quality: ‘A publicly accessible, spacious, clean and litter free site with clear pathways and natural features that encourage wildlife conservation and biodiversity. Sites should be maintained to protect nature conservation interest, with interpretive signage and safety features where appropriate’. • Accessibility: 15 minutes walking time (1,200m).
Multi-Use Games Areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quantitative standard: One MUGA per 5,000 people, to be provided in conjunction with children’s play space allocations. • Quality: Safe and secure locations with good access to sites that include ancillary facilities such as teen shelters and seating. • Accessibility: Within 15 minutes walking time (1,200m) of the whole population.
Tennis courts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quantitative standard: One outdoor court per 3,500 people. • Quality: Courts should: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Be free from dog fouling, vandalism, graffiti and litter. - Have level, well-drained and good quality surfaces. - Have good quality ancillary facilities. - Have maintenance and management that ensures safety and effective usage. • Accessibility: Within 15 minutes walking time (1,200m) of the urban population and 15 minutes driving time (12km) of the rural population.
Bowling greens	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quantitative standard: One bowling green per 12,000 people. • Quality: Greens should: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Be free from dog fouling, vandalism, graffiti and litter. - Have level, well-drained and good quality surfaces. - Have good quality ancillary facilities. - Have maintenance and management that ensures safety and effective usage. • Accessibility: Within 15 minutes driving time (12km) of the whole population.

<i>Type of greenspace</i>	<i>Revised Standard</i>
Golf courses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quantitative standard: One 18-hole golf course per 17,500 people. • Quality: Courses should: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Be free from dog fouling, vandalism, graffiti and litter. - Have level, well-drained and good quality surfaces. - Have good quality ancillary facilities. - Have maintenance and management that ensures safety and effective usage. • Accessibility: Within 15 minutes driving time (12km) of the whole population.
Allotments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quantitative standard: 0.31 ha. per 1,000 people (equivalent to highest levels of provision in the district at present). • Quality: 'A clean, well kept and secure site that encourages sustainable communities, biodiversity and healthy living with appropriate ancillary facilities to meet local needs, clearly marked pathways to and within the site'. • Accessibility: 10 minutes walking time (800m).

Applying the greenspace standards

15) Applying the standards of provision to the current and future population of the district produced the following assessment of deficiencies. Surpluses are shown in brackets:

a) *Parks and gardens:*

<i>Analysis area</i>	<i>Current provision</i>	<i>Current shortfall</i>	<i>Future needs</i>	<i>Future shortfall</i>
Banbury	20.14ha	0.0ha	23.42ha	3.28ha
Bicester	2.74ha	10.90ha	17.83ha	6.93ha
Kidlington	0.0ha	6.59ha	6.95ha	0.36ha
Total urban	22.88ha	17.49ha	48.20ha	10.57ha

b) *Natural and semi-natural greenspace:*

<i>Analysis area</i>	<i>Current provision</i>	<i>Current shortfall</i>	<i>Future needs</i>	<i>Future shortfall</i>
Banbury	20.85ha	1.34ha	25.86ha	3.67ha
Bicester	16.35ha	(1.14ha)	19.69ha	3.34ha
Kidlington	7.57ha	(0.29ha)	7.68ha	0.11ha
Rural north	22.36ha	48.12ha	75.74ha	5.26ha
Rural central	84.70ha	(37.60ha)	49.20ha	(35.50ha)
Rural south	52.16ha	8.56ha	66.22ha	5.50ha
Cherwell	203.99ha	58.02ha	244.39ha	17.88ha

c) *Amenity greenspace:*

<i>Analysis area</i>	<i>Current provision</i>	<i>Current shortfall</i>	<i>Future needs</i>	<i>Future shortfall</i>
Banbury	28.51ha	0.0ha	24.39ha	0.0ha
Bicester	9.75ha	4.60ha	18.57ha	4.22ha
Kidlington	4.75ha	2.12ha	7.25ha	0.38ha
Rural north	10.06ha	4.08ha	16.68ha	2.55ha
Rural central	9.72ha	0.0ha	11.21ha	1.49ha
Rural south	8.66ha	3.52ha	14.84ha	2.66ha
Cherwell	71.45ha	14.31ha	92.94ha	14.74ha

d) *Provision for children and young people:*

- *Younger children:*

<i>Analysis area</i>	<i>Current provision</i>	<i>Current shortfall</i>	<i>Future needs</i>	<i>Future shortfall</i>
Banbury	5.19ha	19.51ha	28.79ha	4.09ha
Bicester	3.27ha	13.67ha	21.91ha	4.97ha
Kidlington	0.38ha	7.73ha	8.55ha	0.44ha
Rural north	1.81ha	9.24ha	13.12ha	2.20ha
Rural central	0.98ha	6.45ha	8.82ha	1.39ha
Rural south	1.91ha	7.67ha	11.68ha	2.10ha
<i>Cherwell</i>	<i>13.54ha</i>	<i>64.27ha</i>	<i>92.87ha</i>	<i>14.99ha</i>

- *Older children:*

<i>Analysis area</i>	<i>Current provision</i>	<i>Current shortfall</i>	<i>Future needs</i>	<i>Future shortfall</i>
Banbury	5.19ha	2.76ha	9.27ha	1.32ha
Bicester	3.27ha	2.18ha	7.06ha	1.61ha
Kidlington	0.38ha	2.23ha	2.75ha	0.14ha
Rural north	1.88ha	1.70ha	4.23ha	0.65ha
Rural central	0.88ha	1.41ha	2.84ha	0.45ha
Rural south	1.91ha	1.17ha	3.76ha	0.68ha
<i>Cherwell</i>	<i>13.54ha</i>	<i>10.82ha</i>	<i>29.91ha</i>	<i>4.82ha</i>

- *Multi-Use Games Areas:*

<i>Analysis area</i>	<i>Current provision</i>	<i>Current shortfall</i>	<i>Future needs</i>	<i>Future shortfall</i>
Banbury	8	0	10	2
Bicester	5	1	7	1
Kidlington	2	1	3	0
Rural north	4	0	5	1
Rural central	4	(1)	5	0
Rural south	1	2	4	1
<i>Cherwell</i>	<i>24</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>32</i>	<i>5</i>

e) *Outdoor sports facilities:*

- *Tennis courts:*

<i>Analysis area</i>	<i>Current provision</i>	<i>Current shortfall</i>	<i>Future needs</i>	<i>Future shortfall</i>
Banbury	9	3	14	2
Bicester	7	1	11	3
Kidlington	2	2	4	0
Rural north	12	(7)	6	(6)
Rural central	5	(1)	4	(1)
Rural south	2	3	6	1

<i>Cherwell</i>	<i>35</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>45</i>	<i>6</i>
------------------------	------------------	-----------------	------------------	-----------------

- ***Bowling greens:***

<i>Analysis area</i>	<i>Current provision</i>	<i>Current shortfall</i>	<i>Future needs</i>	<i>Future shortfall</i>
Banbury	3	0	4	1
Bicester	1	1	2	0
Kidlington	1	0	1	0
Rural north	2	0	2	0
Rural central	2	(1)	1	(1)
Rural south	1	0	2	1
<i>Cherwell</i>	<i>10</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>12</i>	<i>2</i>

- ***Golf courses:***

<i>Analysis area</i>	<i>Current provision</i>	<i>Current shortfall</i>	<i>Future needs</i>	<i>Future shortfall</i>
Banbury	0	2	2	0
Bicester	0	2	2	0
Kidlington	0	1	1	0
Rural north	3	(2)	1	0
Rural central	0	1	1	1
Rural south	4	(3)	1	0
<i>Cherwell</i>	<i>7</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>8</i>	<i>1</i>

f) ***Allotments and community gardens:***

<i>Analysis area</i>	<i>Current provision</i>	<i>Current shortfall</i>	<i>Future needs</i>	<i>Future shortfall</i>
Banbury	6.86ha	6.12ha	15.12ha	2.14ha
Bicester	3.51ha	5.39ha	11.51ha	2.61ha
Kidlington	3.21ha	1.05ha	4.49ha	0.23ha
Rural north	7.08ha	(1.23ha)	6.89ha	(0.19ha)
Rural central	9.87ha	(5.97ha)	4.63ha	(5.24ha)
Rural south	10.02ha	(4.99ha)	6.13ha	(3.89ha)
<i>Cherwell</i>	<i>40.55ha</i>	<i>0.37ha</i>	<i>48.77ha</i>	<i>7.85ha</i>

The Action Plan

16) ***Introduction:*** The action plan identifies ways of meeting the identified deficiencies in greenspace provision in Cherwell district will be met.

17) ***Delivery partners:*** There are a range of delivery partners, including the following both individually and in partnership:

a) Cherwell District Council.

b) Town and parish councils.

- c) Schools.
 - d) Voluntary organisations.
 - e) Commercial organisations.
 - f) Housing developers.
- 18) **Implementation options:** There are several options for implementing the action plan:
- a) **New provision.**
 - b) **Upgrading provision:** This can be achieved through:
 - Extended provision.
 - Improved provision.
 - c) **Enhanced access:** Improving access to existing greenspace provision can be achieved in a number of ways:
 - Formal agreements.
 - Physical improvements.
 - Public transport improvements.
 - Rights of way improvements.
 - Information and awareness.
 - d) **Integrated provision:** Combining greenspace provision can broaden the appeal of a site.
- 19) **Funding options:** There are several external funding options including:
- a) Developer contributions.
 - b) Lottery funding.
 - c) Landfill tax and aggregates levy.
 - d) Charities and trusts.
- 20) **Action Plan:** The action plan sets out how and where the identified deficiencies in greenspace provision in Cherwell district will be met.

I.

INTRODUCTION

I INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 Ploszajski Lynch Consulting Ltd. (PLC) was commissioned by Cherwell District Council (CDC) to produce a green spaces strategy, to build upon a recently completed study of open space, sport and recreation in the district, undertaken in line with Planning Policy Guidance Note 17 (PPG17).

Project background

- 1.2 ***The PPG17 study:*** The 2006 study audited open space provision in the district, recommended local standards of provision and identified gaps in provision on an area basis for the different types of open space. It also identified sites to be protected and enhanced and broad areas of the district where new provision is required.
- 1.3 ***The green spaces strategy:*** The production of a district-wide green spaces strategy is now required to develop the findings of the PPG17 study, to set out in detail the vision and goals that the Council wants to achieve for green space in the district and the resources, methods and time needed to meet these goals.

The statutory planning context

- 1.4 ***Planning policy:*** Current planning policies and proposals concerning public open space, sport and recreation are contained in the Oxfordshire Structure Plan 2016, the adopted Cherwell Local Plan 1996 and the non-statutory Cherwell Local Plan 2011. The adopted local plan, together with the Structure Plan and RPG9, forms the statutory Development Plan for the district.
- 1.5 ***Future proposals:*** The non-statutory Cherwell Local Plan 2011 has been approved by the Council as interim policy for development control purposes, but will not be progressed to the final stages to adoption. Instead, CDC will prepare Development Plan Documents (DPDs) under the new Local Development Framework (LDF) system.
- 1.6 ***Green spaces strategy status:*** The green spaces strategy will be used as part of the evidence base for the Council's LDF and in preparing policies and proposals in DPDs. New recreation site allocations and related policies to protect and enhance existing sites required as a result of the strategy will be included in a Delivery DPD. Policies setting out local standards of provision are to be included in the Core Strategy DPD.
- 1.7 ***Developer contributions:*** The strategy will also assist in determining greenspace requirements in association with new development and be used in determining planning applications and negotiating developer contributions through Section 106 agreements.

Other considerations

- 1.8 ***Town and parish councils:*** Third tier government plays an important role throughout the district, in the provision and maintenance of green spaces, therefore appropriate consultation with town and parish councils must form an integral part of the strategy production process.
- 1.9 ***Methodology:*** The methodology should follow the guidance in the CABE Space ‘*Green Space Strategies: A Good Practice Guide*’. The PPG17 study will provide information and background for the production of the strategy. The strategy should confirm the Council’s approach to each type of open space and its priorities and associated timescale for delivery.
- 1.10 ***Site-specific assessment:*** Clear indication should be given as to which sites allocated in the non-statutory Cherwell Local Plan 2011 for recreation use should continue to be designated as such in whole or part, for which type of open space and with what justification. The PPG17 report indicates that all sites should continue to be allocated because there is a deficiency of at least two types of open space in each analysis area. The strategy needs to clarify which sites or parts of sites should meet each type of deficiency.
- 1.11 ***Multi-functional networks:*** The strategy should consider the potential for maintaining and extending strategic links to form multi-functional networks of open space. The requirements for green infrastructure provision in relation to the urban areas of the district will form an important component of directions of growth to be identified in the Council’s Core Strategy. It should also reflect Natural England’s vision for countryside in and around towns.
- 1.12 ***Strategy content:*** Since the strategy will form part of the evidence base for the Council’s DPDs, it will need to cover the period to 2026 to be consistent with the timescale for LDF. The strategy should also include the following:
- a) An action plan for delivering the strategy together with a monitoring procedure to ensure the action plan is delivered.
 - b) Suggestions as to where and how any shortfall of specific green spaces may be delivered.
 - c) Identification of any outstanding maintenance or indication of any sites that are in need of enhancement.
 - d) Identification of external sources of funding that the council could realistically utilise in conjunction with developer contributions to maximise any identified works.
 - e) Establishment of how and where uses can be decanted and/or reconfigured to maximise utilisation of some sites, or be converted/equipped to meet an identified deficiency.

- f) Any rationalisation, having regard to any surplus capacity, areas of demand, site quality and facilities (bearing in mind any particular features and/or habitat of the site), potential for alternative use (including adjacent uses and access arrangements), relative costs of running each site, any longer term investment that a site might require and any legal constraints.

1.13 ***Proposed developments:*** Clear indication needs to be given of the need to allocate new green space provision and if so, the number, type and location. The strategy should indicate the council's priorities on a town and village basis. From a planning point of view, the strategy should show:

- a) Whether there is a need for further provision. The PPG17 study should provide the data to establish surpluses and deficiencies but the local context needs extrapolating and the strategy made clear for each town and village.
- b) Where new development is likely, whether the need is for on or off site provision. This includes definition of the thresholds for on-site provision, the type of space to be provided, whether some provision could be amalgamated with another and whether there might be a mix of on and off site provision.
- c) The type of on-site ancillary facility requirements.
- d) For off-site provision, the allocation needs to be related to a specific site or scheme with clear deliverables that show how they are meeting the needs of the new development and therefore need to be related to all parts of the district.

1.14 ***Area-based fund:*** The strategy should include the exploration of schemes supported by an area-based fund as recommended by the PPG17 study.

Project scope

1.15 ***Green space included:*** The types of green space that are included in the strategy are those covered by the PPG17 study and are as follows:

- a) Parks and gardens.
- b) Natural and semi-natural green space.
- c) Amenity green space.
- d) Provision for children and young people.
- e) Outdoor sports facilities.
- f) Allotments and community gardens.
- g) Cemeteries and churchyards.
- h) Green corridors.

- i) Civic spaces.

The methodology adopted

- 1.16 ***Introduction:*** To meet the requirements of the brief, the following methodology was adopted, in line with the three phase approach advocated by the Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment (CABE) for this stage of the strategy production process, namely:
- a) Preliminary activities.
 - b) Information gathering and analysis.
 - c) Strategy production.
- 1.17 ***Preliminary activities:*** Most of the preliminary activities were previously undertaken by CDC, but the following tasks were undertaken from those advocated by CABE for this stage of the strategy production process:
- a) Identifying links with other council strategies.
 - b) Reviewing previous work and existing data.
 - c) Preparing a strategy framework report.
- 1.18 ***Information gathering and analysis:*** The majority of the information gathering and analysis was based upon the PPG17 study and other relevant existing documentation. From this material, the evidence base was developed in the format recommended by CABE, which included:
- a) A summary of national, regional and local policy.
 - b) An analysis of demographic issues, including growth to 2026 (to conform with the LDF timeframe).
 - c) A summary of the landscape and ecological characteristics of the area.
 - d) A review of the assessment of supply of green spaces in the PPG17 study.
 - e) A review of the assessment of need and demand (including consultation) in the PPG17 study.
 - f) An identification of local standards in the PPG17 study.
 - g) The application of standards to identify surpluses or deficits at sub-area and ward level.
 - h) The definition of priorities.

- 1.19 **Strategy Production:** A draft strategy was produced, built upon the evidence base from the preceding work, which contained:
- a) A synopsis of the evidence base outlined above.
 - b) The application of the local standards of provision, to identify surpluses and deficiencies in provision. The assessment was conducted at:
 - Sub-area level.
 - Ward level.
 - c) Currently and at specified dates in the future, based upon projected increases in population and participation.
 - d) Suggestions as to where and how shortfalls in green space may be delivered.
 - e) An action plan for delivering the strategy together with a monitoring procedure to ensure the action plan is delivered.
 - f) Identification of any outstanding maintenance or indication of any provision that is in need of enhancement.
 - g) Identification of external sources of funding that the council could realistically utilise in conjunction with developer contributions to maximise any identified works.
 - h) Establishment of how and where uses can be decanted and/or reconfigured to maximise utilisation of some sites, or be converted/equipped to meet an identified deficiency.

Report format

- 1.20 To meet the provisions of the brief, this document adopts the following format:
- a) Introduction.
 - b) Strategic vision and policy overlay.
 - c) A summary of national, regional and local policy.
 - d) A summary of the district context, including an analysis of demographic issues, including population growth and a summary of the landscape and ecological characteristics of the area.
 - e) A review of the assessment of the current provision of green spaces in the PPG17 study including the identification of local standards.
 - f) The application of standards to identify deficiencies at sub-area and ward level.
 - g) Action plan.

II.

STRATEGIC VISION AND POLICY OVERLAY

II STRATEGIC VISION AND POLICY OVERLAY

Section summary

2.1 This section contains the vision for the strategy and the related policy overlay.

Vision

2.2 The vision for green spaces in Cherwell is *‘to provide, safeguard and develop a network of safe, accessible and attractive green spaces that are valued, well managed and maintained and enhance the quality of life, sense of well-being, health and learning opportunities of all sections of the community’*.

Policy overlay

2.3 **Introduction:** In support of the vision, a number of policies have been developed in consultation with local people and taking account of the specific physical, demographic and strategic context of Cherwell district, and these are in turn reflected in the assessment of green spaces provision in the strategy.

2.4 **Locally derived standards of provision:** Planning Policy Guidance 17 ‘Open Space, Sport and Recreation’ (PPG17) states that ‘the Government believes that open space, sport and recreation standards are best set locally. Local authorities should use the information gained from their assessments of needs and opportunities to set robust local standards. These should form the basis for redressing quantitative and qualitative deficiencies through the planning process’. The standards of provision proposed in the Cherwell Green Spaces Strategy are therefore based upon a detailed assessment of local needs. In most cases this has involved:

- a) Identifying the highest levels of green space provision per capita in six designated ‘sub-areas’ of the district.
- b) Consulting with local communities to seek their views on the current adequacy of provision.
- c) Setting a districtwide standard that in most cases relates to the highest levels of provision at present, where local people feel that the quantity of green space is ‘about right’.

2.5 **Minimum standards of provision:** The standards of provision for green spaces should be regarded as the minimum levels required to meet existing needs. This means that it will be appropriate to:

- a) Seek higher levels of provision in appropriate circumstances where opportunities permit it.
- b) Regularly review and amend the standards as needs like increased rates of physical activity evolve over time.

- 2.6 **Urban and rural differences:** PPG17 states that ‘residents in rural areas cannot realistically expect to have the same level of access to the full range of different types of green spaces that are generally available in the more densely populated urban areas. Equally, if the total amount of open space in rural areas is assessed against an ‘urban’ provision standard, there might appear to be a surplus. This means that some local authorities may require both urban and rural standards’. For this reason, the standard of provision and associated assessment of amenity green space in Cherwell includes differential urban and rural standards.
- 2.7 **Existing and new developments:** In some of the more densely populated urban parts of the district, opportunities for meeting identified deficiencies in green spaces are limited by the absence of opportunities in such built-up areas. Similarly, in some rural areas where most land is in private ownership, securing public access to green spaces may not be possible. However, the opportunities presented by new residential developments may offer the flexibility to achieve enhanced levels of greenspace provision, recognising that the current standards represent an assessment of the minimum amounts that are needed.
- 2.8 **Quality of provision:** Quality criteria were set in consultation with local communities, to define the condition to which each green space in the district should aspire. The quality of each site was assessed in relation to a set of objective criteria relating to wider norms and over time all identified qualitative deficiencies will be addressed progressively as resources and opportunities allow.
- 2.9 **Multi-functionality:** The form of assessment advocated by PPG17 requires green spaces to be categorised in relation to their primary function only. The advantage of this is that there is no ‘double counting’ of sites, but the disadvantage is that the multi-function nature of many sites is downplayed. As an example, an area designated as a playing pitch may be used for its primary function for only 1.5 hours per week and as amenity greenspace for the remainder of the time, but the latter function will not be included in the formal assessment. For this reason, combined standards of provision for the following generic types of greenspace provision will be applied to new developments:
- a) General greenspace (combining parks and gardens, natural and semi-natural greenspace and amenity greenspace).
 - b) Playspace (combining provision for younger and older children).
 - c) Outdoor sports provision (combining tennis courts, bowling greens, golf courses and playing pitches).
 - d) Allotments.
- 2.10 **Environmental sustainability:** To reflect the principles of environmental sustainability, green space provision will normally be made within walking distance catchments, the details of which will reflect local travel time tolerances. New areas of greenspace will therefore be located wherever possible to maximise their accessibility by non-vehicular forms of transport.

2.11 ***Provision relating to new developments:*** The following principles will apply:

- a) All new dwellings should contribute towards the provision of greenspaces. For smaller developments where on-site provision is not achievable, a financial contribution will be sought from developers towards the improvement of provision elsewhere, where appropriate schemes can be identified within the defined catchment.
- b) On-site provision of greenspace will be sought on developments of ten dwellings or more in urban areas and six dwellings or more in rural areas.
- c) The precise nature, composition and size of greenspace provision in new developments will be determined in relation to the overall size of the development and with reference to the minimum standards of provision.
- d) The identification of schemes in each defined catchment area for which financial contributions will be sought will be defined in the Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document, to be progressed in tandem with the Core Strategy and Delivery Development Plan Documents. In some cases the catchments areas will relate to wards, in some to villages and in others to clusters of villages, but in each case will take account of the likelihood of development coming forward at a rate sufficient to provide the identified schemes.
- e) Financial contributions will relate to the size of each dwelling and their anticipated occupancy rates.

2.12 ***'Surplus' provision:*** In some instances the application of districtwide standards at ward or parish level produces an apparent 'surplus' of greenspace provision. However, this should not be interpreted as signifying that the 'surplus' could be disposed of because:

- The standards against which the 'surplus' was assessed are the minimum that are required to meet current local needs. Local concentrations of existing demand and future increases in greenspace usage will both inflate the amount of provision needed to levels well above the minimum stipulation.
- An apparent 'surplus' in one form of greenspace will often compensate for shortfalls in other types of provision locally.
- Some of the larger areas of greenspace serve wider than local needs, with usage catchments well beyond the immediate boundaries of the parish or ward in which they are located. In such cases, it is clearly inappropriate to assess the adequacy of provision solely in relation to the size of the local population.

2.13 ***Community involvement:*** In determining the precise nature of new and improved greenspace in each locality, Cherwell District Council will:

- a) Consult with those with a specific interest in the use of the greenspace (such as young people with play provision), to ensure that wherever possible the new provision meets their needs.

- b) Involve town and parish councils in confirming local needs and the optimum way of meeting them, both in terms of additional provision and its ongoing management.

Conclusions

- 2.14 The strategic vision and policy overlay set the context for the direction and content of the strategy and are informed by the information in the subsequent sections on the overall policy context and the findings of the PPG17 Study.

III.

THE POLICY CONTEXT

III THE POLICY CONTEXT

Section summary

- 3.1 **Introduction:** This section analyses the national and local policy context for the Cherwell green spaces strategy. The areas covered include national and local policies.
- 3.2 **National green space policy:** Government policy emphasises the value of green space for:
- a) Social inclusion and community cohesion.
 - b) Environmental benefits and biodiversity.
 - c) Health and well being.
 - d) Sustainable development.
 - e) Social and economic regeneration.
- 3.3 **National planning policy:** Local authorities are encouraged to:
- a) Assess local green space needs and opportunities.
 - b) Set local green space standards.
 - c) Maintain an adequate supply of green spaces.
 - d) Plan for new green spaces.
- 3.4 **District policy:** The Community Plan identifies several policy areas where green space provision can contribute to wider policy agendas, in particular improving health and well-being.
- 3.5 **District planning policy:** The Local Plan has a range of policies to protect and enhance green space provision.
- 3.6 **Guidance note on open space provision:** The Guidance Note establishes key principles and procedures by which open space, sport and recreation provision will be made and subsequently managed in new residential developments.
- 3.7 **District environmental policies:** The Environment Strategy embeds environmental principles in all other planning areas.

CABE Space

- 3.8 **Introduction:** CABE Space is part of the Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment and is Government funded. CABE Space aims 'to bring excellence to the design, management and maintenance of parks and public space in towns and cities'. Its following publications are summarised below:

- a) *'Green Space Strategies - A Good Practice Guide'* (2004).
- b) *'Manifesto for Better Public Spaces'* (2003).
- c) *'The Value of Public Space'* (2004).

3.9 ***Green Space Strategies - A Good Practice Guide:*** The document highlights the opportunities and benefits that green space strategies provide, including:

- a) Reinforcing local identity and enhancing the physical character of an area, so shaping existing and future development.
- b) Maintaining the visual amenity and increasing the attractiveness of a locality to create a sense of civic pride.
- c) Securing external funding and focusing capital and revenue expenditure cost effectively.
- d) Improving physical and social inclusion including accessibility, particularly for young disabled and older people.
- e) Protecting and enhancing levels of biodiversity and ecological habitats.

3.10 ***Manifesto for better public spaces:*** The manifesto contains ten proposals for improving public spaces:

- a) Ensure that creating and caring for well-designed parks, streets and other public spaces is a national and local political priority.
- b) Encourage people of all ages - including children, young people and retired people - to play an active role in deciding what our parks and public spaces should be like and how they should be looked after.
- c) Ensure that everyone understands the importance of good design to the vitality of our cities, towns and suburbs and that designers, planners and managers all have the right skills to create high quality public spaces.
- d) Ensure that the care of parks and public spaces is acknowledged to be an essential service.
- e) Work to increase public debate about the issue of risk in outside spaces and encourage people to make decisions that give more weight to the benefits of interesting spaces, rather than the perceived risks.
- f) Work to ensure that national and local health policy recognises the role of high quality parks and public space in helping people to become physically active, to recover from illness and to increase their general health and well being.
- g) Work to ensure that good paths and seating, play opportunities, signs in local languages, cultural events and arts are understood to be essential elements of great places - not optional extras to be cut from the budget.

- h) Encourage people who are designing and managing parks and public spaces to protect and enhance biodiversity and to promote its enjoyment to local people.
- i) Seek to ensure that public spaces feel safe to use by encouraging councils to adopt a positive approach to crime prevention through investment in good design and management of the whole network of urban green spaces.
- j) Encourage people from all sectors of the community to give time to improving their local environment. If we work together, we can transform our public spaces and help to improve everyone's quality of life.

3.11 ***The value of public space:*** CABE space highlights the following values of public space:

- a) ***Economic value:*** A high quality public environment is an essential part of any regeneration strategy and can impact positively on the local economy.
- b) ***Physical and mental health:*** Research has shown that well maintained public spaces can help to improve physical and mental health, encouraging more people to be active.
- c) ***Children and young people:*** Good quality public spaces encourage children to play freely outdoors and experience the natural environment, providing them with opportunities for fun, exercise and learning.
- d) ***Reducing crime:*** Better management of public spaces can help to reduce crime rates and help to allay fear of crime, especially in open spaces.
- e) ***Social interaction:*** Well designed and maintained open spaces can bring communities together, providing meeting places in the right context and fostering social ties.
- f) ***Movement:*** A fundamental function of open space is to allow people to move around, with the challenge of reconciling the needs of different modes of transport.
- g) ***Biodiversity:*** Public spaces and gardens help to bring important environmental benefits to urban areas, as well as providing an opportunity for people to be close to nature.

Department for Communities and Local Government

3.12 ***Introduction:*** The DCLG and its predecessor departments for Local Government, Transport and the Regions and the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister, produced the following policy documents, each of which is summarised below:

- a) Planning Policy Guidance 17 (PPG17) '*Planning for Open Space, Sport and Recreation*' (2002).
- b) '*Green Spaces, Better Places - The Final Report of the Urban Green Spaces taskforce*' (2002).
- c) '*Improving Urban Parks, Play Areas and Green Spaces*' (2002).

- 3.13 **PPG17:** In July 2002, the Government issued Planning Policy Guidance 17 ‘*Planning for Open Space, Sport and Recreation*’ superceding the earlier 1991 version and setting out Government policy on green space provision.
- 3.14 The document states that ‘open spaces, sport and recreation all underpin people’s quality of life. Well-designed and implemented planning policies for open space, sport and recreation are therefore fundamental to delivering broader Government objectives’. These include:
- a) ***Supporting an urban renaissance:*** ‘Local networks of high-quality, well-managed and maintained open space, sport and recreation facilities help create urban environments that are attractive, clean and safe’.
 - b) ***Supporting a rural renewal:*** ‘Open spaces within rural settlements and accessibility to local sports and recreation facilities contribute to the quality of life and well-being of people who live in rural areas’.
 - c) ***Promotion of social inclusion and community cohesion:*** ‘Well planned and maintained open spaces and good quality sport and recreation facilities can help play a major part in improving people’s sense of well-being in the place they live. As a focal point for community activities, they can bring together members of deprived communities and provide opportunities for social interaction’.
 - d) ***Health and well-being:*** ‘Open space, sport and recreation facilities have a vital role to play in promoting healthy living and preventing illness and in the social development of children of all ages through play, sporting activities and interaction with others’.
 - e) ***Promoting more sustainable development:*** ‘By ensuring that open space, sport and recreation facilities are easily accessible by walking and cycling and that more heavily used or intensive sports and recreation facilities are planned for locations served by public transport’.
- 3.15 Local authorities are encouraged to undertake the following exercises:
- a) ***Assessments of needs and opportunities:***
 - To ensure effective planning for green spaces, it is essential that the needs of local communities are known. Local authorities should undertake robust assessments of the existing and future needs of their communities.
 - As a minimum, assessments of need should cover the differing and distinctive needs of the population for green spaces.
 - Local authorities should also undertake audits of green space, the use made of existing provision, access in terms of location and costs and opportunities for open space. Audits should consider both the qualitative and quantitative elements of the sites. Audits of quality will be particularly important as they will allow local authorities to identify potential for increased use through better design, management and maintenance.

- Assessments and audits will allow local authorities to identify specific needs and quantitative or qualitative deficits or surpluses of green spaces and will form the start point for a clear strategy and effective planning policies. They will provide vital tools for resolving the potential conflicts that arise between different uses of open space.
 - The Government expects all local authorities to carry out assessments of need and audits of open space in accordance with the above.
- b) **Setting local standards:** The Government believes that green space standards are best set locally. Local authorities should use the information gained from their assessments of needs and opportunities to set local standards, including:
- **Quantitative elements:** How much provision may be needed.
 - **Qualitative components:** Against which to measure the need for enhancement of existing facilities.
 - **Accessibility:** Including distance thresholds and cost factors.
- c) **Maintaining an adequate supply of green spaces:** Existing green space should not be built upon unless an assessment has been undertaken which has clearly shown it to be surplus to requirements. Sites that are of high quality, or of particular quality to a local community, should be recognised and given protection by local authorities through appropriate policies in plans.
- d) **Planning for new green spaces:** In identifying where to locate new green spaces, local authorities should:
- Promote accessibility by walking, cycling and public transport and ensure that facilities are accessible for people with disabilities.
 - Avoid any significant loss of amenity to residents, neighbouring uses or biodiversity.
 - Improve the quality of the public realm through good design.
 - Add to and enhance the range and quality of existing facilities.
 - Carefully consider security and personal safety, especially for children.
 - Assess the impact of new facilities on social inclusion.
 - Consider the recreational needs of visitors and tourists.

3.16 **Green Spaces, Better Places:** The report concluded the following:

- a) Urban parks and open spaces remain popular, despite a decline in quality as well as quantitative elements.
- b) Open spaces make an important contribution to the quality of life in many areas and help to deliver wider social, economic and environmental benefits.

- c) Planners and planning mechanisms need to take better account of the need for parks and open spaces, including related management and maintenance issues.
- d) Parks and open spaces should be central to any vision of sustainable modern towns and cities.
- e) Strong civic values and local pride and responsibility are necessary to achieve the vision reinforced by a successful green spaces strategy.
- f) There is a need for a more co-ordinated approach at the national level to guide local strategies.

3.17 ***Improving green spaces:*** The report examined patterns of use, barriers and the wider role of green space in urban regeneration. It concluded the following:

- a) ***The wider value of green spaces:*** Green spaces can help to meet wider council policy objectives, such as education, health, diversity, safety, the environment, jobs and regeneration. In particular they:
 - Contribute significantly to social inclusion because they are free and accessible to all.
 - Can become a centre of community spirit.
 - Contribute to child development through the scope for outdoor, energetic and imaginative play.
 - Offer numerous educational benefits.
 - Provide a range of health, environmental and economic benefits.
- b) ***Community involvement:*** Community involvement in local parks can lead to increased use, enhancement of quality and richness of experience and, in particular, can ensure that the facilities are suited to local needs.
- c) ***Resources:*** The acknowledged decline in the quality of care for green spaces in England can be linked to declining local authority green space budgets. However, the Heritage Lottery Fund and Section 106 agreements provide valuable sources of external funding.
- d) ***Partnerships:*** Links between a local authority and community groups, funding agencies and business can result in significant added value, both in terms of finances and quality of green space.
- e) ***Urban renewal:*** Four levels of integration of green space into urban renewal were identified:
 - Attracting inward economic investment through the provision of attractive urban landscape.
 - Unforeseen spin-offs from grassroots green space initiatives.

- Parks as flagships in neighbourhood renewal.
- Strategic, multi-agency, area-based regeneration, linking environment and economy.

Cherwell District Council policy documents

3.18 This section examines local policy influences on playing pitch provision. It covers the following:

- a) *'The Cherwell Community Plan 2016'* (2005).
- b) *'The Non-Statutory Cherwell Local Plan 2011'* (2004).
- c) *'Recreation and Amenity Open Space Provision: The Provision of Open Space in New Residential Development - Guidance Note'* (2004).
- d) *'The Cherwell Environment Strategy'* (2002).
- e) *'The Cherwell Biodiversity Action Plan'*.
- f) *'Oxfordshire's Play Strategy with Implementation Plan for Cherwell'* (2007).

3.19 ***The Cherwell Community Plan:*** The Plan sets out a long-term vision for the district and contains ten visions with associated aims, many of which are relevant to green spaces.

- a) ***Reducing crime and tackling the drugs problem:*** Making Cherwell a safer place to live.
- b) ***Improving health and reducing health inequalities:*** Green space-related actions include:
 - Promoting participation in active recreation as a key component of a healthy lifestyle, including exercise on prescription.
 - Promoting the benefits of planned 'health walks' to sedentary people and/or those recovering from ill health.
 - Increasing physical activity in schools.
- c) ***Improving education:*** Raising standards in schools and colleges.
- d) ***Securing more affordable housing:*** Development pressures need to be managed, with protection for existing green spaces and additional provision to meet local needs. Green space-related actions include:
 - Protecting and improving the landscape, natural habitat and woodland heritage.
 - Providing parks, play areas and open spaces in line with local needs.

- Protecting Cherwell's natural woodland heritage through adopting a Tree and Woodland Plan and associated management plan and also by undertaking a full audit of ancient trees.
 - Establishing a tree planting and nature conservation scheme to promote community involvement, public access and improved education.
- e) ***Improving recreation opportunities:*** This involves widening participation, supporting recreational activities and expanding or developing new facilities.
- f) ***Rural perspective:*** Preserving and enhancing the quality of rural life includes the following actions of relevance to green spaces:
- Encouraging vibrant and thriving village communities.
 - Ensuring accessible services and facilities.
 - Preserving Cherwell's environmental character in rural areas.
 - Conserving the quality and appearance of the landscape.
 - Maintaining the open countryside through the control of development, including the Oxford Green Belt.
 - Promoting greater access to the countryside for walkers, cyclists and horse riders, emphasising public footpaths and bridleways.
 - Promoting and supporting nature conservation projects which are aimed at community involvement, public access and education.
- g) ***Urban perspective:*** Developing the unique characters of Banbury, Bicester and Kidlington, including more leisure facilities.
- h) ***Improving the quality of life of all:*** This particularly involves older people, the young, disabled people and ethnic minorities.

3.20 ***The Non-Statutory Cherwell Local Plan:*** The Plan was intended to review the adopted Cherwell Local Plan 1996 but was not progressed to adoption. The Council ceased work on the Plan in 2004 and is now preparing a Local Development Framework under the new planning system. However, its policies, together with the policies of the adopted Cherwell Local Plan 1996, are still being used as a guide for current developments. The main material of relevance to green spaces are as follows:

- a) ***The Oxford Green Belt:*** The Green Belt restrains development around Oxford to protect its character and setting. Supplementary roles include:
- Providing opportunities for access to open countryside for the urban population.
 - Providing opportunities for outdoor sport and recreation near urban areas.
 - Retaining and enhancing attractive landscapes near to where people live.

- b) ***Town centres, urban renewal and local shopping:*** Policies exist to provide areas of open space at a number of redevelopment sites, particularly in Banbury which include:
- A major public square at the western entrance to the railway station.
 - A public park between the River Cherwell and the canal north of the George Street extension to the station.
 - Land adjacent to the Oxford Canal.
 - A public space at the eastern entrance to the station.
 - A public park to serve the development on the former cattle market.
 - Public outdoor playing space.
- c) ***Transport:*** Policies affecting green space provision include:
- Disused railway lines must not be severed by development where there is an opportunity to provide pedestrian and cycle routes.
 - The Oxford Canal is a valuable local resource that is currently used almost entirely for recreational purposes. Proposals that prejudice the future use of the canal for this, or other important uses, will not be permitted.
- d) ***Recreation and community facilities:*** Policies affecting green space provision include:
- The Council seeks to establish a series of green spaces based upon the River Cherwell and Oxford Canal, linked by public footpaths/cycleways. Both areas have issues regarding accessibility and quality that currently limit their usage.
 - The Council seeks to establish a series of green spaces in Bicester, linked by public footpaths and cycleways. This circular link would increase accessibility to the green spaces as well as providing new areas of open space through allocations in the plan.
- e) ***Conserving and enhancing the environment:*** The Plan aims to conserve and enhance the natural environment of the district, including its ecological resource. Any proposed development will be assessed in terms of its likely effect on nature conservation.

3.21 ***Recreation and Amenity Open Space Provision:*** The Guidance Note has been adopted by the Council as Supplementary Planning Guidance.

- a) **Purpose:** The purpose of the document is ‘to set out for those developing land, the Council’s requirements for the provision of children’s play space, outdoor sports and amenity areas to support new residential development in accordance with the Local Plan’. It should also ‘help local communities to understand the open space that is likely to be provided with new development and the role of the district, town and parish councils in the long term ownership, management and maintenance of open space areas.
- b) **Policy context:** The Council places considerable importance on achieving appropriate play, sports and amenity provision for the residents of new developments. High quality open spaces contribute to the attractiveness of areas and the quality of life of residents. Well-designed and maintained open space is greatly valued by local residents and is a valuable asset.
- c) **Sites the requirements will apply to:** The guide is principally applicable to calculating and designing open space provision for the following:
- Sites allocated in the Local plan where a development brief has not been, or is not being, prepared. (Large housing sites are normally allocated in the Local Plan and development briefs will be prepared for each of these sites which will set out in more detail the Council’s specific requirements for open space, play and sports pitch provision).
 - Other sites of ten or more dwellings, or where the number of dwellings is not specified of 0.4 hectares or more. (It is also recognised that small developments of even one or two dwellings can cumulatively generate significant requirement for recreation facilities. This is particularly relevant in villages, where development sites tend to be smaller than ten dwellings or 0.4 hectares. The Council will therefore consult parish councils to agree what threshold is appropriate for the application of the overall policy).
- d) **Standards of provision:** In the interim period whilst more detailed strategies are being developed, the standards of provision identified in open space assessments commissioned by the Council in 2000 and 2001 which are based upon the National Playing Fields Association’s 6 acres (2.4 hectares) per 1,000 people will be applied to produce the following requirements. The abbreviations used in the table are as follows:
- LAP - Local Area for Play.
 - LEAP - Local Equipped Area for Play.
 - NEAP - Neighbourhood Equipped Area for Play.
 - MUGA - Multi-Use Games Area.

<i>No. dwellings</i>	<i>Amenity areas</i>	<i>Children's play space</i>	<i>Sports provision</i>
10 dwellings - population 24.3	As appropriate to local circumstances	1 LAP (194.4 sq. m.)	388 sq. m. - Equivalent to small MUGA
50 dwellings - population 121.5	As appropriate to local circumstances	1 LEAP plus LAPs (972 sq. m.)	1,944 sq. m. - Equivalent to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 adjacent tennis /netball courts, or: • 1 bowling green with changing accommodation.
100 dwellings - population 243	As appropriate to local circumstances	1 LEAP plus LAPs (1,944 sq. m.)	3,888 sq. m. - Equivalent to <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 Mini-Soccer pitch, or: • 3 adjacent tennis/basketball/netball courts plus a bowling green, or: • 2 bowling greens with changing provision plus one MUGA.
200 dwellings - population 486	As appropriate to local circumstances	2 LEAPs plus LAPs (3,888 sq. m.)	7,666 sq. m. - Equivalent to <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2 Mini-Soccer pitches, or: • 2 adjacent courts plus 1 junior football pitch, or: • Hockey/lacrosse plus 1 court, or: • 2 Mini-Hockey pitches plus 4 MUGAs.
500 dwellings - population 1,215	As appropriate to local circumstances	1 NEAP plus LEAPs and LAPs (9,720 sq. m.)	1,944 ha. - Equivalent to <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 six-lane athletics track, or: • 1 adult football pitch plus 1 hockey pitch, or: • 1 rugby and 1 hockey pitch, or: • 1 cricket pitch (46m boundary) plus 2 bowling greens with changing provision.

- e) **Timing:** The Council will seek to ensure that the open space is provided at an appropriate time to serve the new residents of a development. Normally play areas will be required to be completed and available for use prior to the occupation of adjacent houses. On large sites, phased provision may be necessary. Where pitches are to be provided that require time to establish, an early provision will be sought to ensure their availability for use as soon as possible and before the completion of the development. Where public access to open space can safely be achieved during the development of a site, this will also be sought.
- f) **Quality:** The quality of open space, in terms of its design, implementation and maintenance can affect the level of use of the space, its attractiveness, the value placed on it by local people and the level of maintenance required. The Council will carry out quality assessments as part of the process of developing local standards and high quality designs and implementation will be sought for new provision.
- g) **Maintenance:** The long-term maintenance of open spaces is critical to ensuring they achieve and maintain their maximum potential benefit and value. In the case of new housing developments, the developer will normally be required to maintain the required provision for 12 months, although sports pitches will have a two-year establishment and maintenance period by the developer. Following this, transfer to the district, town or parish council will be accompanied by an appropriate contribution towards maintenance after adoption. This will normally be in the form of a commuted sum, to cover 15-years maintenance, secured through a Section 106 agreement.

h) **Adoption procedures:** The principles and procedures for the adoption and management of open spaces provided by developers are as follows:

- The District Council will have the responsibility for adopting open space, but will engage with the parish councils on matters of design and content.
- All open spaces to be adopted will be transferred to the District Council, with the relevant commuted sums.
- A legal agreement will be entered into with a parish which agrees to take a transfer to ensure that it will be maintained as open space and that the commuted sum will be used only for that maintenance.
- ‘Strategic’ areas of open space (i.e. serving more than the local community) will be transferred to the District Council, with the relevant commuted sums.
- Balancing ponds provided in new residential developments with areas of open space will be transferred to the District Council, with the relevant commuted sums.

3.22 **Cherwell Environment Strategy:** The Strategy is one of the medium term strategies aimed at delivering the vision and objectives of the Cherwell Community Plan. The vision of the Environment Strategy is to ‘develop a district-wide culture of good environmental practice, provide environmental education, reduce dependency of fossil fuels and increase the use of alternative energy’. The strategy has eight main themes:

- a) Incorporate the principles of ‘sustainable development’ in all plans.
- b) Promote environmentally sound transport solutions.
- c) Preserve the countryside and wildlife and protect parks and open spaces.
- d) Conserve and enhance the built environment.
- e) Reduce business and household waste, encourage reuse and increase recycling.
- f) Minimise pollution and manage local air and water quality.
- g) Increase environmental awareness and promote local community action.

3.23 **Biodiversity Action Plan:** The Plan is a working document that focuses attention and resources on those habitats and species that are under threat or are of particular importance in the district.

- a) **Key sites:** The plan identifies the following:
 - 15 Sites of Special Scientific Interest, whose condition is monitored by English Nature.

- 94 County Wildlife Sites. More than 50 of the sites have been surveyed and management advice provided, but in some cases landowners have refused permission to survey and declined provision of advice.
 - There are two nature reserves and Government agencies own or manage a number of sites with importance for biodiversity.
 - The River Cherwell and its watercourse is managed by the Environment Agency, which has a biodiversity action plan for the Thames area.
 - The Oxford Canal is owned by British Waterways and is subject to an Environmental Code of Practice.
- b) **Key habitats:** Nine Habitat Action Plans have been produced for farmland, woodland, wetland, earth heritage, aquatic, scrub, settlement, parkland and veteran trees, grassland, grazing marsh and heathland.

3.24 **Oxfordshire's Play Strategy:** The Strategy was produced by the Oxfordshire Play Partnership and sets out an overall framework for the development of play in the county, with a specific action plan for Cherwell district.

a) **Objectives:** The Strategy has the following objectives:

- To enable more people to participate.
- To improve playgrounds and other play spaces including informal and natural environments.
- To bring people of different ages and backgrounds together.
- To include everyone, regardless of background or disability.
- To make it easier to play in urban areas.
- To make it easier to play in rural areas.
- To allow children and young people to take more risks when they are playing.
- To provide more supervision and support.
- To introduce more play opportunities into out-of-school activities, childcare and extended schools.
- To try out new ideas.
- To improve information, publicity, training and public awareness.
- To improve coordination and partnership working.

b) **The Cherwell Implementation Plan:** The main focus of the Council's priorities over the next two to three years will be as follows:

- Access to play opportunities will be developed in green and open spaces, equipped playgrounds and through activity programmes.
- In urban areas, where opportunities for new equipped play areas are often limited by the absence of available sites, opportunities will generally be increased by qualitative improvements to existing equipped play areas and the provision of outreach play opportunities.
- Standards of provision will be developed through the Green Spaces Strategy, which will reflect the policy approach of the Play Strategy.

Conclusions

3.25 The national and local policy context provide the overall framework within which the Green Spaces Strategy sits.

IV.

THE DISTRICT CONTEXT

IV THE DISTRICT CONTEXT

Section summary

- 4.1 **Introduction:** This section analyses the district and local context for the green spaces strategy.
- 4.2 **Population profile:** The relatively young age profile of the district population means that proportionately more people are in the age groups with higher demand rates for outdoor sports facilities and children’s play provision.
- 4.3 **Demography:** The population is relatively affluent, healthy and has high levels of personal mobility (car ownership). All these features are associated with higher than average use of green space provision.
- 4.4 **Population increases:** A 4.9% growth in population is forecast between 2001 and 2016, but is concentrated in specific geographical areas, particularly Banbury and Bicester. Demand for green space in these areas is therefore likely to rise proportionate to the population. In the longer term, a 14.6% increase in population is projected between 2007 and 2026, with the strongest growth in the numbers of people aged over 50.
- 4.5 **Landscape character:** Many of the district’s green spaces are part of a high quality landscape network.

District demography

- 4.6 **Population:** At the 2001 census, the total population of Cherwell district was 131,785. The details by age group are tabulated below:

Age Group	Total People	% Cherwell	% South East	% England
0-14	26,082	19.8	18.7	18.9
15-29	23,973	18.3	18.1	18.8
30-44	33,379	25.3	22.6	22.7
45-59	24,832	18.8	19.5	18.9
60+	23,519	17.8	21.1	20.7
TOTAL	131,785	100.0	100.0	100.0

- 4.7 Cherwell has a relatively young age profile, compared with the South East region and England as a whole.
- 4.8 **Ethnicity:** There are relatively few black and minority ethnic (BME) communities in the district. Only 3.9% of the resident population are drawn from BME groups, compared with 4.9% for the South East and 8.9% for England.
- 4.9 **Health indices:** Cherwell has a relatively healthy population, with only 6.2% of people describing their health as ‘not good’ (compared with 7.1% in the South East and 9.0% in England) and 13.3% having a limiting long-term illness (compared with 15.5% regionally and 17.9% nationally).
- 4.10 **Economic activity:** A local unemployment rate of 1.9% compares with 2.7% for the South East and 3.3% nationally.

4.11 **Car ownership:** Only 16.6% of households in Cherwell have no access to at least one car or van, compared with 19.4% regionally and 26.8% nationally.

4.12 **Parish populations:** The distribution of population by parish in Cherwell at the 2001 census is set out in the table below:

Parish	Population	Parish	Population
Adderbury	2,496	Islip	617
Ambrosden	1,749	Kidlington	13,719
Ardley	666	Kirtlington	872
Arncott	1,293	Launton	1,117
Banbury	41,802	Lower Heyford	484
Barford St. John and St. Michael	520	Merton	449
Begbroke	792	Middle Aston	110
Bicester	28,672	Middleton Stoney	312
Blackthorn	267	Milcombe	630
Bletchington	872	Milton	216
Bloxham	3,132	Mixbury	255
Bodicote	2,065	Mollington	469
Bourton	604	Newton Purcell with Shelswell	103
Broughton	305	Noke	132
Bucknell	249	North Aston	212
Caversfield	1,752	North Newington	321
Charlton-on-Otmoor	412	Oddington	133
Chesterton	835	Piddington	371
Claydon with Clattercot	321	Prescote	16
Cottisford	156	Shenington with Alkerton	387
Cropredy	712	Shipton-on-Cherwell and Thrupp	419
Deddington	2,123	Shutford	461
Drayton	247	Sibford Ferris	428
Duns Tew	513	Sibford Gower	498
Epwell	293	Somerton	281
Fencott and Murcott	258	Souldern	362
Finmere	436	South Newington	302
Fringford	613	Steeple Aston	920
Fritwell	668	Stoke Lyne	232
Godington	40	Stratton Audley	393
Gosford and Water Eaton	1,226	Swalcliffe	237
Hampton Gay and Poyle	173	Tadmarton	430
Hanwell	263	Upper Heyford	1,154
Hardwick with Tusmore	63	Wardington	580
Hethe	279	Wendlebury	434
Hook Norton	2,001	Weston-on-the Green	520
Horley	319	Wiggington	192
Hornnton	323	Wroxton	530
Horton-cum-Studley	454	Yarnton	2,523

Projected population change

4.13 **Introduction:** Population projections in Cherwell between 2001 and 2016 were produced by Oxfordshire County Council and are summarised below. Longer term projections to 2026, produced by the Office on National Statistics are summarised subsequently.

4.14 **Overall increase 2001 - 2016:** The population is projected to rise from 131,785 to 138,406 (4.9%), which is around the average for the county as a whole. The increases will be highest in the age groups over 45.

4.15 **The main towns:** Projected changes in the main towns are as follows:

Town	2001	2016	% change 2001 - 2016
Banbury	41,863	42,997	+ 2.7%
Bicester	28,705	32,667	+ 13.8%
Kidlington	13,743	12,744	- 7.3%

4.16 **The wards:** The projected changes by ward are as follows:

Ward	2001	2007	2016	% change 2001 - 2016
Adderbury	2,736	2,684	2,668	- 2.5%
Ambrosden and Chesterton	3,336	3,410	4,943	+ 48.2%
Banbury Calthorpe	5,366	5,166	5,493	+ 2.4%
Banbury Easington	7,625	7,410	7,168	- 6.0%
Banbury Grimsbury and Castle	8,897	8,889	9,548	+ 7.3%
Banbury Hardwick	5,988	7,313	7,310	+ 22.1%
Banbury Neithrop	5,552	5,412	5,182	- 6.7%
Banbury Ruscote	8,435	8,360	8,196	- 2.8%
Bicester East	6,194	6,188	6,093	- 1.6%
Bicester North	5,653	6,416	6,562	+ 16.1%
Bicester South	4,366	5,203	6,305	+ 44.4%
Bicester Town	4,931	4,737	6,346	+ 28.7%
Bicester West	7,561	7,534	7,361	- 2.7%
Bloxham and Bodicote	5,860	5,680	7,365	+ 25.7%
Caversfield	2,897	2,752	2,592	- 10.5%
Cropredy	2,707	2,581	2,508	- 7.4%
Deddington	2,649	2,546	2,495	- 5.8%
Fringford	2,337	2,261	2,131	- 8.8%
Hook Norton	2,492	2,414	2,369	- 4.9%
Kidlington North	5,285	5,094	4,826	- 8.7%
Kidlington South	8,458	8,096	7,918	- 6.4%
Kirtlington	2,869	2,776	2,745	- 4.3%
Launton	3,048	2,976	3,021	- 0.9%
Otmoor	2,455	2,328	2,185	- 11.0%
Sibford	2,520	2,552	2,393	- 5.0%
The Astons and Heyfords	4,711	4,703	5,924	+ 25.8%
Wroxton	2,531	2,398	2,243	- 11.4%
Yarnford, Gosford and Water Eaton	4,528	4,347	4,516	- 0.3%

- 4.17 The projected increases in population are very geographically specific, with only nine of the 28 wards in the district experiencing growth.
- 4.18 **Population increase 2007 - 2026:** Population increase in the period covered by the LDF is tabulated below:

Age group	2007	2026	% change 2007 - 2026
0 - 4	8,600	9,100	+ 5.8%
5 - 9	8,300	8,800	+ 6.0%
10 - 14	8,500	8,500	0.0%
15 - 19	8,800	8,200	- 6.8%
20 - 24	7,700	8,000	+ 3.9%
25 - 29	8,800	9,800	+ 11.4%
30 - 34	9,300	10,000	+ 7.5%
35 - 39	11,200	11,400	+ 1.8%
40 - 44	11,700	10,300	- 12.0%
45 - 49	10,000	9,500	- 5.0%
50 - 54	8,600	9,700	+ 12.8%
55 - 59	8,500	10,600	+ 24.7%
60 - 64	7,500	10,400	+ 38.7%
65 - 69	5,600	8,600	+ 53.6%
70 - 74	4,800	7,100	+ 47.9%
75 - 79	4,000	7,000	+ 75.0%
80 - 84	2,700	4,700	+ 74.0%
85+	2,700	4,800	+ 77.8%
CHERWELL TOTAL	137,300	157,400	+ 14.6%

- 4.19 The overall increase in population during the period of the LDF will be 14.6%, but this conceals significant variations between age groups in the rates of increase. For example, the number of people in the district aged under 50 will increase by only 11.7% in the period, whereas the number of people aged over 50 will increase by 41.7%.
- 4.20 **Increases at local level:** Because population estimates have only been identified at a local level for the period to 2016, the projected population increases at ward level to 2026 have been extrapolated. They are based on the assumption that whilst the overall population will increase to 157,400 in this period the percentage of the district population in each ward will remain constant between 2016 and 2026 (following the initial period of differential growth between 2001 and 2016, tabulated in section 3.13 above).

Ward	Population in 2026
Adderbury	3,040
Ambrosden and Chesterton	5,620
Banbury Calthorpe	6,250
Banbury Easington	8,150
Banbury Grimsbury and Castle	10,870
Banbury Hardwick	8,310
Banbury Neithrop	5,890
Banbury Ruscote	9,320
Bicester East	6,930
Bicester North	7,460
Bicester South	7,160
Bicester Town	7,210
Bicester West	8,380
Bloxham and Bodicote	8,380
Caversfield	2,950
Cropredy	2,850
Deddington	2,830
Fringford	2,430
Hook Norton	2,690
Kidlington North	5,490
Kidlington South	9,000
Kirtlington	3,120
Launton	3,430
Otmoor	2,490
Sibford	2,730
The Astons and Heyfords	6,740
Wroxton	2,550
Yarnford, Gosford and Water Eaton	5,130

Landscape and ecological characteristics

4.21 The countryside of rural Cherwell is varied and distinctive, with picturesque villages and hamlets set in a mainly agricultural landscape. Much of the 59,000 hectares of Cherwell is recognised as being of high landscape value, including a small part of the Cotswold Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty near Epwell. There are four landscape character areas, each with their own characteristics:

- a) The Cherwell Valley.
- b) Ironstone Downs.
- c) Ploughley Limestone Plateau.
- d) Clay Vale of Otmoor.

4.22 In the south of the district, Otmoor, including the RSPB reserve is a significant habitat for many species of plants, birds and insects. There are 15 Sites of Special Scientific Interest, including Pixey and Yarnton Meads which is of European importance being a Special Area of Conservation.

- 4.23 Significant gains in biodiversity have resulted from the designation of the Upper Thames Tributaries as an Environmentally Sensitive Area, within which farmers and landowners have received various payments to follow environmentally favourable agricultural practices. Over 8,000 hectares in the south of the district is designated as Oxford Green Belt.

Conclusions

- 4.24 The demographic and physical landscape characteristics of the district have a profound effect on the demand for different types of greenspace and the extent to which there is scope for developing more provision.

V.

**CURRENT PROVISION OF
GREEN SPACE**

V THE CURRENT PROVISION OF GREEN SPACES

Section summary

5.1 This section examines the current provision of green space in Cherwell and is based upon data from 'The Cherwell Open Space, Sport and Recreational Facilities Needs assessment, Audit and Strategy' (2006). It covers the following types of green space.

- a) Parks and gardens.
- b) Natural and semi-natural green space.
- c) Amenity green space.
- d) Provision for children and young people.
- e) Outdoor sports facilities.
- f) Allotments and community gardens.
- g) Cemeteries and churchyards.
- h) Green corridors.
- i) Civic spaces.

Sub-area analysis

5.2 To enable deficiencies to be identified at a sub-district level, six 'Analysis Areas' district were identified for the PPG17 study. The details of the sub-areas are set out in the table below, along with the wards incorporated in each and their respective populations:

<i>Sub-Area</i>	<i>Wards</i>	<i>Population</i>
Banbury	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Banbury Calthorpe• Banbury Easington• Banbury Grimsbury and Castle• Banbury Hardwick• Banbury Neithrop• Banbury Ruscote	41,863
Bicester	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Bicester East• Bicester North• Bicester South• Bicester Town• Bicester West	28,705
Kidlington	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Kidlington North• Kidlington South	13,743

Sub-Area	Wards	Population
Rural North	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adderbury • Bloxham and Bodicote • Cropredy • Hook Norton • Sibford • Wroxton 	18,846
Rural Central	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Caversfield • Deddington • Fringford • The Astons and Heyfords 	12,594
Rural South	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ambrosden and Chesterton • Kirtlington • Launton • Otmoor • Yarnford, Gosford and Water Eaton 	16,236

Green space designations

- 5.3 Each individual type of green space is analysed separately below. The PPG17 study allocated greenspace to specific categories on the basis of the primary function of each site. In some instances, where more than one type of greenspace is provided on a site, for example amenity greenspace and children's play, the site was sub-divided and the respective areas were assigned to the specialist category that best reflected their primary function.
- 5.4 The advantage of this approach is that it prevents the extent of greenspace from being over-recorded. In other words, each area is counted only once for the purposes of establishing the total extent of green space in the district. The disadvantage is that the multi-function role of many green spaces is underplayed and secondary functions are unrecorded. For example, an area categorised as natural and semi-natural greenspace may also serve amenity greenspace, children's play and green corridor functions. The findings of the PPG17 study therefore need to be seen in this context and in some instances identified deficiencies need to be qualified as a result.

Parks and Gardens

- 5.5 **Quantity:** There are five parks and gardens in the district, all of which are in Banbury (four) and Bicester (one). These collectively total 22.88 hectares, equivalent to 0.17 ha. per 1,000 population.
- a) The general view from 55% of respondents to the household survey conducted in conjunction with the study, is that the existing level of provision is 'about right'.
 - b) Other consultation indicated that residents of Kidlington were unhappy with local levels of provision of parks and gardens.
 - c) A quantitative standard of 0.66 hectares per 1,000 urban residents was

proposed, equivalent to the highest existing levels of provision in the district.

- d) **Quality:** The average quality score for parks in the district was relatively high at 69%. A qualitative standard was set to provide a vision for new provision and a benchmark for existing parks to achieve in terms of enhancement. The standard is ‘a welcoming, clean, well maintained site that is free from vandalism and graffiti and provides a range of facilities for all users, with a good variety of well kept flowers, trees and shrubs and ancillary facilities that will enhance the user’s visit and feeling of safety. The site should reflect local traditions and allow for the viewing of public art’.

5.6 **Accessibility:** Based upon the household survey, an accessibility standard of 15 minutes walking time (1,200m) was set.

5.7 **Applying the standard:** To identify areas with unmet needs, the quantitative and accessibility standards were applied with the following results:

<i>Analysis area</i>	<i>Current provision (ha. per 1000 pop.)</i>	<i>Future standard (ha. per 1000 pop.)</i>	<i>Surplus/ (Deficit)</i>
Banbury	0.48	0.48	0
Bicester	0.10	0.48	(0.38)
Kidlington	0	0.48	(0.48)
Total urban	0.27	0.48	(0.21)

5.8 **Quantitative shortfalls:** To meet the standard, a further 17.68 ha. of parks and gardens will need to be created, with 10.90ha. in Bicester and 6.59 ha. in Kidlington. However, it is important to note that several other sites in the district are known or named as ‘parks’, but have been classified for the purposes of the assessment as other forms of green space. As a consequence, there are other sites in the district that offer the many of the benefits of parks and gardens and to some extent, these mitigate the identified deficiencies.

5.9 **Accessibility shortfalls:** The following deficiencies were identified, based upon the 15 minute walking time catchment:

- a) **Banbury:** Areas in the north-west, south-west and east of the urban area are currently deficient. It is recommended that the north-west area is prioritised for extra provision, because it has the largest unserved population.
- b) **Bicester:** The majority of Bicester is not covered by the catchment area of a park and garden. Ideally a centrally based site could be developed to increase provision, but this is unlikely given the degree of urbanisation, so sites on the periphery, linking with the planned circular route are more realistic.
- c) **Kidlington:** None of the town is served by a park or garden at present.

5.10 **PPG17 Study Recommendations:** These were as follows:

- a) Investigate the possibility of providing a new park and garden in Kidlington.
- b) Long-term planning should be undertaken to identify new park sites on the periphery of Bicester.

- c) Green Flag status for one site by 2010 and all applicable sites by 2015.
- d) Protect and enhance all existing park and gardens sites.

Natural and semi-natural green space

5.11 **Quantity:** This is green space with a primary purpose of wildlife conservation and biodiversity. There are 54 natural and semi-natural green space sites in the district, 12 of which are located within urban areas. These collectively total 203.99ha., equivalent to 1.55ha. per 1,000 population. The distribution by analysis area is as follows:

<i>Analysis area</i>	<i>No. sites</i>	<i>Size (ha.)</i>
Banbury	6	20.85
Bicester	5	16.35
Kidlington	1	7.57
Rural north	10	22.36
Rural central	18	84.70
Rural south	14	52.16

5.12 The local household survey suggests that the current level of provision is about right. The standards proposed are:

- a) In urban areas, 0.57 ha. per 1,000 people (equivalent to highest levels of provision in urban parts of the district at present).
- b) In rural areas, 6.73 ha. per 1,000 people (equivalent to highest levels of provision in rural parts of the district at present).

5.13 **Quality:** The average quality score for natural and semi-natural green space in the district was average at 56%. A qualitative standard was set as ‘a publicly accessible, spacious, clean and litter free site with clear pathways and natural features that encourage wildlife conservation and biodiversity. Sites should be maintained to protect nature conservation interest, with interpretive signage and safety features where appropriate’.

5.14 **Accessibility:** Based upon the household survey, an accessibility standard of 15 minutes walking time (1,200m) was set.

5.15 **Applying the standard:** To identify areas with unmet needs, the quantitative and accessibility standards were applied with the following results:

<i>Analysis area</i>	<i>Current provision (ha. per 1000 pop.)</i>	<i>Future standard (ha. per 1000 pop.)</i>	<i>Surplus/ (Deficit)</i>
Banbury	0.52	0.57	(0.05)
Bicester	0.57	0.57	0
Kidlington	0.55	0.57	(0.02)
Total urban	0.54	0.57	(0.03)
Rural north	1.19	6.73	(5.54)
Rural central	6.73	6.73	0
Rural south	3.21	6.73	(3.52)
Total rural	3.37	6.73	(3.36)

5.16 **Accessibility shortfalls:** Overall, the geographical distribution of natural and semi-natural green space in the district is poor. However, this is mitigated for the most part by significant areas of accessible countryside that are served by a good network of public rights of way.

5.17 **PPG17 Study Recommendations:** These were as follows:

- a) Protect the current levels of provision in the district.
- b) Ensure that new provision is located in Banbury and rural areas north and south as a priority.
- c) Investigate and improve (where appropriate) the accessibility to sites by wheelchairs and pushchairs.

Amenity green space

5.18 **Quantity:** This is green space providing recreation spaces in and around housing, providing opportunities for informal activities close to home and enhancing the appearance of residential areas. There are 299 amenity green space sites in the district, which collectively total 63.57ha., equivalent to 0.48ha. per 1,000 population. The average size of an amenity green space in the district is 0.22ha. The distribution by analysis area is as follows:

<i>Analysis area</i>	<i>No. sites</i>	<i>Size (ha.)</i>
Banbury	86	28.51
Bicester	44	9.75
Kidlington	16	4.75
Rural north	68	10.06
Rural central	37	9.72
Rural south	48	8.66

5.19 The local household survey suggests that there are greater levels of satisfaction for current levels of provision in rural areas. The standards proposed are:

- a) In urban areas, 0.5 ha. per 1,000 people (slightly above the highest levels of provision in urban parts of the district at present, to achieve equality of provision between the three urban areas).
- b) In rural areas, 0.75 ha. per 1,000 people (equivalent to highest levels of provision in rural parts of the district at present).

5.20 **Quality:** The average quality score for amenity green space in the district was good at 63%. A qualitative standard was set as ‘a clean and well-maintained green space site with well kept grass and varied vegetation and large enough to accommodate informal play. Sites should have appropriate ancillary facilities (benches, litter bins) and landscaping in the right places, providing a spacious outlook and overall enhancing the appearance of the local environment’.

- 5.21 **Accessibility:** Based upon the household survey, an accessibility standard of 5 minutes walking time (240m) was set.
- 5.22 **Applying the standard:** To identify areas with unmet needs, the quantitative and accessibility standards were applied with the following results:

<i>Analysis area</i>	<i>Current provision (ha. per 1000 pop.)</i>	<i>Future standard (ha. per 1000 pop.)</i>	<i>Surplus/ (Deficit)</i>
Banbury	0.50	0.50	0
Bicester	0.34	0.50	(0.16)
Kidlington	0.35	0.50	(0.15)
Total urban	0.42	0.50	(0.08)
Rural north	0.54	0.75	(0.21)
Rural central	0.75	0.75	0
Rural south	0.53	0.75	(0.22)
Total rural	0.59	0.75	(0.16)

- 5.23 **PPG17 Study Recommendations:** These were as follows:

- a) Protect the current levels of provision in the district.
- b) Work with parish councils to ensure that all villages have access to a village green (or other amenity green space).
- c) Ensure all new developments located in areas without amenity green space allow for the establishment of such a space, except where residents are close to an appropriate park or garden site and there is an excess of provision in that area.

Provision for children and young people

- 5.24 **Quantity:** This includes equipped play areas, ball courts, skateboard areas and teen shelters, with a primary purpose to provide opportunities for play and social interaction involving children and young people. There are 177 dedicated, equipped play areas, which collectively total 13.64ha., equivalent to 0.10ha. per 1,000 population. The average size of a play area in the district is 0.076ha. The distribution by analysis area is as follows:

<i>Analysis area</i>	<i>No. sites</i>	<i>Size (ha.)</i>
Banbury	54	5.19
Bicester	58	3.27
Kidlington	7	0.38
Rural north	19	1.88
Rural central	18	0.98
Rural south	21	1.91

5.25 The local consultation suggests that the biggest lack of provision is for older children. The standards proposed are:

a) For younger children, 0.59 ha. per 1,000 people.

b) In older children, 0.19 ha. per 1,000 people.

5.26 **Quality:** The average quality score for children’s play in the district was relatively good at 63%. A qualitative standard was set as ‘a site providing a suitable mix of well-maintained formal equipment and an enriched play environment to encourage informal play and recreation by children and young people. A safe and secure location with good access to the site that includes ancillary facilities such as teen shelters, seating where appropriate’.

5.27 **Accessibility:** Based upon the household survey, an accessibility standard of 5 minutes walking time (480m) was set for younger children’s play facilities and 15 minutes walking time (1,200m) for older children’s provision.

5.28 **Applying the standard:** To identify areas with unmet needs, the quantitative and accessibility standards were applied with the following results:

a) **Provision for younger children:**

<i>Analysis area</i>	<i>Current provision (ha. per 1000 pop.)</i>	<i>Future standard (ha. per 1000 pop.)</i>	<i>Surplus/ (Deficit)</i>
Banbury	0.12	0.59	(0.47)
Bicester	0.09	0.59	(0.50)
Kidlington	0.14	0.59	(0.45)
Total urban	0.10	0.59	(0.49)
Rural north	0.10	0.59	(0.49)
Rural central	0.08	0.59	(0.51)
Rural south	0.12	0.59	(0.47)
Total rural	0.10	0.59	(0.49)

b) **Provision for older children:**

<i>Analysis area</i>	<i>Current provision (ha. per 1000 pop.)</i>	<i>Future standard (ha. per 1000 pop.)</i>	<i>Surplus/ (Deficit)</i>
Banbury	0.02	0.19	(0.17)
Bicester	0.02	0.19	(0.17)
Kidlington	0.01	0.19	(0.18)
Total urban	0.02	0.19	(0.17)
Rural north	0.004	0.19	(0.186)
Rural central	0.002	0.19	(0.188)
Rural south	0.001	0.19	(0.189)
Total rural	0.002	0.19	(0.188)

5.29 All areas fall well short of the proposed standard of provision.

5.30 **PPG17 Study Recommendations:** These were as follows:

- a) Protect the current levels of provision in the district.
- b) Develop an action plan to upgrade all sites falling below a 50% quality score.
- c) Investigate whether any amenity green space or park and garden sites could have a play area located on them.
- d) The Council should produce a play strategy.

Outdoor sports facilities

5.31 **Quantity:** This is a wide-ranging category of green space, including natural and artificial surfaces, publicly and privately owned, which are used for sport and recreation. This includes playing pitches, bowling greens, tennis courts and golf courses. There are 155 outdoor sports facilities, which collectively total 299.88 ha., equivalent to 2.28 ha. per 1,000 population. The distribution by analysis area is as follows:

<i>Analysis area</i>	<i>No. sites</i>	<i>Size (ha.)</i>
Banbury	26	65.67
Bicester	22	45.27
Kidlington	11	12.25
Rural north	40	77.46
Rural central	24	31.64
Rural south	30	67.59

5.32 The local consultation suggests that there is a need for more facilities, with 43% stating that current provision is inadequate. A local standard just above the current level would help to achieve the aim of increasing provision slightly. The standards proposed are:

- a) For urban areas, 1.50 ha. per 1,000 people.
- b) For rural areas, 3.62 ha. per 1,000 people (excluding any future golf courses).

5.33 **Quality:** The average quality score for outdoor sport in the district was relatively good at 68%. A qualitative standard was set as ‘all sports facility sites should be free from dog fouling, vandalism, graffiti and litter, with level, well-drained and good quality surfaces. Sites should provide good quality ancillary facilities, where appropriate, including changing accommodation, toilets, car parking and facilities for a range of age groups. The maintenance and management of the sites should continue to ensure safety and effective usage’.

5.34 **Accessibility:** Based upon a survey of facility users, an accessibility standard of 15 minutes walking time (1,200m) was set.

5.35 **Applying the standard:** Due to the wide catchment area set for this typology, most of the residents of Cherwell can reach an outdoor sports facility within 15 minutes. However:

- a) Many facilities are on school sites with little or no community access.
- b) There is user's dissatisfaction with the quantity and quality of tennis courts.

5.36 **PPG17 Study Recommendations:** These were as follows:

- a) Provide additional facilities in the north of Kidlington.
- b) The Council should establish a tennis court surface renewal programme.
- c) The Council should encourage schools to open their sports facilities.
- d) The Council should produce a district wide playing pitch strategy.

5.37 **Additional analysis:** Because outdoor sports facilities were analysed on an aggregated basis in the PPG17 Study, an evaluation of individual types has been undertaken as follows:

- a) **Playing pitches:** These have been subject to a separate detailed assessment in the Cherwell Playing Pitch Strategy.
- b) **Tennis courts:** These are distributed as follows by analysis area:

Analysis area	Sites	No. courts	Courts/'000
Banbury	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Banbury Tennis Club, Horton View • People's Park 	6 Tarmac 3 Tarmac	1: 4,651
Bicester	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bicester Tennis Club, The Garth • Cooper School, Anson Way 	3 Tarmac 4 Tarmac	1: 4,101
Kidlington	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exeter Hall 	2 Tarmac	1: 6,972
Rural north	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Banbury West End TC, Meadow View, Adderbury • Cropredy Recreation Ground • Hook Norton TC, Hook Norton Playing Field 	7 Tarmac 2 Tarmac 3 Artificial Grass	1: 1,571
Rural central	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deddington Tennis Club, The Windmill Centre 	3 Tarmac	1: 4,198
Rural south	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Horton-cum-Studley Recreation Ground • Launton Recreation Ground 	1 Tarmac 1 Tarmac	1: 8,118
Cherwell	-	35	1: 3,765

- c) **Bowling greens:** These are distributed as follows by analysis area:

Analysis area	Sites	Greens/'000
Banbury	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Banbury Borough BC (People's Park) • Banbury Central BC (Horton View Recn. Ground) • Banbury Chestnuts BC (The Shades) 	1: 13,954
Bicester	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bicester BC (The Garth) 	1: 28,705
Kidlington	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kidlington BC (Exeter Close) 	1: 13,743
Rural north	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adderbury BC (Twyford Gardens) • Bloxham BC (The Ridgeway) 	1: 9,423
Rural central	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deddington Beeches BC (Windmill Centre) • Lower Heyford BC (Station Road) 	1: 6,297
Rural south	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Begbroke BC (Begbroke Lane) 	1: 16,236
CHERWELL	-	1: 13,179

d) **Golf courses:** These are distributed as follows by analysis area:

Analysis area	Sites	No. holes	Holes/'000
Banbury	None	-	-
Bicester	None	-	-
Kidlington	None	-	-
Rural north	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Banbury Golf Club • Rye Hill Golf Course • Tadmarton Heath GC 	27 18 18	1: 299
Rural central	None	-	-
Rural south	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bicester Golf and Country Club, Chesterton • Kirtlington GC • North Oxford Golf Course • Studley Wood GC, Horton-cum-Studley 	18 18 18 18	1: 226
CHERWELL	-	135	1: 976

Allotments and community gardens

5.38 **Quantity:** This includes all forms of allotments, with a primary purpose to enable people to grow their own produce. 89% of those responding to the household survey do not use allotments. Of those that do, opinion was equally divided on whether or not there is sufficient provision at present. There are 49 allotment sites, which collectively total 40.55ha., equivalent to 0.31ha. per 1,000 population. The average size of an allotment in the district is 0.83ha. The distribution by analysis area is as follows:

Analysis area	No. sites	Size (ha.)
Banbury	6	6.86
Bicester	5	3.51
Kidlington	6	3.21
Rural north	12	7.08
Rural central	11	9.87
Rural south	9	10.02

5.39 The standards proposed are:

- a) In urban areas, 0.23 ha. per 1,000 people (equivalent to highest levels of provision in urban parts of the district at present).
- b) In rural areas, 0.78 ha. per 1,000 people (equivalent to highest levels of provision in rural parts of the district at present).

5.40 **Quality:** The average quality score for allotments in the district was relatively good at 62%. A qualitative standard was set as 'a clean, well kept and secure site that encourages sustainable communities, biodiversity and healthy living with appropriate ancillary facilities to meet local needs, clearly marked pathways to and within the site'.

5.41 **Accessibility:** Based upon the household survey, an accessibility standard of 10 minutes walking time (800m) was set for allotments.

5.42 **Applying the standard:** To identify areas with unmet needs, the quantitative and accessibility standards were applied with the following results:

Analysis area	Current provision (ha. per 1000 pop.)	Future standard (ha. per 1000 pop.)	Surplus/ (Deficit)
Banbury	0.16	0.23	(0.07)
Bicester	0.12	0.23	(0.11)
Kidlington	0.23	0.23	0
Total urban	0.16	0.23	(0.07)
Rural north	0.38	0.78	(0.40)
Rural central	0.78	0.78	0
Rural south	0.62	0.78	(0.16)
Total rural	0.57	0.78	(0.21)

5.43 Whilst there are large gaps in geographical provision in the district, allotments are demand led and therefore quantity issues are more immediately important than accessibility.

5.44 **PPG17 Study Recommendations:** These were as follows:

- a) Investigate the possibility of providing a new allotment site in the north or east of Banbury, either through new provision or redistribution.
- b) Investigate the possibility of providing a new allotment site in the north of Bicester.
- c) Investigate the possibility of providing a new allotment site in rural areas north and central.
- d) All allotment sites should be protected against development unless long term poor usage is shown and then sites should be considered for redesignation to another open space typology.

Cemeteries and churchyards

5.45 **Quantity:** Churchyards are encompassed within the walled boundary of a church and cemeteries are burial grounds outside the confines of a church. Whilst their primary function is for the burial of the dead and the need for their provision should therefore be determined according to this requirement, they also serve an important supplementary function as greenspace that facilitates quiet contemplation and are included in the green spaces strategy on that basis. There are 93 cemeteries and churchyards in Cherwell, which collectively total 37.56 ha. No quantitative standard is proposed. The distribution by sub-area is as follows:

Analysis area	No. sites	Size (ha.)
Banbury	4	7.26ha
Bicester	2	2.74ha
Kidlington	2	1.85ha
Rural north	36	12.01ha
Rural central	24	7.38ha

Rural south	25	7.58ha
-------------	----	--------

5.46 **Quality:** The mean quality score for cemeteries and churchyards in the district was average to good at 66%. A qualitative standard was set as ‘a well maintained, clean and safe site with the provision of seating areas, clear footpaths and car parking either on site or nearby. The site will encourage biodiversity by providing varied vegetation and aim to be an oasis for quiet contemplation’.

5.47 **Accessibility:** No accessibility standard was set.

5.48 **PPG17 Study Recommendations:** These were as follows:

- a) Adoption of the quality standard for all sites in the district.
- b) Formulate an action plan to increase accessibility by public transport to existing sites throughout the district.

Green corridors

5.49 **Quantity:** Green corridors include towpaths along canals and riverbanks, cycleways, rights of way and disused railway lines. The primary purpose is to provide opportunities for walking, cycling and horse riding and opportunities for wildlife migration. The Oxford Canal runs the length of the district and links Banbury in the north with Kidlington in the south. No quantitative standard is proposed.

5.50 **Quality:** A qualitative standard was set as ‘clean, well maintained safe and secure routes with clear, level and well drained paths, which are provided by the protection and reinforcement of existing vegetation. The green corridor should provide links to major open spaces, urban areas and community facilities. Sites should provide a natural wildlife habitat, cyclist provision and ancillary accommodation such as seating and toilets where appropriate’.

5.51 **Accessibility:** No accessibility standard was set.

5.52 **PPG17 Study Recommendations:** These were as follows:

- a) Adoption of the quality standard for all current and future green corridors in the district.
- b) Improve accessibility and signage for wheelchair and pushchair users at all sites.
- c) Continue Local Plan protection policies to stop inappropriate development at green corridor sites.
- d) Ensure that green corridor linkages and improvements are key to new large housing sites.

Civic spaces

- 5.53 **Quantity:** Civic spaces include civic and market squares and other hard-surfaced community areas designed for pedestrians, with the primary purpose of providing a setting for civic buildings and community events. The major civic spaces in the district are based upon the historic market places in Banbury and Bicester. No quantitative standard is proposed.
- 5.54 **Quality:** A qualitative standard was set as ‘a clean, safe, litter and graffiti free community site which encourages a sense of place where local distinctiveness and traditions can be celebrated. The civic space will provide public art and ancillary facilities, where appropriate, to accommodate a wide range of users’.
- 5.55 **Accessibility:** No accessibility standard was set.
- 5.56 **PPG17 Study Recommendations:** These were as follows:
- a) Adoption of the quality standard for all current and future civic spaces in the district.
 - b) Continue to examine the possibility of creating new civic spaces, or extending existing civic spaces, as part of urban extensions or modifications in the centres of Banbury, Bicester and Kidlington.

Conclusions

- 5.57 The PPG17 study provides a preliminary basis for assessing the current provision of green spaces in Cherwell district, but a more detailed analysis follows in section V below.

VI.

THE APPLICATION OF STANDARDS

VI THE APPLICATION OF STANDARDS

Section summary

- 6.1 The PPG17 study identified deficiencies in provision at a district and sub-area level. This section applies the standards of provision identified in the PPG17 study, with amendments where appropriate, to identify more localised deficiencies in each type of green space, based upon the current and future population.
- 6.2 The application of the standards identifies a number of current (2008) and future additional (2026) deficiencies at district and ward level, as follows:

<i>Type of greenspace</i>	<i>Current provision</i>	<i>Current shortfall</i>	<i>Future Shortfall</i>	<i>Future needs</i>
Parks and gardens	22.88ha	17.49ha	10.57ha	48.20ha
Natural/semi-natural greenspace	203.99ha	58.02ha	17.88ha	244.39ha
Amenity greenspace	71.45ha	14.31ha	14.40ha	92.94ha
Play (younger children)	13.54ha	64.34ha	14.99ha	92.87ha
Play (older children)	13.54ha	11.52ha	4.82ha	29.88ha
Multi-Use Games Areas	24 MUGAs	3 MUGAs	5 MUGAs	32 MUGAs
Tennis courts	35 courts	3 courts	6 courts	45 courts
Bowling greens	10 greens	0 greens	2 greens	12 greens
Golf courses	7 courses	0 courses	1 course	8 courses
Allotments	40.55ha	0.37ha	7.85ha	48.77ha

Parks and gardens

- 6.3 ***Introduction:*** The PPG17 study identified five parks and gardens in the district, four of which are in Banbury and one in Bicester. These collectively total 22.88 hectares, equivalent to 0.17 ha. per 1,000 population. Parks and gardens serve an important function in the larger settlements, where they provide green space to meet a number of important community needs. In smaller settlements, the greenspace functions served by parks and gardens are often met by other forms of greenspace, many of which are more accessible to local communities given the rural character of their setting. For this reason, the district standard of provision was developed for application in the three main urban areas of the district only.
- 6.4 ***Standard of provision:*** This was set as follows in the PPG17 Study:
- a) ***Quantity:*** 0.48 hectares of parks and gardens per 1,000 urban residents, equivalent to the highest existing levels of provision in the district.
 - b) ***Quality:*** ‘A welcoming, clean, well maintained site that is free from vandalism and graffiti and provides a range of facilities for all users, with a good variety of well kept flowers, trees and shrubs and ancillary facilities that will enhance the user’s visit and feeling of safety. The site should reflect local traditions and allow for the viewing of public art’.
 - c) ***Accessibility:*** 15 minutes walking time (1,200m).

6.5 **Current deficiencies:** Applying the quantitative standard to the existing population of each urban sub-area, produces the following shortfalls in provision:

<i>Analysis area</i>	<i>Current provision</i>	<i>Current needs based on the standard</i>	<i>Surplus/(Deficit)</i>
Banbury	20.14ha	20.14ha	0.0ha
Bicester	2.74ha	13.64ha	(10.90ha)
Kidlington	0.0ha	6.59ha	(6.59ha)
Total urban	22.88ha	40.37ha	(17.49ha)

6.6 **Current accessibility shortfalls:** The following deficiencies were identified, based upon the 15 minute walking time catchment:

- a) **Banbury:** Areas in the north-west, south-west and east of the urban area are currently deficient. It is recommended that the north-west area is prioritised for extra provision, because it has the largest unserved population.
- b) **Bicester:** The majority of Bicester is not covered by the catchment area of a park and garden. Ideally a centrally based site could be developed to increase provision, but this is unlikely given the degree of urbanisation, so sites on the periphery, linking with the planned circular route are more realistic.
- c) **Kidlington:** None of the town is served by a park or garden at present.

6.7 **PPG17 Study recommendations to meet current deficiencies:** The PPG17 study identified the following:

- a) Investigate the possibility of providing a new park and garden site in Kidlington.
- b) Long-term planning should be undertaken to identify new park sites on the periphery of Bicester.
- c) Achieve Green Flag status by 2010 for one site and all applicable sites by 2015.
- d) Protect and enhance all existing parks and gardens sites.

6.8 **Future deficiencies:** Based upon the population projections for 2026 in section 3.17 above, the application of the quantitative standard for parks and open spaces to the three urban sub-areas produces the following needs by the end of the LDF timeframe, once existing deficiencies have been met.

<i>Analysis area</i>	<i>Population in 2026</i>	<i>Future needs based on the standard</i>	<i>Surplus/(Deficit)</i>
Banbury	48,790	23.42ha	(3.28ha)
Bicester	37,140	17.83ha	(6.93ha)
Kidlington	14,490	6.95ha	(0.36ha)
Total urban	100,420	48.20ha	(10.57ha)

6.9 **Recommendations to meet future deficiencies:** The table below sets out the recommendations for meeting the projected future deficiencies:

Analysis area	Current provision	Current shortfall	Future needs	Future shortfall	Meeting deficiencies
Banbury	20.14ha	0.0ha	23.42ha	3.28ha	A new 3.3ha park in Banbury.
Bicester	2.74ha	10.90ha	17.83ha	6.93ha	A new park around 7.0ha in size, based on sites around the periphery of Bicester, linking with the planned circular route.
Kidlington	0.0ha	6.59ha	6.95ha	0.36ha	A 0.4ha extension to the proposed new park in Kidlington.
Total urban	22.88ha	17.49ha	48.20ha	10.57ha	-

Natural and Semi-natural Greenspace

6.10 **Introduction:** The PPG17 study identified 54 natural and semi-natural green space sites in the district, 12 of which are located within urban areas. These collectively total 203.99ha. equivalent to 1.55ha. per 1,000 population. The distribution by analysis area is as follows:

Analysis area	No. sites	Size (ha.)
Banbury	6	20.85
Bicester	5	16.35
Kidlington	1	7.57
Rural north	10	22.36
Rural central	18	84.70
Rural south	14	52.16

6.11 **Standard of provision:** This was proposed as follows in the PPG17 Study:

- a) **Quantitative standard:** Urban and rural standards were set as follows:
 - In urban areas, 0.57 ha. per 1,000 people (equivalent to highest levels of provision in urban parts of the district at present).
 - In rural areas, 6.73 ha. per 1,000 people (equivalent to highest levels of provision in rural parts of the district at present).
- b) **Quality:** ‘A publicly accessible, spacious, clean and litter free site with clear pathways and natural features that encourage wildlife conservation and biodiversity. Sites should be maintained to protect nature conservation interest, with interpretive signage and safety features where appropriate’.
- c) **Accessibility:** 15 minutes walking time (1,200m).

6.12 **PPG17 Study recommendations to meet current deficiencies:** The PPG17 study identified the need to:

- a) Protect the current levels of provision in the district.
- b) Ensure that new provision is located in Banbury and rural areas north and south as a priority.

- c) Investigate and improve (where appropriate) the accessibility to sites by wheelchairs and pushchairs.

6.13 **Review of the PPG17 standard:** There are several reasons why it is appropriate to review the standard proposed in the PPG17 study:

- a) The proposed standard is based on the highest levels of current provision in the respective urban and rural sub-areas, but the weakness in this approach is that when the amount of greenspace concerned is disproportionately high in one area, it creates unrealistic requirements when the per capita standard is applied to the other areas.
- b) Some of the larger natural and semi-natural greenspace sites in the Rural Central sub-area serve wider than sub-area needs. By virtue of their size, sites such as Stoke Wood and Ardley Wood serve district wide needs, so assigning them to one sub-area for the purposes of assessing provision distorts the assessment somewhat.
- c) Applying the PPG17 standard to the current situation produces an assessed shortfall of almost 250ha of natural and semi-natural greenspace in the district. In addition, only six out of 28 wards meet the standard. The magnitude of additional provision is so great that there is no realistic chance of meeting it.

6.14 **Accessible Natural Greenspace:** An additional measure of the adequacy of current provision of natural and semi-natural greenspace is to apply Natural England's Accessible Natural Greenspace Standards (ANGSt). The standards are as follows:

- a) There should be at least one accessible 2ha site within 300m of home.
- b) There should be at least one accessible 20ha site within 2km of home.
- c) There should be at least one accessible 100ha site within 5km of home.
- d) There should be at least one accessible 500ha site within 10km of home.

6.15 Natural England's 'An Analysis of Accessible Natural Greenspace Provision in the South East' (2007) assessed the extent to which the standards are met at present, including:

- a) Natural and semi-natural greenspace, including woodlands, urban forestry, scrub, grasslands and wetlands.
- b) Green Corridors, including river and canal banks.
- c) Country parks.

6.16 The report identified the following percentages of households in Cherwell district that meet the ANGSt criteria (including access to sites outside the district boundaries, but within the relevant distance criteria). The respective figures for Oxfordshire and the South east as a whole shown for comparative purposes:

Criterion	Cherwell (%)	Oxfordshire (%)	South East (%)
Within 300m of a 2ha+ site	11%	13%	20%
Within 2km of a 20ha+ site	18%	36%	66%
Within 5km of a 100ha+ site	19%	41%	77%
Within 10km of a 500ha+ site	0%	0%	46%
Meeting all ANGSt requirements	0%	0%	8%
Meeting no ANGSt requirements	72%	48%	10%
Served only by linear greenspace	36%	10%	4%

6.17 The analysis identifies that:

- a) Cherwell has the second highest percentage of households (72%) meeting none of the access criteria of the 67 local authorities in the South East, with only the largely urban area of Winchester higher (at 77%).
- b) Of households that do meet the access criteria, Cherwell has the second highest percentage (36%) served only by linear greenspace (green corridors), as opposed to areas allowing more lateral open access. The latter are regarded by Natural England as having greater user benefit.

6.18 The report concluded that the nature of land use and ownership in north Oxfordshire is such that there are limited opportunities for developing access to existing natural greenspace with no public access at present, or for creating new areas of semi-natural greenspace.

6.19 Given the above analysis, it is more appropriate to take the current **average** levels of provision as the basis for developing a standard, than the **highest** levels in the urban and rural sub-areas as proposed in the PPG17 Study. On this basis, the following standard has been adopted.

a) **Existing provision:** Standards for existing provision were set as follows:

- In urban areas, 0.53ha. per 1,000 people (equivalent to the average levels of provision in urban parts of the district at present).
- In rural areas, 3.74ha. per 1,000 people (equivalent to the average levels of provision in rural parts of the district at present).

b) **Future provision:** Standards for future provision were set as follows:

- In urban areas, 0.53ha. per 1,000 people (equivalent to the average levels of provision in urban parts of the district at present).
- In rural areas, 1.55ha. per 1,000 people (equivalent to the average levels of provision for the district as a whole at present).

6.20 **Current sub-area deficiencies:** Applying the quantitative standard to the existing population of each sub-area, produces the following shortfalls in provision:

<i>Analysis area</i>	<i>Current provision</i>	<i>Current needs based on the standard</i>	<i>Surplus/ (Deficit)</i>
Banbury	20.85ha	22.19ha	(1.34ha)
Bicester	16.35ha	15.21ha	1.14ha
Kidlington	7.57ha	7.28ha	0.29ha
Rural north	22.36ha	70.48ha	(48.12ha)
Rural central	84.70ha	47.10ha	37.60ha
Rural south	52.16ha	60.72ha	(8.56ha)

6.21 **Current ward level deficiencies:** Examination of levels of provision in each ward provides a good means of identifying local deficiencies in accessibility. This is tabulated below, with wards where levels of provision meet the minimum standard of provision highlighted in italics:

<i>Ward</i>	<i>Population</i>	<i>No. sites</i>	<i>Total hectares</i>	<i>Ha/1,000 people</i>
Adderbury	2,736	2	2.53ha	0.93ha
<i>Ambrosden and Chesterton</i>	<i>3,336</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>28.16ha</i>	<i>8.44ha</i>
Banbury Calthorpe	5,366	0	0.00ha	0.00ha
Banbury Easington	7,625	2	4.03ha	0.53ha
<i>Banbury Grimsbury and Castle</i>	<i>8,897</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>11.90ha</i>	<i>1.34ha</i>
<i>Banbury Hardwick</i>	<i>5,988</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>3.28ha</i>	<i>0.55ha</i>
Banbury Neithrop	5,552	0	0.00ha	0.00ha
Banbury Ruscote	8,435	1	1.64ha	0.19ha
<i>Bicester East</i>	<i>6,194</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>4.13ha</i>	<i>0.67ha</i>
<i>Bicester North</i>	<i>5,653</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>6.97ha</i>	<i>1.23ha</i>
<i>Bicester South</i>	<i>4,366</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3.66ha</i>	<i>0.83ha</i>
Bicester Town	4,931	0	0.00ha	0.00ha
Bicester West	7,561	1	1.60ha	0.21ha
Bloxham and Bodicote	5,860	3	7.55ha	1.29ha
<i>Caversfield</i>	<i>2,897</i>	<i>8</i>	<i>80.29ha</i>	<i>27.71ha</i>
Cropredy	2,707	1	0.38ha	0.14ha
<i>Deddington</i>	<i>2,649</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>10.12ha</i>	<i>3.82ha</i>
<i>Fringford</i>	<i>2,337</i>	<i>10</i>	<i>14.92ha</i>	<i>6.38ha</i>
Hook Norton	2,492	1	1.31ha	0.53ha
Kidlington North	5,285	0	0.00ha	0.00ha
<i>Kidlington South</i>	<i>8,458</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>7.57ha</i>	<i>0.89ha</i>
<i>Kirtlington</i>	<i>2,869</i>	<i>6</i>	<i>18.43ha</i>	<i>6.42ha</i>
Launton	3,048	2	4.77ha	1.56ha
Otmoor	2,455	1	0.64ha	0.26ha
Sibford	2,520	1	0.04ha	0.02ha
The Astons and Heyfords	4,711	3	4.17ha	0.89ha
<i>Wroxton</i>	<i>2,531</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>17.28ha</i>	<i>6.83ha</i>
Yarnton, Gosford and Water Eaton	4,528	1	0.17ha	0.04ha

6.22 **Accessibility shortfalls:** The analysis at ward level shows that 12 wards (six urban and six rural) meet the district standard of provision. The PPG17 study notes that ‘the geographical distribution of natural and semi-natural green space in the district is poor’, but that ‘it is mitigated for the most part by significant areas of

accessible countryside that are served by a good network of public rights of way’.

6.23 **Future deficiencies:** Based upon the population projections for 2026, the application of the quantitative standard for natural and semi-natural greenspace to the sub-areas produces the following needs by the end of the LDF timeframe, in addition to the existing deficiencies.

Analysis area	Population in 2026	Future needs based on the standard	Surplus/(Deficit)
Banbury	48,790	25.86ha	(3.67ha)
Bicester	37,140	19.69ha	(4.48ha)
Kidlington	14,490	7.68ha	(0.40ha)
Rural north	22,240	75.74ha	(5.26ha)
Rural central	14,950	49.20ha	35.50ha
Rural south	19,790	66.22ha	(5.50ha)
CHERWELL	157,400	244.39ha	17.88ha

6.24 **Recommendations to meet future deficiencies:** The table below contains recommendations on meeting future needs, once existing deficiencies have been met. Bracketed figures indicate a current or future notional surplus of provision. The following issues need to be considered in relation to the provision of additional natural and semi-natural greenspace:

- a) This category of open space is, by definition, naturally (or semi-naturally) occurring and therefore cannot be ‘created’ in the same way that other forms of greenspace might be. Additional provision will therefore generally mean developing or enhancing public access to existing areas of natural and semi-natural greenspace without such access, where biodiversity considerations are not compromised, or the creation of country parks. It will be entirely appropriate to invite developer contributions to improve the provision of and access to natural and semi-natural greenspace by the residents of new housing developments in the district.
- b) Other forms of greenspace such as green corridors, amenity greenspace and churchyards and cemeteries serve similar amenity functions to natural and semi-natural greenspace. The planning of additional provision of other types of greenspace should therefore take account of natural and semi-natural greenspace deficiencies, to mitigate shortfalls on an integrated basis.
- c) The notional ‘surplus’ of provision in the Rural Central sub-area is largely due to two large sites that, by virtue of their size, serve district wide needs. To some extent therefore, deficiencies elsewhere are mitigated by Stoke Wood and Ardley Wood, centrality to the district maximises their accessibility.
- d) The Non-Statutory Cherwell Local Plan advocates the development of a series of open spaces based upon the River Cherwell and the Oxford Canal in Banbury. This would extend access to natural and semi-natural greenspace and contribute to a reduction in the deficiency. It would also serve as a spine for the development of a multi-functional network of green spaces in the area.

Analysis area	Current provision	Current shortfall	Future needs	Future shortfall	Meeting deficiencies
Banbury	20.85ha	1.34ha	25.86ha	3.67ha	3.7ha of additional space provided via a combination of new provision and enhanced public access to existing sites, ideally linked to the river/canal corridor.
Bicester	16.35ha	(1.14ha)	19.69ha	3.34ha	3.4ha of additional space provided via a combination of new provision and enhanced public access to existing sites.
Kidlington	7.57ha	(0.29ha)	7.68ha	0.11ha	0.1ha of additional space provided via a combination of new provision and enhanced public access to existing sites.
Rural north	22.36ha	48.12ha	75.74ha	5.26ha	5.3ha of additional space provided via a combination of new provision and enhanced public access to existing sites.
Rural central	84.70ha	(37.60ha)	49.20ha	(35.50ha)	No quantitative deficiency.
Rural south	52.16ha	8.56ha	66.22ha	5.50ha	5.5ha of additional space provided via a combination of new provision and enhanced public access to existing sites.
Cherwell	203.99ha	58.02ha	244.39ha	17.88ha	-

Amenity green space

6.25 **Introduction:** The PPG17 Study identified 299 amenity green space sites in the district, which collectively total 69.77ha., equivalent to 0.53ha. per 1,000 population. The average size of an amenity green space in the district is 0.22ha. The distribution by analysis area is as follows:

Analysis area	No. sites	Size (ha.)
Banbury	86	28.51
Bicester	44	9.75
Kidlington	16	4.75
Rural north	68	10.06
Rural central	37	9.72
Rural south	48	8.66

6.26 **Standard of provision:** This was set as follows in the PPG17 Study:

a) **Quantitative standard:** This was set as follows:

- In urban areas, 0.5 ha. per 1,000 people (slightly above the highest levels of provision in urban parts of the district at present, to achieve equality of provision between the three urban areas).
- In rural areas, 0.75 ha. per 1,000 people (equivalent to highest levels of provision in rural parts of the district at present).

b) **Quality:** ‘A clean and well-maintained green space site with well kept grass and varied vegetation and large enough to accommodate informal play. Sites should have appropriate ancillary facilities (benches, litter bins) and landscaping in the right places, providing a spacious outlook and overall enhancing the appearance of the local environment’

c) **Accessibility:** 5 minutes walking time (240m).

6.27 **Current sub-area deficiencies:** Applying the quantitative standard to the existing population of each sub-area, produces the following shortfalls in provision:

Analysis area	Current provision	Current needs based on the standard	Surplus/ (Deficit)
Banbury	28.51ha	28.51ha	0.00ha
Bicester	9.75ha	14.35ha	(4.60ha)
Kidlington	4.75ha	6.87ha	(2.12ha)
Total urban	35.45ha	42.17ha	(6.72ha)
Rural north	10.06ha	14.14ha	(4.08ha)
Rural central	9.72ha	9.72ha	0.00ha
Rural south	8.66ha	12.18ha	(3.52ha)
Total rural	28.44ha	35.74ha	(7.30ha)

6.28 **Current ward level deficiencies:** Examination of levels of provision in each ward provides a good means of identifying local deficiencies in accessibility. This is tabulated below, with wards where levels of provision meet the minimum standard of provision highlighted in italics:

Ward	Population	No. sites	Total hectares	Ha/1,000 people
Adderbury	2,736	8	1.44ha	0.53ha
<i>Ambrosden and Chesterton</i>	<i>3,336</i>	<i>19</i>	<i>3.87ha</i>	<i>1.16ha</i>
<i>Banbury Calthorpe</i>	<i>5,366</i>	<i>17</i>	<i>5.94ha</i>	<i>1.11ha</i>
Banbury Easington	7,625	10	1.48ha	0.19ha
<i>Banbury Grimsbury and Castle</i>	<i>8,897</i>	<i>14</i>	<i>4.59ha</i>	<i>0.52ha</i>
<i>Banbury Hardwick</i>	<i>5,988</i>	<i>19</i>	<i>8.25ha</i>	<i>1.38ha</i>
<i>Banbury Neithrop</i>	<i>5,552</i>	<i>17</i>	<i>4.27ha</i>	<i>0.77ha</i>
<i>Banbury Ruscote</i>	<i>8,435</i>	<i>23</i>	<i>7.45ha</i>	<i>0.88ha</i>
<i>Bicester East</i>	<i>6,194</i>	<i>13</i>	<i>8.45ha</i>	<i>1.36ha</i>
<i>Bicester North</i>	<i>5,653</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>4.01ha</i>	<i>0.71ha</i>
<i>Bicester South</i>	<i>4,366</i>	<i>8</i>	<i>16.91ha</i>	<i>3.87ha</i>
<i>Bicester Town</i>	<i>4,931</i>	<i>9</i>	<i>2.98ha</i>	<i>0.60ha</i>
Bicester West	7,561	17	2.41ha	0.32ha
Bloxham and Bodicote	5,860	9	1.27ha	0.22ha
<i>Caversfield</i>	<i>2,897</i>	<i>8</i>	<i>2.77ha</i>	<i>2.09ha</i>
Cropredy	2,707	10	1.11ha	0.41ha
Deddington	2,649	8	0.89ha	0.34ha
<i>Fringford</i>	<i>2,337</i>	<i>10</i>	<i>3.01ha</i>	<i>1.29ha</i>
<i>Hook Norton</i>	<i>2,492</i>	<i>9</i>	<i>2.13ha</i>	<i>0.85ha</i>
<i>Kidlington North</i>	<i>5,285</i>	<i>11</i>	<i>4.68ha</i>	<i>0.89ha</i>
Kidlington South	8,458	9	2.38ha	0.28ha
Kirtlington	2,869	9	1.19ha	0.41ha
Launton	3,048	6	0.91ha	0.30ha
Otmoor	2,455	6	1.34ha	0.55ha
Sibford	2,520	10	1.19ha	0.47ha
The Astons and Heyfords	4,711	10	3.45ha	0.73ha
<i>Wroxton</i>	<i>2,531</i>	<i>22</i>	<i>3.34ha</i>	<i>1.32ha</i>
Yarnton, Gosford and Water Eaton	4,528	4	1.06ha	0.23ha

6.29 **Accessibility shortfalls:** The above analysis at ward level shows that ten out of thirteen urban wards meet the district urban standard of provision, but only five out of fifteen rural wards meet the rural standard.

6.30 **PPG17 Study recommendations to meet current deficiencies:** The PPG17 study identified the need to:

- a) Protect the current levels of provision in the district.
- b) Work with parish councils to ensure that all villages have access to a village green (or other amenity green space).
- c) Ensure all new developments located in areas without amenity green space allow for the establishment of such a space, except where residents are close to an appropriate park or garden site and there is an excess of provision in that area.

6.31 **Future deficiencies:** Based upon the population projections for 2026, the application of the quantitative standard for amenity greenspace to the sub-areas produces the following needs by the end of the LDF timeframe.

Analysis area	Population in 2026	Future needs based on the standard	Surplus/(Deficit)
Banbury	48,790	24.39ha	0.00ha
Bicester	37,140	18.57ha	(4.22ha)
Kidlington	14,490	7.25ha	(0.38ha)
Rural north	22,240	16.68ha	(2.55ha)
Rural central	14,950	11.21ha	(1.49ha)
Rural south	19,790	14.84ha	(2.66ha)
CHERWELL	157,400	92.94ha	(14.74ha)

6.32 **Recommendations to meet future deficiencies:** The table below contains recommendations on meeting future needs:

Analysis area	Current provision	Current shortfall	Future needs	Future shortfall	Meeting deficiencies
Banbury	28.51ha	0.0ha	24.39ha	0.0ha	No additional requirement.
Bicester	9.75ha	4.60ha	18.57ha	4.22ha	4.22ha of space, once existing deficiencies have been met.
Kidlington	4.75ha	2.12ha	7.25ha	0.38ha	0.4ha of space, once existing deficiencies have been met.
Rural north	10.06ha	4.08ha	16.68ha	2.55ha	2.55ha of space, once existing deficiencies have been met.
Rural central	9.72ha	0.0ha	11.21ha	1.49ha	1.49ha of space.
Rural south	8.66ha	3.52ha	14.84ha	2.66ha	2.66ha of space, once existing deficiencies have been met.
Cherwell	71.45ha	14.31ha	92.94ha	14.74ha	-

Provision for children and young people

6.33 **Introduction:** The PPG17 Study identified 178 dedicated, equipped play areas, which collectively total 13.54ha., equivalent to 0.10ha. per 1,000 population. The average size of a play area in the district is 0.076ha. The distribution by analysis area is as follows:

Analysis area	No. sites	Total size (ha.)
Banbury	54	5.19
Bicester	58	3.27
Kidlington	7	0.38
Rural north	20	1.81
Rural central	18	0.98
Rural south	21	1.91

6.34 **Standard of provision:** This was set as follows in the PPG17 Study:

a) **Quantitative standard:** This was set as follows:

- For younger children, 0.59 ha. per 1,000 people.
- For older children, 0.19 ha. per 1,000 people.

b) **Quality:** ‘A site providing a suitable mix of well-maintained formal equipment and an enriched play environment to encourage informal play and recreation by children and young people. A safe and secure location with good access to the site that includes ancillary facilities such as teen shelters, seating where appropriate’.

c) **Accessibility:** 5 minutes walking time (480m) for younger children’s play facilities and 15 minutes walking time (1,200m) for older children’s provision.

6.35 **Review of the PPG17 study standard:** The standard of provision in the PPG17 study was produced prior to the production of the Oxfordshire Play Strategy and related Cherwell district action plan which concluded that:

a) Access to play opportunities will be developed in green and open spaces and through activity programmes, in addition or as an alternative to the equipped play areas that were assessed in the PPG17 study.

b) In urban areas, where opportunities for new equipped play areas are limited by the absence of available sites, opportunities will generally be increased by qualitative improvements to existing equipped play areas and the provision of outreach play opportunities utilizing other appropriate forms of greenspace.

6.36 The application of the quantitative element of the standard should therefore be considered in conjunction with the above considerations.

6.37 **Current sub-area deficiencies:** Applying the quantitative standard to the existing population of each sub-area, produces the following shortfalls in provision:

a) *Provision for younger children:*

<i>Analysis area</i>	<i>Current provision</i>	<i>Current needs based on the standard</i>	<i>Surplus/ (Deficit)</i>
Banbury	5.19ha	24.70ha	(19.51ha)
Bicester	3.27ha	16.94ha	(13.67ha)
Kidlington	0.38ha	8.11ha	(7.73ha)
Total urban	8.84ha	49.30ha	(40.91ha)
Rural north	1.81ha	11.12ha	(9.31ha)
Rural central	0.98ha	7.43ha	(6.45ha)
Rural south	1.91ha	9.58ha	(7.67ha)
Total rural	4.70ha	28.13ha	(23.43ha)

b) *Provision for older children:*

<i>Analysis area</i>	<i>Current provision</i>	<i>Current needs based on the standard</i>	<i>Surplus/ (Deficit)</i>
Banbury	5.19ha	7.95ha	(2.76ha)
Bicester	3.27ha	5.45ha	(2.18ha)
Kidlington	0.38ha	2.61ha	(2.23ha)
Total urban	8.84ha	16.01ha	(7.17ha)
Rural north	1.81ha	3.58ha	(1.77ha)
Rural central	0.98ha	2.39ha	(1.41ha)
Rural south	1.91ha	3.08ha	(1.17ha)
Total rural	4.70ha	9.05ha	(4.35ha)

6.38 **Current ward level deficiencies:** Examination of levels of provision in each ward provides a good means of identifying local deficiencies in accessibility. This is tabulated below, with wards where levels of provision meet the minimum standard of provision highlighted in italics:

Ward	Population	No. sites	Total hectares	Ha/1,000 people
Adderbury	2,736	2	0.26ha	0.10ha
Ambrosden and Chesterton	3,336	4	0.17ha	0.05ha
Banbury Calthorpe	5,366	5	0.41ha	0.08ha
Banbury Easington	7,625	8	0.67ha	0.09ha
<i>Banbury Grimsbury and Castle</i>	8,897	8	<i>2.43ha</i>	<i>0.27ha</i>
<i>Banbury Hardwick</i>	5,988	20	<i>1.49ha</i>	<i>0.25ha</i>
Banbury Neithrop	5,552	4	0.17ha	0.03ha
Banbury Ruscote	8,435	9	0.25ha	0.03ha
Bicester East	6,194	2	0.14ha	0.02ha
Bicester North	5,653	28	0.70ha	0.12ha
<i>Bicester South</i>	4,366	17	<i>1.17ha</i>	<i>0.27ha</i>
Bicester Town	4,931	4	0.32ha	0.06ha
Bicester West	7,561	6	0.91ha	0.12ha
Bloxham and Bodicote	5,860	2	0.11ha	0.02ha
Caversfield	2,897	6	0.24ha	0.09ha
Cropredy	2,707	4	0.36ha	0.13ha
Banbury Ruscote	8,435	9	0.25ha	0.03ha

Ward	Population	No. sites	Total hectares	Ha/1,000 people
Deddington	2,649	4	0.27ha	0.10ha
Fringford	2,337	4	0.20ha	0.09ha
Hook Norton	2,492	4	0.29ha	0.12ha
Kidlington North	5,285	3	0.07ha	0.01ha
Kidlington South	8,458	4	0.30ha	0.04ha
Kirtlington	2,869	2	0.11ha	0.04ha
Launton	3,048	3	0.37ha	0.12ha
Otmoor	2,455	6	0.45ha	0.18ha
Sibford	2,520	4	0.41ha	0.16ha
The Astons and Heyfords	4,711	5	0.33ha	0.07ha
Wroxton	2,531	2	0.12ha	0.05ha
Yarnton, Gosford and Water Eaton	4,528	6	0.82ha	0.18ha

6.39 **Accessibility shortfalls:** The above analysis at ward level shows that only three wards (all urban) meet the district standard of provision for older children, but that none meets the standard for younger children.

6.40 **Recommendations:** These were as follows:

- a) Protect the current levels of provision in the district.
- b) Develop an action plan to upgrade all sites falling below a 50% quality score.
- c) Investigate whether any amenity green space or park and garden sites could have a play area located on them.
- d) The Council should produce a play strategy.

6.41 **Multi-Use Games Areas:** Multi-Use Games Areas (MUGA's) are a specialist form of play provision for older children, catering for a range of sports and play activities on a casual basis. Provision is made as part of overall children's play space allocations. The distribution by analysis area is as follows:

Analysis area	Sites	MUGAs/'000
Banbury	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bankside MUGA • Hillfield Park MUGA • Ironstones Park MUGA • Merton Street MUGA • Moorfields Park MUGA • Princess Diana Park MUGA • Ruscote Open Space MUGA • Stanbridge Park MUGA 	1: 5,232
Bicester	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bicester and Ploughley Sports Centre MUGA (x2) • Blythe Place Recreation Ground MUGA • Keble Road Recreation Ground MUGA • Thompson Drive Recreation Ground MUGA 	1: 5,741
Kidlington	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exeter Hall MUGA • Park Hill Recreation Ground MUGA 	1: 6,872

<i>Analysis area</i>	<i>Sites</i>	<i>MUGAs/'000</i>
Rural north	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hook Norton MUGA • Hornton MUGA • Swalcliffe MUGA • Tadmarton MUGA 	1: 4,711
Rural central	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fritwell MUGA • Steeple Aston MUGA • Upper Heyford MUGA • Windmill Community Centre MUGA, Deddington 	1: 3,149
Rural south	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yarnton Playing Field MUGA 	1: 16,236
CHERWELL	-	1: 5,491

6.42 **Standard of provision:** The proposed standard of provision is set out below, together with its supporting rationale. Wherever possible and appropriate, elements of the children's play standard from the PPG17 study are incorporated.

<i>Standard</i>	<i>Justification</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One MUGA per 5,000 people, to be provided in conjunction with children's play space allocations. • Safe and secure locations with good access to sites that include ancillary facilities such as teen shelters and seating. • Within 15 minutes walk (1,200m) of the whole population. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local consultation suggests that existing levels of provision are broadly adequate. A local standard around the current level is therefore appropriate. 'PPG17 study' (2006). • The qualitative element of the standard is based upon that proposed in the PPG17 study. • The accessibility element based upon the overall standard for provision for older children, proposed in the PPG17 study. 'PPG17 study' (2006).

6.43 **Current sub-area deficiencies:** Applying the quantitative standard to the existing population of each sub-area, produces the following shortfalls in provision.

<i>Analysis area</i>	<i>Existing MUGAs</i>	<i>MUGAs needed based on standard</i>	<i>Surplus/ (Deficit)</i>
Banbury	8	8	0
Bicester	5	6	(1)
Kidlington	2	3	(1)
Rural north	4	4	0
Rural central	4	3	1
Rural south	1	3	(2)
CHERWELL	24	27	(3)

6.44 **Accessibility deficiencies:** There are accessibility shortfalls for MUGAs in Bicester, Kidlington and the rural south sub-area.

6.45 **Future deficiencies:** Based upon the population projections for 2026, the application of the quantitative standard for children's play provision to the sub-areas produces the following needs by the end of the LDF timeframe, once existing deficiencies have been met.

a) *Provision for children and young people:*

<i>Analysis area</i>	<i>Population in 2026</i>	<i>Future needs (younger children)</i>	<i>Surplus/ (Deficit)</i>	<i>Future needs (older children)</i>	<i>Surplus/ (Deficit)</i>
Banbury	48,790	28.79ha	(4.09ha)	9.27ha	(1.32ha)
Bicester	37,140	21.91ha	(4.97ha)	7.06ha	(1.61ha)
Kidlington	14,490	8.55ha	(0.44ha)	2.75ha	(0.14ha)
Rural north	22,240	13.12ha	(2.00ha)	4.23ha	(0.65ha)
Rural central	14,950	8.82ha	(1.39ha)	2.84ha	(0.45ha)
Rural south	19,790	11.68ha	(2.10ha)	3.76ha	(0.68ha)
CHERWELL	157,400	92.87ha	(14.99ha)	29.91ha	(4.82ha)

b) *Multi-Use Games Areas:*

<i>Analysis area</i>	<i>Population in 2026</i>	<i>Future needs</i>	<i>Surplus/(Deficit)</i>
Banbury	48,790	10	(2)
Bicester	37,140	7	(1)
Kidlington	14,490	3	0
Rural north	22,240	5	(1)
Rural central	14,950	3	1
Rural south	19,790	4	(1)
CHERWELL	157,400	32	(5)

6.46 *Recommendations to meet future deficiencies:* The tables below contain recommendations on meeting future needs.

a) *Younger children:*

<i>Analysis area</i>	<i>Current provision</i>	<i>Current shortfall</i>	<i>Future needs</i>	<i>Future shortfall</i>	<i>Meeting deficiencies</i>
Banbury	5.19ha	19.51ha	28.79ha	4.09ha	4.1ha of space provided via a combination of new equipped play areas and the provision of outreach play opportunities.
Bicester	3.27ha	13.67ha	21.91ha	4.97ha	5.0ha of space provided via a combination of new equipped play areas and the provision of outreach play opportunities.
Kidlington	0.38ha	7.73ha	8.55ha	0.44ha	0.5ha of space provided via a combination of new equipped play areas and the provision of outreach play opportunities.
Rural north	1.81ha	9.31ha	13.12ha	2.00ha	2.0ha of space provided via a combination of new equipped play areas and the provision of outreach play opportunities.
Rural central	0.98ha	6.45ha	8.82ha	1.39ha	1.4ha of space provided via a combination of new equipped play areas and the provision of outreach play opportunities.

Analysis area	Current provision	Current shortfall	Future needs	Future shortfall	Meeting deficiencies
Rural south	1.91ha	7.67ha	11.78ha	2.10ha	2.1ha of space provided via a combination of new equipped play areas and the provision of outreach play opportunities.
Cherwell	13.54ha	64.34ha	92.87ha	14.99ha	-

b) **Older children:**

Analysis area	Current provision	Current shortfall	Future needs	Future shortfall	Meeting deficiencies
Banbury	5.19ha	2.76ha	9.27ha	1.32ha	1.3ha of space provided via a combination of new equipped play areas and the provision of outreach play opportunities.
Bicester	3.27ha	2.18ha	7.06ha	1.61ha	1.6ha of space provided via a combination of new equipped play areas and the provision of outreach play opportunities.
Kidlington	0.38ha	2.23ha	2.75ha	0.14ha	0.2ha of space provided via a combination of new equipped play areas and the provision of outreach play opportunities.
Rural north	1.88ha	1.77ha	4.23ha	0.65ha	0.7ha of space provided via a combination of new equipped play areas and the provision of outreach play opportunities.
Rural central	0.98ha	1.41ha	2.84ha	0.45ha	0.5ha of space provided via a combination of new equipped play areas and the provision of outreach play opportunities.
Rural south	1.91ha	1.17ha	3.76ha	0.68ha	0.7ha of space provided via a combination of new equipped play areas and the provision of outreach play opportunities.
Cherwell	13.54ha	11.52ha	29.91ha	4.82ha	-

c) **MUGAs:**

Analysis area	Current provision	Current shortfall	Future needs	Future shortfall	Meeting deficiencies
Banbury	8	0	10	2	2 MUGAs in Banbury, to be provided in conjunction with children's play space allocations.
Bicester	5	1	7	1	1 MUGA in Bicester, to be provided in conjunction with children's play space allocations.
Kidlington	2	1	3	0	No additional provision required, once existing deficiencies are met.

<i>Analysis area</i>	<i>Current provision</i>	<i>Current shortfall</i>	<i>Future needs</i>	<i>Future shortfall</i>	<i>Meeting deficiencies</i>
Rural north	4	0	5	1	1 MUGA in Rural north, to be provided in conjunction with children's play space allocations.
Rural central	4	(1)	5	0	No additional provision required.
Rural south	1	2	4	1	1 MUGA in Rural south, to be provided in conjunction with children's play space allocations.
<i>Cherwell</i>	<i>24</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>32</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>-</i>

Outdoor sports facilities

6.47 ***Introduction:*** The PPG17 study treated outdoor sports facilities collectively, aggregating playing pitches, golf courses, tennis courts and bowling greens into a single category for analysis. The study acknowledges that this makes it difficult to determine deficiencies in individual facility types so the following sections:

- a) Propose minimum recommended standards of provision for golf courses, tennis courts and bowling greens.
- b) Apply the standards to establish current and future deficiencies.

6.48 Playing pitches are not addressed, since they are the subject of a separate pitch strategy.

6.49 ***Tennis courts:***

- a) ***Current provision:*** Tennis courts are distributed as follows by analysis area:

<i>Analysis area</i>	<i>Sites</i>	<i>No. courts</i>	<i>Courts/'000</i>
Banbury	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Banbury Tennis Club, Horton View • People's Park 	6 Tarmac 3 Tarmac	1: 4,651
Bicester	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bicester Tennis Club, The Garth • Cooper School, Anson Way 	3 Tarmac 4 Tarmac	1: 4,101
Kidlington	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exeter Hall 	2 Tarmac	1: 6,972
Rural north	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Banbury West End TC, Meadow View, Adderbury • Cropredy Recreation Ground • Hook Norton TC, Hook Norton Playing Field 	7 Tarmac 2 Tarmac 3 Artificial Grass	1: 1,571
Rural central	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deddington Tennis Club, The Windmill Centre 	3 Tarmac	1: 4,198
Rural south	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Horton-cum-Studley Recreation Ground • Launton Recreation Ground 	1 Tarmac 1 Tarmac	1: 8,118
<i>Cherwell</i>	<i>-</i>	<i>35</i>	<i>1: 3,765</i>

- b) ***Standard of provision:*** The proposed standard of provision is set out below, along with its justification. Where appropriate, elements of the outdoor sports facilities standard from the PPG17 study are incorporated, because the qualitative and accessibility elements were based upon local consultation.

<i>Standard</i>	<i>Justification</i>
One outdoor court per 3,500 people, with courts: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Free from dog fouling, vandalism, graffiti and litter • With level, well-drained and good quality surfaces. • Good quality ancillary facilities. • The maintenance and management of the courts should continue to ensure safety and effective usage. • Within 15 minutes walking time (1,200m) of the urban population and 15 minutes driving time (12km) of the rural population. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ‘Local consultation suggests that there is a need for more facilities, with 43% stating that current provision is inadequate. A local standard just above the current level would help to achieve the aim of increasing provision slightly’. ‘PPG17 study’ (2006). • The qualitative element of the standard is based upon that proposed in the PPG17 study. • The urban accessibility element is based upon that proposed in the PPG17 study. • The rural accessibility element based upon driving time is based on the premise in PPG17 that accessibility in rural areas to specialist facilities like tennis courts cannot reasonably be expected to match urban levels of provision.

c) **Current sub-area deficiencies:** Applying the quantitative standard to the existing population of each sub-area, produces the following shortfalls in provision:

<i>Analysis area</i>	<i>Existing courts</i>	<i>Courts needed based on standard</i>	<i>Surplus/ (Deficit)</i>
Banbury	9	12	(3)
Bicester	7	8	(1)
Kidlington	2	4	(2)
Rural north	12	5	7
Rural central	3	4	1
Rural south	2	5	(3)
CHERWELL	35	36	(1)

d) **Current ward level deficiencies:** Examination of levels of provision in each ward provides a means of identifying local deficiencies in accessibility. This is tabulated below, with wards where levels of provision meet the minimum standard of provision highlighted in italics:

<i>Ward</i>	<i>Population</i>	<i>Courts</i>	<i>Surplus/ (Deficit)</i>
<i>Adderbury</i>	2,736	7	6
Ambrosden and Chesterton	3,336	0	(1)
Banbury Calthorpe	5,366	0	(1)
<i>Banbury Easington</i>	7,625	9	7
Banbury Grimsbury and Castle	8,897	0	(2)
Banbury Hardwick	5,988	0	(2)
Banbury Neithrop	5,552	0	(2)
Banbury Ruscote	8,435	0	(2)
<i>Bicester East</i>	6,194	4	0
Bicester North	5,653	0	(2)
Bicester South	4,366	0	(1)
<i>Bicester Town</i>	4,931	3	2
Bicester West	7,561	0	(2)
Bloxham and Bodicote	5,860	0	(2)

<i>Ward</i>	<i>Population</i>	<i>Courts</i>	<i>Surplus/ (Deficit)</i>
Caversfield	2,897	0	(1)
Cropredy	2,707	2	1
Deddington	2,649	3	2
Fringford	2,337	0	(1)
Hook Norton	2,492	3	2
Kidlington North	5,285	0	(2)
Kidlington South	8,458	2	0
Kirtlington	2,869	0	(1)
Launton	3,048	1	0
Otmoor	2,455	1	0
Sibford	2,520	0	(1)
The Astons and Heyfords	4,711	2	1
Wroxton	2,531	0	(1)
Yarnton, Gosford and Water Eaton	4,528	0	(1)

e) **Accessibility shortfalls:** The above analysis at ward level shows that nine wards meet or exceed the district standard of provision, but the following caveats apply:

- The courts in Banbury are all at the north end of Easington ward, close to the boundaries of Calthorpe, Ruscote, Neithrop and Grimsbury and Castle wards, the populations all of which are also served by the courts in Easington.
- Three of the courts in Bicester are close to the border between Town and South and East wards.
- The 15 minute drivetime catchments for tennis courts in the rural wards means that many rural wards without their own provision (and therefore nominal deficiencies) are served by courts in neighbouring wards.

f) **Future deficiencies:** Based upon the population projections for 2026, the application of the quantitative standard for tennis courts to the sub-areas produces the following needs by the end of the LDF timeframe, once existing deficiencies have been met.

<i>Analysis area</i>	<i>Population in 2026</i>	<i>Future needs based on the standard</i>	<i>Surplus/(Deficit)</i>
Banbury	48,790	14	(2)
Bicester	37,140	11	(3)
Kidlington	14,490	4	0
Rural north	22,240	6	6
Rural central	14,950	4	1
Rural south	19,790	6	(1)
CHERWELL	157,400	45	6

g) **Recommendations to meet future deficiencies:** The table below contains recommendations on meeting future need.

Analysis area	Current provision	Current shortfall	Future needs	Future shortfall	Meeting deficiencies
Banbury	9	3	14	2	2 additional courts.
Bicester	7	1	11	3	3 additional courts.
Kidlington	2	2	4	0	No additional provision required.
Rural north	12	(7)	6	(6)	No additional provision required.
Rural central	3	1	4	0	No additional provision required.
Rural south	2	3	6	1	1 additional court.
Cherwell	35	3	45	6	-

6.50 **Bowling greens:**

a) **Current provision:** Bowling greens are distributed as follows by sub-area:

Analysis area	Sites	Greens/'000
Banbury	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Banbury Borough BC (People's Park) Banbury Central BC (Horton View Recn. Ground) Banbury Chestnuts BC (The Shades) 	1: 13,954
Bicester	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bicester BC (The Garth) 	1: 28,705
Kidlington	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Kidlington BC (Exeter Close) 	1: 13,743
Rural north	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adderbury BC (Twyford Gardens) Bloxham BC (The Ridgeway) 	1: 9,423
Rural central	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Deddington Beeches BC (Windmill Centre) Lower Heyford BC (Station Road) 	1: 6,297
Rural south	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Begbroke BC (Begbroke Lane) 	1: 16,236
CHERWELL	-	1: 13,179

b) **Standard of provision:** The proposed standard of provision is set out below, together with its supporting rationale. Wherever appropriate, elements of the outdoor sports facilities standard from the PPG17 study are incorporated.

Standard	Justification
<p>One bowling green per 12,000 people, with greens:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Free from dog fouling, vandalism, graffiti and litter. With level, well-drained and good quality surfaces. Good quality ancillary facilities. The maintenance and management of the greens should continue to ensure safety and effective usage. Within 15 minutes driving time (12km) of the whole population. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 'Local consultation suggests that there is a need for more facilities, with 43% stating that current provision is inadequate. A local standard just above the current level would help to achieve the aim of increasing provision slightly'. 'PPG17 study'. The qualitative element of the standard is based upon that proposed in the PPG17 study. The accessibility element based upon driving time is based on the premise that bowling greens are specialist facilities and that as such, a 15 minute drivetime is a reasonable maximum time/distance to travel to reach one.

c) **Current sub-area deficiencies:** Applying the quantitative standard to the existing population of each sub-area, produces the following:

<i>Analysis area</i>	<i>Existing greens</i>	<i>Greens needed based on standard</i>	<i>Surplus/(Deficit)</i>
Banbury	3	3	0
Bicester	1	2	(1)
Kidlington	1	1	0
Rural north	2	2	0
Rural central	2	1	1
Rural south	1	1	0
CHERWELL	10	10	0

- d) **Current ward level deficiencies:** Examination of levels of provision in each ward is not appropriate in the case of bowling greens, because a 7.5km radius for the catchments takes in multiple wards so the sub-area analysis above is the most appropriate scale for assessing accessibility shortfalls.
- e) **Accessibility shortfalls:** The above analysis shows that five of the sub-areas meet or exceed the district standard of provision, with only Bicester deficient.
- h) **Future deficiencies:** Based upon the population projections for 2026, the application of the quantitative standard for bowling greens to the sub-areas produces the following needs by the end of the LDF timeframe, once existing deficiencies have been met.

<i>Analysis area</i>	<i>Population in 2026</i>	<i>Future needs based on the standard</i>	<i>Surplus/(Deficit)</i>
Banbury	48,790	4	(1)
Bicester	37,140	2	0
Kidlington	14,490	1	0
Rural north	22,240	2	0
Rural central	14,950	1	1
Rural south	19,790	2	(1)
CHERWELL	157,400	12	(2)

- f) **Recommendations to meet future deficiencies:** These are as follows.

<i>Analysis area</i>	<i>Current provision</i>	<i>Current shortfall</i>	<i>Future needs</i>	<i>Future shortfall</i>	<i>Meeting deficiencies</i>
Banbury	3	0	4	1	1 additional green to meet sub-area needs.
Bicester	1	(1)	2	0	No additional provision required.
Kidlington	1	0	1	0	No additional provision required.
Rural north	2	0	2	0	No additional provision required.
Rural central	2	1	1	(1)	No additional provision required.
Rural south	1	0	2	1	1 additional green to meet sub-area needs.
Cherwell	10	0	12	2	-

6.51 **Golf courses:**

- a) **Current provision:** Golf courses are currently distributed as follows by sub-area:

<i>Analysis area</i>	<i>Sites</i>	<i>No. holes</i>	<i>Holes/'000</i>
Banbury	None	-	-
Bicester	None	-	-
Kidlington	None	-	-
Rural north	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Banbury Golf Club • Rye Hill Golf Course • Tadmarton Heath GC 	27 18 18	1: 299
Rural central	None	-	-
Rural south	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bicester Golf and Country Club, Chesterton • Kirtlington GC • North Oxford Golf Course • Studley Wood GC, Horton-cum-Studley 	18 18 18 18	1: 226
CHERWELL	-	135	1: 976

b) **Standard of provision:** The proposed standard of provision is set out below, together with its supporting rationale. Where appropriate, elements of the outdoor sports facilities standard from the PPG17 study have been included.

<i>Standard</i>	<i>Justification</i>
One 18 hole golf course per 17,500 people: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Free from dog fouling and litter. • Well-drained, good quality surfaces • Good quality ancillary facilities. • Maintenance and management should ensure safe and effective usage. • Within 15 minutes drive time (12km) of the whole population. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ‘Local consultation suggests that there is a need for more facilities, with 43% stating that current provision is inadequate. A local standard just above the current level would help to achieve the aim of increasing provision slightly’. ‘PPG17 study’ (2006). • The English Golf Union states that nationally ‘supply of golf courses currently exceeds demand, with membership vacancies existing in the majority of golf clubs. Nevertheless, it is important to note that participation rates are still rising’. ‘Golf Development Strategic Plan 2004-2014’ (EGU, 2004) • The quantitative standard is based upon one golf hole per 976 people x 18 holes = 17,568 people. • The qualitative element of the standard is based upon that proposed in the PPG17 study. • The accessibility element based upon driving time is based on the premise that golf courses are specialist facilities and that as such, a 15 minute drivetime is a reasonable maximum time/distance to travel to reach one.

c) **Current sub-area deficiencies:** Applying the quantitative standard to the existing population of each sub-area, produces the following:

<i>Analysis area</i>	<i>Existing courses</i>	<i>Courses needed based on standard</i>	<i>Surplus/ (Deficit)</i>
Banbury	0	2	(2)
Bicester	0	1	(1)
Kidlington	0	1	(1)
Rural north	3	1	2
Rural central	0	1	(1)
Rural south	4	1	3
CHERWELL	7	7	0

d) **Current ward level deficiencies:** Examination of levels of provision in each ward is not appropriate in the case of golf courses, because a 7.5km radius for the catchments takes in multiple wards so the sub-area analysis above is the

most appropriate scale for assessing accessibility shortfalls.

- e) **Accessibility shortfalls:** The above analysis shows that four of the sub-areas have nominal deficiencies in relation to the district standard of provision, however the following caveats apply:
- Given the amount of land required for a golf course, it is not reasonable to expect provision to be made within any urban ward, but courses should be provided in adjacent rural wards. The deficiencies in Banbury, Bicester and Kidlington should therefore be met in the rural sub-areas.
 - In addition to the courses within Cherwell district, a further two courses (Cherwell Edge GC near Banbury and North Oxford GC near Kidlington) are located very close to the district boundary and these serve to reduce in-district deficiencies.
- f) **Future deficiencies:** Based upon the population projections for 2026, the application of the quantitative standard for golf courses to the sub-areas produces the following needs by the end of the LDF timeframe.

Analysis area	Population in 2026	Future needs based on the standard	Surplus/(Deficit)
Banbury	48,790	2	(2)
Bicester	37,140	2	(2)
Kidlington	14,490	1	(1)
Rural north	22,240	1	2
Rural central	14,950	1	(1)
Rural south	19,790	1	3
CHERWELL	157,400	8	(1)

- g) **Recommendations to meet future deficiencies:** The table below contains recommendations on meeting current and future needs:

Analysis area	Current provision	Current shortfall	Future needs	Future shortfall	Meeting deficiencies
Banbury	0	2	2	0	No additional provision required - Cherwell Edge GC and surplus provision in rural north meet current and future needs.
Bicester	0	2	2	0	No additional provision required - surplus provision in rural south meets other current and future needs.
Kidlington	0	1	1	0	No additional provision required - North Oxford GC meets current and future needs.
Rural north	3	(2)	1	0	No additional provision required.
Rural central	0	1	1	1	1 additional course.
Rural south	4	(3)	1	0	No additional provision required.
Cherwell	7	0	8	1	-

Allotments and community gardens

6.52 **Introduction:** The PPG17 study identified 49 allotment sites, which collectively

total 40.55ha., equivalent to 0.31ha. per 1,000 population. The average size of an allotment in the district is 0.83ha. The distribution by analysis area is as follows:

<i>Analysis area</i>	<i>No. sites</i>	<i>Size (ha.)</i>
Banbury	6	6.86ha
Bicester	5	3.51ha
Kidlington	6	3.21ha
Rural north	12	7.08ha
Rural central	10	9.87ha
Rural south	9	10.02ha

6.53 **Standard of provision:** This was set as follows in the PPG17 Study:

a) **Quantitative standard:** This was set as follows:

- In urban areas, 0.23ha. per 1,000 people (equivalent to highest levels of provision in urban parts of the district at present).
- In rural areas, 0.78ha. per 1,000 people (equivalent to highest levels of provision in rural parts of the district at present).

b) **Quality:** ‘A clean, well kept and secure site that encourages sustainable communities, biodiversity and healthy living with appropriate ancillary facilities to meet local needs, clearly marked pathways to and within the site’.

c) **Accessibility:** 10 minutes walking time (800m).

6.54 **Review of the PPG17 standard:** There are several reasons why it is appropriate to review the standard proposed in the PPG17 study:

a) Demand for allotments is consistent across the district and it is therefore not appropriate to have a differential urban and rural standard.

b) Applying the current highest levels of provision of allotments (0.78ha per 1,000 people) across the whole district would produce lead to oversupply in relation to demand levels and therefore applying the districtwide average (0.31ha per 1,000 people) is a more appropriate measure of need.

6.55 **Current sub-area deficiencies:** Applying the quantitative standard to the existing population of each sub-area, produces the following shortfalls in provision:

<i>Analysis area</i>	<i>Current provision</i>	<i>Current needs based on the standard</i>	<i>Surplus/ (Deficit)</i>
Banbury	6.86ha	12.98ha	(6.12ha)
Bicester	3.51ha	8.90ha	(5.39ha)
Kidlington	3.21ha	4.26ha	(1.05ha)
Rural north	7.08ha	5.85ha	1.23ha
Rural central	9.87ha	3.90ha	5.97ha
Rural south	10.02ha	5.03ha	4.99ha
Total	40.55ha	40.92ha	(0.37ha)

6.56 **Current ward level deficiencies:** Examination of levels of provision in each ward provides a good means of identifying local deficiencies in accessibility. This is

tabulated below, with wards where levels of provision meet the minimum standard of provision highlighted in italics:

Ward	Population	No. sites	Total hectares	Ha/1,000 people
Adderbury	2,736	0	0.00ha	0.00ha
<i>Ambrosden and Chesterton</i>	<i>3,336</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>2.49ha</i>	<i>0.75ha</i>
Banbury Calthorpe	5,366	0	0.00ha	0.00ha
Banbury Easington	7,625	2	2.04ha	0.27ha
Banbury Grimsbury and Castle	8,897	1	2.07ha	0.23ha
Banbury Hardwick	5,988	1	1.66ha	0.28ha
Banbury Neithrop	5,552	1	0.71ha	0.13ha
Banbury Ruscote	8,435	1	0.37ha	0.04ha
Bicester East	6,194	1	0.46ha	0.07ha
Bicester North	5,653	0	0.00ha	0.00ha
Bicester South	4,366	1	0.72ha	0.16ha
<i>Bicester Town</i>	<i>4,931</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>1.92ha</i>	<i>0.39ha</i>
Bicester West	7,561	0	0.00ha	0.00ha
<i>Bloxham and Bodicote</i>	<i>5,860</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>1.86ha</i>	<i>0.31ha</i>
Caversfield	2,897	0	0.00ha	0.00ha
<i>Cropredy</i>	<i>2,707</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>1.72ha</i>	<i>0.64ha</i>
<i>Deddington</i>	<i>2,649</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>1.58ha</i>	<i>0.60ha</i>
Fringford	2,337	0	0.00ha	0.00ha
Hook Norton	2,492	1	0.12ha	0.05ha
Kidlington North	5,285	2	1.29ha	0.24ha
Kidlington South	8,458	3	1.45ha	0.17ha
<i>Kirtlington</i>	<i>2,869</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3.80ha</i>	<i>1.32ha</i>
Launton	3,048	1	0.29ha	0.10ha
Otmoor	2,455	2	0.68ha	0.28ha
Sibford	2,520	0	0.00ha	0.00ha
<i>The Astons and Heyfords</i>	<i>4,711</i>	<i>10</i>	<i>8.29ha</i>	<i>1.76ha</i>
<i>Wroxton</i>	<i>2,531</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3.93ha</i>	<i>1.55ha</i>
Yarnton, Gosford and Water Eaton	4,528	1	0.50ha	0.11ha

6.57 **Accessibility shortfalls:** The above analysis at ward level shows that eight wards (one urban and seven rural) meet the respective district standards of provision, but that there is no provision at all in six wards.

6.58 **PPG17 Study recommendations to meet current deficiencies:** The PPG17 study identified the need to:

- a) Investigate the possibility of providing a new allotment site in the north or east of Banbury, either through new provision or redistribution.
- b) Investigate the possibility of providing a new allotment site in the north of Bicester.
- c) Investigate the possibility of providing a new allotment site in rural areas north and central.
- d) All allotment sites should be protected against development unless long term poor usage is shown and then sites should be considered for redesignation to another open space typology.

6.59 **Future deficiencies:** Based upon the population projections for 2026, applying the quantitative standard for allotments to the sub-areas produces the following needs by the end of the LDF timeframe, once existing deficiencies are met.

Analysis area	Population in 2026	Future needs based on the standard	Surplus/(Deficit)
Banbury	48,790	15.12ha	(2.14ha)
Bicester	37,140	11.51ha	(2.61ha)
Kidlington	14,490	4.49ha	(0.23ha)
Rural north	22,240	6.89ha	0.19ha
Rural central	14,950	4.63ha	5.24ha
Rural south	19,790	6.13ha	3.89ha
CHERWELL	157,400	48.77ha	(7.85ha)

6.60 **Recommendations to meet future deficiencies:** The table below contains recommendations on meeting future needs, once existing deficiencies have been met. Notional surpluses in provision are shown in brackets.

Analysis area	Current provision	Current shortfall	Future needs	Future shortfall	Meeting deficiencies
Banbury	6.86ha	6.12ha	15.12ha	2.14ha	2.1ha of allotments.
Bicester	3.51ha	5.39ha	11.51ha	2.61ha	2.6ha of allotments.
Kidlington	3.21ha	1.05ha	4.49ha	0.23ha	0.23ha of allotments.
Rural north	7.08ha	(1.23ha)	6.89ha	(0.19ha)	No additional provision required.
Rural central	9.87ha	(5.97ha)	4.63ha	(5.24ha)	No additional provision required.
Rural south	10.02ha	(4.99ha)	6.13ha	(3.89ha)	No additional provision required.
Cherwell	40.55ha	0.37ha	48.77ha	7.85ha	-

Cemeteries and churchyards

6.61 **Introduction:** The PPG17 study identified 93 cemeteries and churchyards in the district, which collectively total 37.56 ha. The analysis of the need for this type of provision is based upon its greenspace functions as defined in PPG17 of ‘quiet contemplation...often linked to the promotion of wildlife conservation and biodiversity’. The distribution by sub-area is as follows:

Analysis area	No. sites	Size (ha.)
Banbury	4	7.26ha
Bicester	2	2.74ha
Kidlington	2	1.85ha
Rural north	36	12.01ha
Rural central	24	7.38ha
Rural south	25	7.58ha

6.62 **Standard of provision:** This was set as follows in the PPG17 Study:

- a) **Quantitative standard:** No quantitative standard was set.
- b) **Quality:** ‘A well maintained, clean and safe site with the provision of seating areas, clear footpaths and car parking either on site or nearby. The site will

encourage biodiversity by providing varied vegetation and aim to be an oasis for quiet contemplation’.

c) **Accessibility:** No accessibility standard was set.

6.63 **Ward level provision:** With no quantitative standard for cemeteries and churchyards, it is not possible to identify specific deficiencies in the greenspace functions they serve. However, examining provision in each ward illustrates the extent to which other forms of greenspace provision are supplemented at local level by cemeteries and churchyards. This is tabulated below.

Ward	Population	No. sites	Total hectares	Ha/1,000 people
Adderbury	2,736	2	0.57ha	0.21ha
Ambrosden and Chesterton	3,336	5	1.86ha	0.58ha
Banbury Calthorpe	5,366	0	0.00ha	0.00ha
Banbury Easington	7,625	0	0.00ha	0.00ha
Banbury Grimsbury and Castle	8,897	2	0.73ha	0.08ha
Banbury Hardwick	5,988	0	0.00ha	0.00ha
Banbury Neithrop	5,552	2	6.53ha	1.18ha
Banbury Ruscote	8,435	0	0.00ha	0.00ha
Bicester East	6,194	0	0.00ha	0.00ha
Bicester North	5,653	0	0.00ha	0.00ha
Bicester South	4,366	0	0.00ha	0.00ha
Bicester Town	4,931	2	2.74ha	0.56ha
Bicester West	7,561	0	0.00ha	0.00ha
Bloxham and Bodicote	5,860	4	2.44ha	0.42ha
Caversfield	2,897	4	1.10ha	0.38ha
Cropredy	2,707	6	2.31ha	0.85ha
Deddington	2,649	4	1.32ha	0.50ha
Fringford	2,337	6	1.69ha	0.72ha
Hook Norton	2,492	7	2.21ha	0.89ha
Kidlington North	5,285	2	1.85ha	0.35ha
Kidlington South	8,458	0	0.00ha	0.00ha
Kirtlington	2,869	6	1.92ha	0.67ha
Launton	3,048	3	0.86ha	0.28ha
Otmoor	2,455	9	1.83ha	0.75ha
Sibford	2,520	7	1.95ha	0.77ha
The Astons and Heyfords	4,711	9	3.72ha	0.79ha
Wroxton	2,531	10	2.53ha	1.00ha
Yarnton, Gosford and Water Eaton	4,528	2	1.11ha	0.25ha
CHERWELL	131,785	93	37.36ha	0.28ha

6.64 **PPG17 Study recommendations to meet current deficiencies:** The PPG17 study identified the need to:

- a) Adoption of the quality standard for all sites in the district.
- b) Develop an action plan to increase access by public transport to existing sites.

6.65 **The functional role of cemeteries and churchyards:** In addition to the greenspace function that they serve, the primary function of cemeteries and churchyards as

burial sites will also define the amount of space required for this purpose. There are no recognised standards for calculating the adequacy of provision in this regard, however the following factors will need to be taken into account:

- a) The size of the local population.
- b) The death rate per annum (national average 9.5%).
- c) Deaths per annum (the overall population x the annual death rate).
- d) Cremation/burial ratio (national average 72:28).
- e) Percentage of burials in existing graves.
- f) Number of new graves required per annum (number of deaths x 28%).
- g) Life expectancy of the site.
- h) Number of new graves required (number per annum x the life expectancy of the site).
- i) Area per grave (3.34sq.m.).
- j) % of cemetery used for circulation space/landscaping.
- k) Required area = number of new graves x area per grave x 1.3 (to include circulation space).

6.66 Deficiencies in cemetery provision in relation to their burial function alone, cannot be determined by the application of a single standard, because the life expectancy of sites will vary between settlements and can require detailed investigation to determine the remaining available capacity. This level of analysis is beyond the scope of this strategy. However, the above methodology might usefully be adopted by town and parish councils in calculating the adequacy of current provision and identifying future needs.

6.67 The Council is aware of some settlements in the district where the capacity of existing cemeteries is an issue. Banbury Town Council has indicated that burial space may become an issue during the period of the LDF. Bicester Cemetery has limited remaining capacity and the Town Council has appointed consultants to investigate this further, with a view to identifying suitable sites for a new cemetery. Securing additional land for cemetery provision in Bicester is hindered by the development hope value attached to areas of land around the town. The District Council is therefore assisting the Town Council with the study, with a view to a site being identified in the LDF.

6.68 Where additional cemetery provision is required in the smaller settlements in the district, such villages are less likely to be affected by development hope value and will be providing for lower levels of demand than in towns. The PPG17 study identified up to ten parishes where there could be a need for cemetery provision during the LDF period. The quickest and most efficient way of securing this would be by submitting a planning application, rather than through the LDF process itself. Kidlington Parish Council has been investigating the suitability of sites for cemetery provision for some time and is intending to submit a planning application once its preferred site has been identified.

Green corridors

6.69 **Introduction:** The PPG17 study identified five green corridors in the district, which collectively total 2.95 ha. The distribution by sub-area is as follows:

<i>Analysis area</i>	<i>No. sites</i>	<i>Size (ha.)</i>
Banbury	2	0.55ha
Bicester	0	0.00ha
Kidlington	0	0.00ha
Rural north	2	2.02ha
Rural central	0	0.00ha
Rural south	1	0.40ha

6.70 **Standard of provision:** This was set as follows in the PPG17 Study:

- a) **Quantitative standard:** No quantitative standard was set.
- b) **Quality:** ‘Clean, well maintained safe and secure routes with clear, level and well drained paths, which are provided by the protection and reinforcement of existing vegetation. The green corridor should provide links to major open spaces, urban areas and community facilities. Sites should provide a natural wildlife habitat, cyclist provision and ancillary accommodation such as seating and toilets where appropriate’.
- c) **Accessibility:** No accessibility standard was set.

6.71 **Current deficiencies:** With no quantitative standard, it is not possible to identify specific deficiencies at sub-area or ward level. However, whilst they might not be overtly designated as ‘green corridors’ it will be important to identify as many opportunities as possible to develop multi-functional networks of green space in the district, particularly:

- a) Providing links between different types of greenspace.
- b) Creating green (non-vehicular) transport opportunities, to reduce car dependence.
- c) Linking urban areas with the countryside.

6.72 In this regard, two specific opportunities are proposed:

- a) An ‘Urban Edge’ park around the periphery of Bicester.
- b) A series of open spaces based upon the river/canal corridor in Banbury, as cited in the Non-Statutory Cherwell Local Plan.

6.73 **PPG17 Study recommendations to meet current deficiencies:** The PPG17 study identified the need to:

- a) Adoption of a quality standard for all green corridors in the district.
- b) Improve access and signage for wheelchair and pushchair users at all sites.
- c) Continue Local Plan policies to prevent development on green corridor sites.

6.74 **Future deficiencies:** The PPG17 study did not identify a need for further green corridors in the district to supplement existing green space and rights of way, but it did support the creation of a circular route around the periphery of Bicester.

Civic spaces

6.75 **Introduction:** The PPG17 study identified three civic spaces in the district, two in Banbury and one in Bicester, which collectively total 0.72 ha.

6.76 **Standard of provision:** This was set as follows in the PPG17 Study:

- a) **Quantitative standard:** No quantitative standard was set.
- b) **Quality:** ‘A clean, safe, litter and graffiti free community site which encourages a sense of place where local distinctiveness and traditions can be celebrated. The civic space will provide public art and ancillary facilities, where appropriate, to accommodate a wide range of users’.
- c) **Accessibility:** No accessibility standard was set.

6.77 **Current deficiencies:** With no quantitative standard, it is not possible to identify specific deficiencies at sub-area or ward level.

6.78 **PPG17 Study recommendations to meet current deficiencies:** The PPG17 study identified the need to:

- a) Adopt a quality standard for all current and future civic spaces in the district.
- b) Create new civic spaces, or extend existing civic spaces, as part of urban extensions or modifications in the centres of the three main towns.

6.79 **Future deficiencies:** The PPG17 study did not identify specific needs for further civic spaces in the district.

Sites allocated in the Non-Statutory Cherwell Local Plan

6.80 **Introduction:** The ‘Non-Statutory Cherwell Local Plan 2011’ contains details of a number of sites that are allocated for greenspace provision. The need for their continued designation has been assessed in relation to the deficiencies identified above and an evaluation of each site is contained below.

6.81 **Banbury:** The sites allocated for ‘Recreation Use’ and ‘Formal Sports Provision’, together with the case for their continued designation are listed below:

<i>Site</i>	<i>Justification for retention</i>
Bankside Urban Extension (to include land for Recreation Use)	Would provide additional amenity greenspace.
Land to the south of the Bankside Urban Extension, designated for Formal Sports Provision	Would help to meet the deficiency of rugby pitches in Banbury (see Playing Pitch Strategy).

6.82 **Bicester:** The sites allocated for ‘Recreation Use’ and ‘Formal Sports Provision’, together with the case for their continued designation are listed below:

<i>Site</i>	<i>Justification for retention</i>
Land adjacent to Skimmingdish Lane	Would help to reduce the current deficiency of allotments in Bicester East ward help to reduce the current deficiency of parks and gardens by contributing to an ‘Urban Edge Park’.
Land to the east of Launton Road	Would contribute to an ‘Urban Edge Park’.
Land to the north of Gavray Drive	Would help to reduce the deficiency of amenity greenspace in Bicester.
Land to the south of Middleton Stoney Road	Would help to reduce the deficiency of outdoor sports provision in Bicester.

6.83 **Caversfield** The sites allocated for ‘Recreation Use’, together with the case for their continued designation are listed below:

<i>Site</i>	<i>Justification for retention</i>
Land to the east of Blencowe Close	Would help to reduce the current deficiency in children’s play provision in Caversfield.
Land to the south of Springfield Road	Would help to reduce the current deficiency in children’s play provision in Caversfield.

Summary

6.79 The application of the standards of provision has enabled current and future deficiencies to be identified.

VII.

ACTION PLAN

VII ACTION PLAN

Section summary

- 7.1 **Introduction:** The action plan identifies ways of meeting the identified deficiencies in greenspace provision in Cherwell district will be met.
- 7.2 **Delivery partners:** There are a range of delivery partners, including the following both individually and in partnership:
- a) Cherwell District Council.
 - b) Town and parish councils.
 - c) Schools.
 - d) Voluntary organisations.
 - e) Commercial organisations.
 - f) Housing developers.
- 7.3 **Implementation options:** There are a range of options for implementing the action plan including:
- a) **New provision.**
 - b) **Upgrading provision:** This can be achieved through:
 - Extended provision.
 - Improved provision.
 - c) **Enhanced access:** Improving access to existing greenspace provision can be achieved in a number of ways:
 - a) Formal agreements.
 - b) Physical improvements.
 - c) Public transport improvements.
 - d) Rights of way improvements.
 - e) Information and awareness.
 - d) **Integrated provision:** Combining forms of greenspace provision can broaden the appeal of a site.
- 7.4 **Funding options:** There are several external funding options including:
- a) Developer contributions.

- b) Lottery funding.
- c) Landfill tax and aggregates levy.
- d) Charities and trusts.

7.5 **Action Plan:** The action plan sets out how and where the identified deficiencies in greenspace provision in Cherwell district will be met.

Delivery partners

7.6 **Introduction:** A wide range of organisations will play a part in implementing the Green Spaces Strategy. The type of roles are summarised below:

- a) **Cherwell District Council:** The District Council is likely to play the lead role in co-ordinating the development of the larger, more strategic sites and facilities, using its statutory planning powers where necessary.
- b) **Town and parish councils:** Town and parish councils will continue to provide more local scale greenspace sites and facilities, in particular amenity greenspace, allotments, provision for children and young people, tennis courts and MUGAs.
- c) **Schools:** Several state and independent schools in the district already provide sport and play facilities from which local communities benefit. The ‘Building Schools for the Future’ programme and ‘Extended Schools’ agenda will provide further opportunities to meet identified deficiencies.
- d) **Voluntary organisations:** Local sports clubs and recreation trusts are significant providers of outdoor sports facilities. County and national conservation trusts (such as the Berkshire, Buckinghamshire and Oxfordshire Wildlife Trust and the Royal Society for the Protection of Birds) also provide and manage natural and semi-natural greenspace sites, including the creation of new areas from time to time.
- e) **Commercial organisations:** Because golf courses can be operated on a commercially viable basis, private sector companies are major providers of this type of outdoor sports facility.
- f) **Housing developers:** The developers of new dwellings in the district can be required either to provide new greenspace as part of an individual development, or to make a financial contribution towards the capital and revenue costs of such provision on site or elsewhere in the vicinity. The key principle is that the greenspace must meet the needs of the residents of the new homes, as opposed to rectifying any pre-existing deficiencies. This mechanism is likely to comprise a major component of new greenspace provision in the district.
- g) **Partnership arrangements:** Partnership arrangements involving combinations of any of the above providers will help to share the costs of provision, management and maintenance of additional greenspace provision.

Implementation options

- 7.7 **Introduction:** This section examines the range of options for extending and enhancing greenspace provision in the district, including:
- a) New provision.
 - b) Upgrading existing provision.
 - c) Enhanced access to existing provision.
 - d) Integrated provision.
- 7.8 **New provision:** Making entirely new provision to meet some of the identified shortfalls is likely to be the only option for some forms of greenspace. To meet the needs of the existing population, this may involve the purchase or leasing of land to secure public access, or the development of access agreements (see below). For the inhabitants of new housing developments in the district, new provision is likely to be made through the medium of developer contributions. The Council's preference is for such provision to be made on site, but financial contributions can also be made to off-site provision where the small scale nature of developments precludes this on site.
- 7.9 **Upgrading provision:** Upgrading existing greenspace provision will help to increase usage capacity, thereby reducing identified deficiencies. The types of upgrade that would be most beneficial in this regard include:
- a) **Extended provision:** Physically expanding the area of an existing site or facility will increase its capacity for use and may enhance its wildlife and biodiversity value. Providing linkages between existing areas of greenspace can help to create green corridors and strategic routes for green travel and wildlife migration.
 - b) **Improved provision:** Providing better playing surfaces and floodlights for outdoor sports facilities will extend their usage periods. Providing additional play equipment in children's play areas, to expand the range of ages and abilities catered for, will attract additional users. Habitat restoration and development improves the biodiversity value of natural and semi-natural greenspace.
- 7.10 **Enhanced access:** Improving access to existing greenspace provision can be achieved in a number of ways:
- a) **Formal agreements:** Securing improved access through the development of formal agreements serves to safeguard public usage of greenspace and in some cases may provide sufficient security of tenure to allow external funding applications to be sought, to provide further enhancements. Examples include:
 - Securing the dual use by the community of education facilities, through a Community Use Agreement.

- The designation of Access Land under the provisions of the Countryside and Rights of Way (CROW) Act (2000), which allows additional public access at specified sites in addition to traditional linear footpaths and bridleways.
 - The provision or extension of longer-term leases (typically 21 years or more), to allow tenants to apply for grant-aid from external sources to fund improved greenspaces.
- b) **Physical improvements:** A number of physical improvements to greenspace sites can improve access, especially for people who are generally less mobile such as the elderly and disabled. Examples include surfaced pathways, the provision of accessible gates and stiles and in the case of sites in rural areas that are relatively distant from the urban parts of the district, dedicated car parking.
- c) **Public transport improvements:** The PPG17 Study notes a number of instances where improvements to public transport (in particular rural buses), would reduce the need for travel by private vehicles.
- d) **Rights of way improvements:** Improving the rights of way network to ensure that there are appropriate linkages between key greenspace sites and urban areas and other key settlements in the district would improve access and promote more sustainable forms of transport. The designation of named and/or themed trails in and around the district would promote the use of key routes. The development of green corridors expands the concept of linear rights of way into a form of greenspace form in its own right.
- e) **Information and awareness:** The provision of interpretive panels at sites with nature conservation interest can help to educate and inform users and enhance the user experience. Similarly, good on-site signposting can improve user confidence in exploring larger sites or following marked trails. By the same token, off-site signposting creates greater awareness of sites by non-users and may therefore encourage usage. Finally, the development and distribution of publicity materials promoting greenspace sites will also raise awareness amongst potential users.

7.11 **Integrated provision:** There are already a number of sites in the district where several greenspace functions are served at the same site. A good example is the many village recreation grounds, where sports pitches are often located alongside children's play facilities, other outdoor sports facilities and amenity greenspace. When making new provision in the future, there are a number of advantages in integrating greenspace:

- a) **Community cohesion:** The combination of different uses of greenspace will encourage a wider range of users, including family groups and will promote community cohesion.
- b) **Maintenance:** Maintenance will be simplified and rationalised if more provision is concentrated at a single site, rather than on a dispersed basis.

Funding options

7.12 **Introduction:** This section considers the various forms of funding that might be available to support the extension and improvement of greenspace provision in Cherwell district. This includes:

- a) Developer contributions.
- b) Lottery funding.
- c) Landfill tax and aggregates levy.
- d) Charities and trusts.

7.13 **Developer contributions:** Developer contributions (or Section 106 Agreements) involve the provision of capital and revenue funds (commuted sums) by housing developers, as a contribution to the facilities and services that the inhabitants of new residential developments will need. The introduction of Development Plan Documents (DPDs) under the new Local Development Framework (LDF) system, will provide local authorities with the basis for formalising such arrangements. Government guidance identifies that the following principles need to be observed in formulating the basis upon which developer contributions will be invited:

- a) **Planning standards:** Policies and planning standards should be comprehensive, but also flexible and easy to understand. Guidance should be clear and unambiguous, to provide practical solutions to meet all circumstances.
- b) **Costs:** There should be clarity about the costs that developers will be required to meet, including the planning and design, installation and longer-term maintenance of greenspace.
- c) **On/off-site contributions:** The basis on which on-site and off-site contributions will be determined should be clearly stated, with thresholds set to reflect the planning standards for greenspace.
- d) **Specific contributions:** Some types of greenspace provision provide for users from specific age ranges (e.g. children's play) and the demographic profile of the inhabitants of new housing should be taken into account in calculating the likely demand that specific developments will generate. On this basis, some types of housing might be exempt from developer contributions towards particular types of greenspace (e.g. sheltered accommodation or care/rest homes).

7.14 The Green Spaces Strategy provides a good basis for determining developer contributions, which are likely to provide the main source of external funding for additional greenspace provision in the district, as follows:

- a) The planning standards are locally derived and evidence-based, in line with the provisions of PPG17 and reflect the strategic vision and policy overlay.

- b) On-site and off-site contributions are proposed in the table below, based upon a combination of the planning standards and minimum size criteria.
- c) The composite standards for the generic forms of greenspace are based upon the approach proposed in the policy overlay, which reflects the multi-functional nature of many types of greenspace and allows flexibility in determining the precise composition of provision in new developments.

Generic typology	Specific typology	Quantitative standard	Accessibility standard	Minimum size of provision	Threshold for on-site provision
Multi-functional greenspace	Parks and gardens	0.48ha per 1,000 urban dwellers (4.8sq.m. /person)	15 minutes walk (1.2km)	2ha (Garth Park 2.9ha, People's Park 3.9ha, St. Louis' Meadow 4.1ha.)	1,714 urban dwellings
	Natural/semi-natural greenspace	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0.53ha per 1,000 urban dwellers (5.3sq.m. / person) • 1.55ha per 1,000 urban edge/rural dwellers (15.5sq.m./person) 	15 minutes walk (1.2km)	2ha (consistent with English Nature's ANGSt standard.	465 dwellings
	Amenity greenspace	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0.5ha per 1,000 urban dwellers (5sq.m. / person) • 0.75ha per 1,000 rural/urban edge dwellers (7.5sq.m./person) 	5 minutes walk (400m)	200sq.m.	16 urban dwellings 11 rural dwellings
	Composite standard	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1.51ha per 1,000 urban dwellers (15.1sq.m. / person) • 2.3ha per 1,000 rural/urban edge dwellers (23sq.m./person) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 minute walk (amenity space) • 15 minute walk (other) 	200sq.m.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 urban dwellings (450 dwellings generates 2.0ha.) • 6 rural/urban edge dwellings (330 dwellings generates 2.0ha.)
Play space	Younger children	0.59ha per 1000 people (5.9sq.m./person)	5 minutes walk (400m)	100 sq.m. activity zone with 400sq.m. including buffer (sufficient for a LAP)	10 dwellings
	Older children	0.19ha per 1000 people (1.9sq.m./person)	5 minutes walk (400m) except for NEAPs (1.2km)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LEAP - 400sq.m. activity zone with 3,600m including buffer. • NEAP - 1,000sq.m. activity zone with 8,500m including buffer. 	90 dwellings

	Composite standard	0.78ha per 1000 people (7.8sq.m./person)	5 minutes walk (400m) except for NEAPs (1.2km)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LAP - 100 sq.m. activity zone with 400sq.m. including buffer. • LEAP - 400sq.m. activity zone with 3,600m including buffer. • NEAP - 1,000sq.m. activity zone with 8,500m including buffer. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 dwellings (for a LAP.) • 50 dwellings (948sq.m.) for a LEAP and LAPs. • 100 dwellings (9,477sq.m.) for a NEAP and LEAPs/LAPs.
Generic typology	Specific typology	Quantitative standard	Accessibility standard	Minimum size of provision	Threshold for on-site provision
Outdoor sports	Tennis courts	1 tennis court (0.06ha) per 3,500 people (0.209 sq.m./person)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 15 minute walk (1.2km - urban) • 15 minute drive (12km - rural) 	2 tennis courts (0.12ha)	65 dwellings
	Bowling greens	1 bowling green (0.14ha) per 12,000 people (0.139sq.m./person)	15 minute drive (12km)	1 bowling green (0.14ha)	75 dwellings
	Golf courses	1 golf course per 17,500 people	15 minute drive (12km)	1 golf course (no fixed size allocation)	No contributions required
	Adult football pitches	1 pitch (2.0ha) per 600 males aged 16-45. (no additional pitches needed by 2026)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 minute walk (800m -urban) • 10 minute drive (8km - rural) 	No additional pitches needed to 2026	No additional provision required.
	Junior football pitches	1 pitch (1.0ha) per 100 males aged 10-15 (3.482sq.m./person)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 minute walk (800m -urban) • 10 minute drive (8km - rural) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Urban - 2 pitches and changing facility • Rural - 1 pitch and changing facility 	500 urban dwellings 250 rural dwellings
	Mini-soccer pitches	1 pitch (0.6ha) per 250 6-9 year olds (1.492sq.m./person)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 minute walk (800m -urban) • 10 minute drive (8km - rural) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Urban - 2 pitches and changing facility • Rural - 1 pitch and changing facility 	300 urban dwellings 150 rural dwellings
	Cricket pitches	1 pitch (2.0ha) per 1,500 males aged 11-55 (3.98sq.m./person)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 minute walk (800m -urban) • 10 minute drive (8km - rural) 	1 pitch plus changing provision	500 dwellings
	Rugby pitches	1 pitch (2.0ha) per 2,250 males aged 13-45 (1.99sq.m./person)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 minute walk (800m -urban) • 10 minute drive (8km - rural) 	Contributions to centralised provision required	Contributions to centralised provision required

Synthetic turf pitches	1 pitch per 12,000 11-45 year olds (no additional pitches needed by 2026).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 20 minute walk (1,600m - urban) • 20 minute drive (15km - rural) 	No additional pitches needed to 2026	No additional provision required.
Composite standard	<i>11.29sq.m./person (excluding golf courses, adult football and synthetic turf pitches with no additional provision needed before 2026.</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>10 minute walk (800m -urban)</i> • <i>10 minute drive (8km - rural)</i> 	<i>0.12ha (sufficient for 2 tennis courts).</i>	<i>65 dwellings generates 1,263sq.m - enough for 2 tennis courts</i>

<i>Generic typology</i>	<i>Specific typology</i>	<i>Quantitative standard</i>	<i>Accessibility standard</i>	<i>Minimum size of provision</i>	<i>Threshold for on-site provision</i>
Allotments	Allotments	0.31ha per 1,000 people (3.1sq.m. per person)	10 minute walk (800m)	0.2ha (to accommodate 8 plots)	275 dwellings generates 0.2ha.

d) Data on household occupancy in new housing developments was produced by Oxfordshire County Council in 2005, based upon a survey of the residents of new developments. The key findings for Cherwell that can be used to project future patterns of population growth in relation to housing developments of different types are as follows:

- The average occupancy (the number of people per occupied household) for new developments in Cherwell was 2.53, slightly higher than the county average of 2.42.
- The average occupancy of children aged 0 - 19 in Cherwell was 0.74, again slightly higher than the county average of 0.65.
- The average number of occupants by number of bedrooms in new developments in Cherwell is tabulated below:

<i>No. bedrooms</i>	<i>% new properties built</i>	<i>Average no. occupants</i>
1	4.2	1.26
2	16.2	1.86
3	41.3	2.58
4	25.4	3.24
5	11.2	3.56
6	1.6	5.00
7	0.1	3.00

e) Contributions by different types of dwelling are proposed in the table below, based upon the likely demography of the inhabitants and their propensity for use of different types of greenspace:

<i>Type of greenspace</i>	<i>Houses</i>	<i>Flats</i>	<i>Bedsits</i>	<i>Hostels</i>	<i>Sheltered accom.</i>	<i>V. Sheltered accom.</i>	<i>Care homes</i>	<i>Student accom.</i>
Parks and gardens	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	X	X	✓
Natural/semi-natural g/space	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	X	X	✓
Amenity greenspace	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	X	X	✓
Play provision	✓	✓	X	X	X	X	X	X
MUGAs	✓	✓	X	X	X	X	X	✓
Tennis courts	✓	✓	✓	✓	X	X	X	✓
Bowling greens	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	X	X	✓
Golf courses	✓	✓	✓	✓	X	X	X	✓
Allotments	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	X	X	✓

7.15 **Lottery funding:** The net proceeds of the National Lottery are distributed to a variety of good causes, several of which are relevant to greenspace provision in Cherwell district as follows:

a) **Big Lottery Fund:** The BIG Fund distributes 50% of the overall money available for good causes. The main grant programmes of relevance are as follows:

- **Parks for People:** The programme, which is funded jointly with the Heritage Lottery Fund, will provide £90 million in grants ranging from £250,000 to £5 million. It aims to ‘bring real improvements to local environments and quality of life, making a lasting impact on the lives of local people and the places where they live. Every community should have access to a good quality local park with opportunities for enjoyment and recreation for all’.
- **Community Assets:** The programme will provide a total of £30 million in grants ranging from £150,000 to £1 million, to refurbish local authority facilities to enable their transfer to the community and voluntary sector.
- **Playful Ideas:** The programme will provide £16 million in grants ranging from £10,000 to £250,000, to support projects that focus on innovation and new ways of providing children’s play. Applications can be submitted by voluntary and community groups and town and parish councils.

b) **Heritage Lottery Fund:** The HLF distributes funding for projects that protect and enhance the natural and built heritage. The main grant programmes of relevance are as follows:

- **Your Heritage:** The programme provides grants ranging from £5,000 to £50,000, to support projects that conserve and enhance our heritage and open up heritage resources and sites to the widest possible audiences.
- **Heritage Grants:** The programme provides grants of more than £50,000, to support larger projects that conserve and enhance our heritage and make sure that everyone can have access to and enjoy their heritage.

c) **Sport England’s Community Investment Fund:** The CIF fund is administered by Sport England’s regional offices and provides capital and revenue grants for projects that meet its priorities of getting more people involved in sport and helping them to stay involved for the rest of their lives. In the South-East, £8.1 million will be available over five years in grants between £50,000 and £400,000 to support projects that:

- Increase participation amongst under-represented groups.
- Contribute to increasing overall participation rates by 1% per annum.

d) **Awards for All:** The fund provides grants of between £300 and £10,000 for voluntary and community organisations and parish and town councils for

projects that promote local sport, heritage and community projects.

7.16 **Landfill tax and aggregates levy:** Both funds provide grants to areas affected by landfill operations or mineral extraction. The details are as follows;

- a) **Landfill Communities Fund:** The Landfill Communities Fund is funded by a levy on landfill and enables landfill site operators to finance environmental bodies to fund projects that will mitigate the effects of landfill on communities that live in the vicinity. Projects funded include ‘the provision, maintenance or improvement of a public park or other general public amenity’ provided that:
- There is open public access to the site.
 - The project is located within ten miles of a landfill site.
- b) **Aggregates Levy Sustainability Fund:** The Fund is administered by DEFRA, with 26 delivery partners and one of its objectives is to compensate local communities for the impact of mineral extraction. Whilst Oxfordshire is not one of the primary areas to benefit, Action for Communities in Rural England (ACRE) is a delivery partner for projects outside the primary areas. Projects funded include community playgrounds, creation and interpretation of wildlife habitats and restoration of degraded landscape.

7.17 **Charities and trusts:** A wide range of charities and trusts provide funding for greenspace projects, although the sums involved are generally small and in many instances the applicant organisation must be a charity or community organisation. Some of the more significant funders in this sector are detailed in the table below:

<i>Name of the Fund</i>	<i>Aims/priorities</i>	<i>Eligibility criteria</i>	<i>Funding available</i>
Aspects of Life Fund	Focus areas include preserving and protecting the environment, habitats and wildlife.	Charitable bodies only.	Grants of up to £5,000
Barclays Spaces for Sport	In partnership with Groundwork and the Football Foundation, capital and revenue funding and professional help are given to transform neglected land into sports facilities.	Community organisations.	No stated maximum
Esmee Fairburn Charitable Trust	Provides funds for environment projects, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conservation projects that link fragmented habitats or protect threatened UK species. • Projects that preserve and enhance public open space and support woodland management. 	Registered charities and all properly constituted bodies. The project purpose must be ‘legally charitable’. No substitute for statutory funding.	Grants of up to £250,000 over 3 years, but average grant of £35,000.
Living Spaces	Funding for improving community green spaces, including natural areas and ponds.	Community organisations.	Maximum of £25,000
Manifold Trust	Funding for a wide range of environmental projects.	Registered charities only.	£400 - £5,000
Shell Better Britain Campaign	The Community Projects Fund provides grants for surveying biodiversity and the creation and improvement of wildlife areas.	Community organisations.	Maximum of £2,000.

<i>Name of the Fund</i>	<i>Aims/priorities</i>	<i>Eligibility criteria</i>	<i>Funding available</i>
Waterways Trust	Small grants scheme provides funding for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community-based projects for facilities on canals and inland waterways. • Projects to improve access for people with disabilities. • Projects that support schemes to benefit young people. • Projects that conserve water voles. • Projects to provide wildlife escape ramps on canals. 	Community organisations and schools.	Up to £5,000

Action Plan

7.18 **Introduction:** This section comprises the action plan for meeting the deficiencies in greenspace provision identified in the Green Spaces Strategy. Because the calculation of developer contributions requires the differentiation between assessed shortfalls based upon the current population and deficiencies attributable to the inhabitants of new dwellings, each type of greenspace has:

- a) An action plan detailing how current (2008) deficiencies will be met.
- b) A separate action plan detailing how future (2026) deficiencies will be met.

7.19 **Parks and gardens:** The action plans are as follows:

a) **Meeting current deficiencies:**

<i>Analysis area</i>	<i>Current shortfall</i>	<i>Action plan for meeting shortfall</i>
Banbury	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No identified quantitative shortfall. • Improve the quality of existing parks, to achieve 'Green Flag' designation by 2015.
Bicester	10.90ha	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop an 'urban edge' park totalling at least 10.9ha around the outskirts of the town (including land designated along Skimmingdish Lane), linking existing greenspaces and with sign-posted footpaths and cycleways connecting to the town centre. • Improve the quality of The Garth, to achieve 'Green Flag' designation by 2015.
Kidlington	6.59ha	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop a park in the vicinity of Exeter Hall, with additional provision on the northern outskirts of the town. • Achieve 'Green Flag' designation by 2015.

b) **Meeting future deficiencies:**

<i>Analysis area</i>	<i>Future shortfall</i>	<i>Action plan for meeting shortfall</i>
Banbury	3.28ha	A new 3.7ha park in Banbury.
Bicester	6.93ha	A new 7.0ha park, based on sites around the periphery of Bicester, linking with the planned circular route.
Kidlington	0.36ha	A 0.4ha extension to the proposed new park in Kidlington.

7.20 *Natural and semi-natural greenspace*: The action plans are as follows:

a) *Meeting current deficiencies*:

<i>Analysis area</i>	<i>Current shortfall</i>	<i>Action plan for meeting shortfall</i>
Banbury	1.34ha	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop community woodland as part of the Bankside development. • Negotiate public access agreements to privately owned natural/ semi-natural greenspace. • Improve the quality of existing natural and semi-natural greenspace, especially access.
Bicester	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No identified current shortfall. • Improve the quality of existing natural and semi-natural greenspace, especially access.
Kidlington	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No identified current shortfall. • Improve the quality of existing natural and semi-natural greenspace, especially access.
Rural north	48.12ha	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Negotiate public access agreements to at least privately owned natural/ semi-natural greenspace. • Improve the quality of existing natural and semi-natural greenspace, especially access.
Rural central	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No identified current shortfall. • Improve the quality of existing natural and semi-natural greenspace, especially access.
Rural south	8.56ha	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Negotiate public access agreements to at least privately owned natural/ semi-natural greenspace. • Improve the quality of existing natural and semi-natural greenspace, especially access.

b) *Meeting future deficiencies*:

<i>Analysis area</i>	<i>Future shortfall</i>	<i>Action plan for meeting shortfall</i>
Banbury	3.67ha	Develop an additional 3.7ha of space through new provision or public access agreements to privately owned sites.
Bicester	3.34ha	Develop 3.4ha of space through new provision or public access agreements to privately owned sites.
Kidlington	0.11ha	Develop 0.1ha of space through new provision or public access agreements to privately owned sites.
Rural north	5.26ha	Develop 5.3ha of space through new provision or public access agreements to privately owned sites.
Rural central	0	No identified future shortfall.
Rural south	5.50ha	Develop 5.5ha of space through new provision or public access agreements to privately owned sites.

7.21 **Amenity greenspace:** The action plans are as follows:

a) **Meeting current deficiencies:**

Analysis area	Current shortfall	Action plan for meeting shortfall
Banbury	0.0ha	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No identified quantitative shortfall. Improve the quality of existing amenity greenspace, especially access.
Bicester	4.60ha	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop 4.6ha of space (including land designated to the north of Gavray Drive). Improve the quality of existing natural and semi-natural greenspace, especially access.
Kidlington	2.12ha	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop 2.2ha of space, with priority provision in South ward. Improve the quality of existing amenity greenspace, especially access.
Rural north	4.08ha	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop 4.1ha of space, with priority provision in Adderbury, Bloxham and Bodicote, Cropredy and Sibford wards. Improve the quality of existing amenity greenspace, especially access.
Rural central	0.0ha	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No identified quantitative shortfall. Improve the quality of existing amenity greenspace, especially access.
Rural south	3.52ha	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop 3.6ha of space, with priority provision in Kirtlington, Launton, Otmoor and Yarnton, Gosford and Water Eaton wards. Improve the quality of existing amenity greenspace, especially access.

b) **Meeting future deficiencies:**

Analysis area	Future shortfall	Action plan for meeting shortfall
Banbury	0.0ha	No identified future shortfall.
Bicester	4.42ha	Develop a further 4.4ha of space.
Kidlington	0.38ha	Develop a further 0.4ha of space.
Rural north	2.55ha	Develop a further 2.6ha of space.
Rural central	1.49ha	Develop 1.5ha of space.
Rural south	2.66ha	Develop a further 2.7ha of space.

7.22 **Provision for children and young people:** The action plans are as follows:

a) **Meeting current deficiencies:**

• **Younger children:**

Analysis area	Current shortfall	Action plan for meeting shortfall
Banbury	19.51ha	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Deficiency to be met through a combination of new equipped play areas and additional play opportunities using other appropriate forms of existing greenspace. Improve the quality of existing play areas.

Bicester	13.67ha	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deficiency to be met through a combination of new equipped play areas and additional play opportunities using other appropriate forms of existing greenspace. • Improve the quality of existing play areas.
----------	---------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

<i>Analysis area</i>	<i>Current shortfall</i>	<i>Action plan for meeting shortfall</i>
Kidlington	7.73ha	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deficiency to be met through a combination of new equipped play areas and additional play opportunities using other appropriate forms of existing greenspace. • Improve the quality of existing play areas.
Rural north	9.31ha	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deficiency to be met through a combination of new equipped play areas and additional play opportunities using other appropriate forms of existing greenspace. • Improve the quality of existing play areas.
Rural central	6.45ha	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deficiency to be met through a combination of new equipped play areas and additional play opportunities using other appropriate forms of existing greenspace. • Improve the quality of existing play areas.
Rural south	7.67ha	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deficiency to be met through a combination of new equipped play areas and additional play opportunities using other appropriate forms of existing greenspace. • Improve the quality of existing play areas.

- *Older children:*

<i>Analysis area</i>	<i>Current shortfall</i>	<i>Action plan for meeting shortfall</i>
Banbury	2.76ha	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop a total of 2.8ha of play space in all wards other than Grimsbury and Castle, through a combination of new equipped play areas, MUGAs and additional play opportunities using other appropriate forms of greenspace. • Improve the quality of existing play areas.
Bicester	2.18ha	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop a total of 2.2ha of play space in all wards other than Bicester South, through a combination of new equipped play areas, MUGAs and additional play opportunities using other appropriate forms of greenspace. • Improve the quality of existing play areas.
Kidlington	2.23ha	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop 2.2ha of play space, through a combination of new equipped play areas, MUGAs and additional play opportunities using other appropriate forms of greenspace. • Improve the quality of existing play areas.
Rural north	1.77ha	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop 1.8ha of play space, through a combination of new equipped play areas, MUGAs and additional play opportunities using other appropriate forms of greenspace. • Improve the quality of existing play areas.
Rural central	1.41ha	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop 1.4ha of play space, through a combination of new equipped play areas, MUGAs and additional play opportunities using other appropriate forms of greenspace. • Improve the quality of existing play areas.

Rural south	1.17ha	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop 1.2ha of play space, through a combination of new equipped play areas, MUGAs and additional play opportunities using other appropriate forms of greenspace. • Improve the quality of existing play areas.
-------------	--------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

b) *Meeting future deficiencies:*

- *Younger children:*

<i>Analysis area</i>	<i>Future shortfall</i>	<i>Action plan for meeting shortfall</i>
Banbury	4.09ha	Meet deficiencies through a combination of new equipped play areas and additional play opportunities using other appropriate forms of greenspace.
Bicester	4.97ha	Meet deficiencies through a combination of new equipped play areas and additional play opportunities using other appropriate forms of greenspace.
Kidlington	0.44ha	Meet deficiencies through a combination of new equipped play areas and additional play opportunities using other appropriate forms of greenspace.
Rural north	2.00ha	Meet deficiencies through a combination of new equipped play areas and additional play opportunities using other appropriate forms of greenspace.
Rural central	1.39ha	Meet deficiencies through a combination of new equipped play areas and additional play opportunities using other appropriate forms of greenspace.
Rural south	2.10ha	Meet deficiencies through a combination of new equipped play areas and additional play opportunities using other appropriate forms of greenspace.

- *Older children:*

<i>Analysis area</i>	<i>Future shortfall</i>	<i>Action plan for meeting shortfall</i>
Banbury	1.32ha	Meet deficiencies through a combination of new equipped play areas and additional play opportunities using other appropriate forms of greenspace.
Bicester	1.61ha	Meet deficiencies through a combination of new equipped play areas and additional play opportunities using other appropriate forms of greenspace.
Kidlington	0.14ha	Meet deficiencies through a combination of new equipped play areas and additional play opportunities using other appropriate forms of greenspace.
Rural north	0.65ha	Meet deficiencies through a combination of new equipped play areas and additional play opportunities using other appropriate forms of greenspace.
Rural central	0.45ha	Meet deficiencies through a combination of new equipped play areas and additional play opportunities using other appropriate forms of greenspace.
Rural south	0.68ha	Meet deficiencies through a combination of new equipped play areas and additional play opportunities using other appropriate forms of greenspace.

7.23 **Multi-Use Games Areas:** The action plans are as follows:

a) **Meeting current deficiencies:**

Analysis area	Current shortfall	Action plan for meeting shortfall
Banbury	0	No identified quantitative shortfall.
Bicester	1	Provide one new MUGA at Pingle Field.
Kidlington	1	Provide one new MUGA at Orchard Recreation Ground.
Rural north	0	No identified quantitative shortfall.
Rural central	0	No identified quantitative shortfall.
Rural south	2	Provide one new MUGA at Kirtlington Recn. Ground and one at Islip Recn. Ground.

b) **Meeting future deficiencies:**

Analysis area	Future shortfall	Action plan for meeting shortfall
Banbury	2	Provide two new MUGAs.
Bicester	1	Provide one new MUGA.
Kidlington	0	No identified future shortfall once current deficiencies are met.
Rural north	1	Provide one new MUGA.
Rural central	0	No additional provision required.
Rural south	1	Provide one new MUGA.

7.24 **Tennis courts:** The action plans are as follows:

a) **Meeting current deficiencies:**

Analysis area	Current shortfall	Action plan for meeting shortfall
Banbury	3	Provide three new courts in conjunction with MUGAs.
Bicester	1	Provide one new court at Pingle Field in conjunction with the new MUGA.
Kidlington	2	Provide two new courts at Exeter Hall.
Rural north	0	No identified quantitative shortfall.
Rural central	0	No identified quantitative shortfall.
Rural south	3	Provide three new courts at Kirtlington Recreation Ground.

b) **Meeting future deficiencies:**

Analysis area	Future shortfall	Action plan for meeting shortfall
Banbury	2	Provide two new courts in conjunction with MUGAs.
Bicester	3	Provide three new courts.
Kidlington	0	No identified future shortfall.
Rural north	0	No identified future shortfall.
Rural central	0	No additional provision required.
Rural south	1	Provide one new court.

7.25 **Bowling greens:** The action plans are as follows:

a) **Meeting current deficiencies:**

Analysis area	Current shortfall	Action plan for meeting shortfall
Banbury	0	No identified quantitative shortfall.
Bicester	1	Provide one new green at Pingle Field, subject to demand from a local club.
Kidlington	0	No identified quantitative shortfall.
Rural north	0	No identified quantitative shortfall.
Rural central	0	No identified quantitative shortfall.
Rural south	0	No identified quantitative shortfall.

b) **Meeting future deficiencies:**

Analysis area	Future shortfall	Action plan for meeting shortfall
Banbury	1	Provide one new green, subject to demand from a local club.
Bicester	0	No identified future shortfall t.
Kidlington	0	No identified future shortfall.
Rural north	0	No identified future shortfall.
Rural central	0	No identified future shortfall.
Rural south	1	Provide one new green, subject to demand from a local club.

7.26 **Golf courses:** The action plan for current and future need is as follows:

Analysis area	Shortfall	Action plan for meeting shortfall
Banbury	0	No additional provision required - Cherwell Edge GC and surplus provision in rural north meet current and future needs.
Bicester	0	No additional provision required - surplus provision in rural central meets other current and future needs.
Kidlington	0	No additional provision required - North Oxford GC meets current and future needs.
Rural north	0	No additional provision required.
Rural central	1	Encourage a club/commercial operator to provide one additional course in the Chesterton area.
Rural south	0	No additional provision required.

7.27 **Allotments:** The action plans are as follows:

a) **Meeting current deficiencies:**

Analysis area	Current shortfall	Action plan for meeting shortfall
Banbury	6.12ha	Provide 6.1ha of space, with priority provision in Calthorpe ward.
Bicester	5.39ha	Provide 5.4ha of space, with priority provision in North and West ward (Skimmingdish Lane).
Kidlington	1.05ha	Provide 1.1ha of space.
Rural north	0	No identified current shortfall.
Rural central	0	No identified current shortfall.

Rural south	0	No identified current shortfall.
-------------	---	----------------------------------

b) *Meeting future deficiencies:*

<i>Analysis area</i>	<i>Future shortfall</i>	<i>Action plan for meeting shortfall</i>
Banbury	2.14ha	Provide an additional 2.1ha, subject to local demand.
Bicester	2.61ha	Provide an additional 2.6ha, subject to local demand.
Kidlington	0.23ha	Provide an additional 0.2ha, subject to local demand.
Rural north	0	No identified future shortfall.
Rural central	0	No identified future shortfall.
Rural south	0	No identified future shortfall.

Summary

7.28 This section sets out the ways in which identified shortfalls in greenspace provision in Cherwell district can be met, both now and in the future. As more definitive information becomes available on the magnitude, location and composition of new housing in the district, the planning standards can be applied to identify with greater precision where and how much additional greenspace provision is required.

APPENDIX I: GREEN SPACES IN CHERWELL DISTRICT

1) *Banbury sub-area:*

a) *Parks and gardens:*

<i>Site</i>	<i>Size</i>
People's Park	3.19ha
Princess Diana Park	2.78ha
St. Louise Meadow	4.16ha
Spiceball Country Park	10.01ha

b) *Natural/semi-natural greenspace:*

<i>Site</i>	<i>Size</i>
Banbury Natural Greenspace	8.45ha
Banbury Nature Reserve	3.45ha
Dorchester Grove Natural Greenspace	1.64ha
Hanwell Fields Nature Reserve	3.28ha
Waller Drive Natural Greenspace (1)	3.35ha
Waller Drive Natural Greenspace (2)	0.68ha

c) *Amenity greenspace:*

<i>Site</i>	<i>Size</i>
Aldbury Close Amenity Greenspace	0.08ha
Austin Drive Amenity Greenspace	0.08ha
Avocet Way Amenity Greenspace	0.05ha
Bankside Amenity Greenspace	0.15ha
Bankside Park	3.25ha
Beaconsfield Road Amenity Greenspace	0.18ha
Beatrice Drive Amenity Greenspace	0.18ha
Bodicote Road Flyover Amenity Greenspace	0.41ha
Booth Road Amenity Greenspace	0.01ha
Boxhedge Square Amenity Greenspace	0.03ha
Bramber Close Amenity Greenspace	0.08ha
Brantwood Rise Amenity Greenspace	0.10ha
Bretch Hill Amenity Greenspace	0.09ha
Bridge Street Park Amenity Greenspace	0.98ha
Bridle Close Amenity Greenspace	0.05ha
Brooke Road Amenity Greenspace	0.18ha
Brunswick Place Amenity Greenspace	0.12ha
Camellics Amenity Greenspace	0.49ha
Causeway Open Space Amenity Greenspace	0.40ha
Chatsworth Drive Amenity Greenspace	0.32ha
Cherry Road Amenity Greenspace (1)	0.04ha
Cherry Road Amenity Greenspace (2)	0.04ha
Coopers Gate Amenity Greenspace	0.29ha
Coppice Close Amenity Greenspace	0.10ha

<i>Site</i>	<i>Size</i>
Danesmore Amenity Greenspace	0.08ha
Daventry Road Gardens Amenity Greenspace	0.07ha
Delapre Drive Amenity Greenspace	0.53ha
Dover Avenue Amenity Greenspace	0.34ha
Dukes Meadow Drive Amenity Greenspace (1)	0.22ha
Dukes Meadow Drive Amenity Greenspace (2)	0.20ha
Edmunds Road Amenity Greenspace (1)	0.04ha
Edmunds Road Amenity Greenspace (2)	0.08ha
Edmunds Road Amenity Greenspace (3)	0.05ha
Edmunds Road Amenity Greenspace (4)	0.05ha
Edmunds Road Amenity Greenspace (5)	0.03ha
Edmunds Road Amenity Greenspace (6)	0.03ha
Evenlode Amenity Greenspace	0.05ha
Farm Way Amenity Greenspace	0.15ha
Forgeway Amenity Greenspace	0.25ha
Forgeway Close Amenity Greenspace	0.07ha
Foscote Rise Amenity Greenspace	0.14ha
Fowler Road Amenity Greenspace	0.46ha
Gillett Road Amenity Greenspace	0.22ha
Glyndebourne Gardens Amenity Greenspace	0.06ha
Grange Road Amenity Greenspace	0.25ha
Grimsbury Green Amenity Greenspace	0.25ha
Grimsbury Square Amenity Greenspace	0.41ha
Guernsey Way Amenity Greenspace	0.23ha
Hanwell Farmhouse Amenity Greenspace	0.15ha
Hanwell Fields Park	3.88ha
Harewood Road Amenity Greenspace	0.19ha
Hastings Park Amenity Greenspace	1.80ha
Hastings Road Amenity Greenspace	0.13ha
Hereford Amenity Greenspace	0.04ha
Hereford Way Amenity Greenspace	0.08ha
High Furlong Amenity Greenspace (1)	0.04ha
High Furlong Amenity Greenspace (2)	0.10ha
High Furlong Amenity Greenspace (3)	0.05ha
Highlands Amenity Greenspace	0.11ha
Howard Road Amenity Greenspace	0.26ha
Humber Walk Amenity Greenspace	0.07ha
Ivatt Walk Amenity Greenspace	0.18ha
Kedlestone Rise Amenity Greenspace	0.05ha
Kingfisher Drive Amenity Greenspace	0.16ha
Lapsley Drive Amenity Greenspace	0.11ha
Lidsey Close Amenity Greenspace	0.07ha
Longelandes Way Amenity Greenspace (1)	0.16ha
Longelandes Way Amenity Greenspace (2)	0.07ha
Longelandes Way Amenity Greenspace (3)	0.07ha
Longelandes Way Amenity Greenspace (4)	0.09ha
Longfellow Road Amenity Greenspace	0.09ha
Lord Grandison Amenity Greenspace	0.20ha

<i>Site</i>	<i>Size</i>
Maple Close Amenity Greenspace	0.16ha
Marlowe Close Amenity Greenspace	0.15ha
Mascourt Close Amenity Greenspace	0.17ha
Mascourt Road Amenity Greenspace	0.06ha
Melbourne Close Amenity Greenspace	0.04ha
Merton Street Amenity Greenspace	0.40ha
Mold Crescent Amenity Greenspace	0.10ha
Morris Drive Amenity Greenspace	0.06ha
Old Parr Close Amenity Greenspace	0.04ha
Orchard Park Amenity Greenspace	1.68ha
Parklands Amenity Greenspace	0.27ha
Penrhyn Close Amenity Greenspace	0.09ha
Poolside Close Amenity Greenspace	0.05ha
Prescott Close Amenity Greenspace	0.20ha
Rosedale Avenue Amenity Greenspace	0.36ha
Rotary Way Amenity Greenspace	0.06ha
Ruscote Park Amenity Greenspace	0.91ha
Sandford Green Amenity Greenspace	1.06ha
Stanbridge Park Amenity Greenspace	2.56ha
St. Anne's Road Amenity Greenspace	0.30ha
Stroud Close Amenity Greenspace	0.06ha
Sussex Drive Amenity Greenspace (1)	0.05ha
Sussex Drive Amenity Greenspace (2)	0.20ha
Sussex Drive Amenity Greenspace (3)	0.04ha
Timms Road Amenity Greenspace	0.10ha
Trinity Park Amenity Greenspace	2.67ha
Walkworth Close Amenity Greenspace	0.12ha
Warwick Road Gardens Amenity Greenspace	0.04ha
Wesley Drive Amenity Greenspace	0.08ha
William Close Amenity Greenspace	0.08ha
Winchelsea Close Amenity Greenspace	0.06ha
Windrush Park Amenity Greenspace	1.77ha
Wintergardens Way Amenity Greenspace	0.05ha
Woodfield Amenity Greenspace	0.11ha

d) *Provision for children and young people:*

<i>Site</i>	<i>Size</i>
Asmead Road Play Area	0.02ha
Beaulieu Close Play Area	1.95ha
Booth Road Play Area	0.05ha
Bridle Close Play Area	0.01ha
Browning Road Play Area	0.02ha
Chatsworth Avenue Play Area	0.18ha
Craster Court Play Area	0.01ha
Dover Avenue Toddler Play Area	0.05ha
Easington Park Play Area	0.14ha
Grange Road Play Area	0.03ha

<i>Site</i>	<i>Size</i>
Griffith Road Play Area	0.03ha
Hart Close Play Area	0.03ha
Hillview Park Play Area	0.03ha
Ironstone Park Play Area	0.05ha
Lapsey Drive Play Area	0.02ha
Manor Close Play Area	0.01ha
Melrose Court Play Area	0.03ha
Merton Street Play Area	0.02ha
Mineral Railway Play Area	0.22ha
Overthorpe Road Play Area	0.03ha
People's Park Play Area	0.40ha
Pitmaston Close Play Area	0.03ha
Princess Diana Park Basketball Area	0.04ha
Princess Diana Park NEAP	0.01ha
Princess Diana Park Play Area	0.03ha
Princess Diana Park Toddlers Play Area	0.01ha
Rugrats Playground	0.01ha
St. Louise Meadow Play Area	0.05ha
Spiceball Park Play Area	0.04ha
Spiceball Skate Park	0.09ha
Stanbridge Park Play Area	0.04ha
Trinity Park Play Area	0.04ha
Usher Drive LEAP	0.13ha
Wesley Drive Play Area	0.03ha
William Close Play Area	0.02ha
Windrush Park LEAP	0.04ha
Winston Drive Play Area	0.03ha

e) **Outdoor sports facilities:** Excluding playing pitches.

- **Tennis courts:**

<i>Site</i>	<i>Number</i>
Banbury Tennis Club, Horton View	6 Tarmac
People's Park	3 Tarmac

- **Bowling greens:**

<i>Site</i>
Banbury Borough BC (People's Park)
Banbury Central BC (Horton View Recn. Ground)
Banbury Chestnuts BC (The Shades)

- **Golf courses:** None.

f) **Allotments:**

<i>Site</i>	<i>Size</i>
Dover Avenue Allotments	0.37ha
Easington Allotments	1.64ha
Grange Road Allotments	0.40ha
Sinclair Avenue Allotments	1.66ha
Spitall Farm Allotments	2.07ha
Wood Green Avenue Allotments	0.71ha

g) **Cemeteries and churchyards:**

<i>Site</i>	<i>Size</i>
Neithrop Methodist Church	0.05ha
St. Leonard's Church	0.16ha
St. Mary's Church	0.57ha
Southam Road Cemetery	6.48ha

h) **Green corridors:**

<i>Site</i>	<i>Size</i>
Old Railway Line	0.04ha
Oxford Canal Path	0.51ha

2) **Bicester sub-area:**

a) **Parks and gardens:**

<i>Site</i>	<i>Size</i>
The Garth	2.74ha

b) **Natural/semi-natural greenspace:**

<i>Site</i>	<i>Size</i>
Charbridge Way Natural Greenspace	4.13ha
Jubilee Lake	1.62ha
Mallards Way Natural Greenspace	2.04ha
Purslane Drive Natural Greenspace	6.97ha
Shakespeare Drive Woods	3.35ha

c) **Amenity greenspace:**

<i>Site</i>	<i>Size</i>
Amenity Greenspace Site	0.07ha
Andover Close Amenity Greenspace	0.11ha
Ashby Road Amenity Greenspace	0.19ha
Avon Crescent Amenity Greenspace	0.29ha
Banbury Road Amenity Greenspace	0.36ha
Blenheim Drive Amenity Greenspace	0.02ha

<i>Site</i>	<i>Size</i>
Boston Road Amenity Greenspace	0.12ha
Campion Place Amenity Greenspace	0.13ha
Coopers Green Amenity Greenspace	0.41ha
Corncrake Way Amenity Greenspace	0.09ha
Dove Green Amenity Greenspace	0.05ha
Dryden Avenue Amenity Greenspace	0.05ha
Fair Close Amenity Greenspace	0.27ha
Followfields Court Amenity Greenspace	0.07ha
Fulmer Court Amenity Greenspace	0.50ha
George Street Recreation Ground	0.46ha
Goldfinch Close Amenity Greenspace	0.10ha
Graham Road Amenity Greenspace	0.09ha
Green Close Amenity Greenspace	0.09ha
Hamilton Close Amenity Greenspace	0.45ha
Hunt Close Amenity Greenspace (1)	0.46ha
Hunt Close Amenity Greenspace (2)	0.19ha
Jarvis Lane Amenity Greenspace	0.95ha
Kennedy Way Amenity Greenspace	0.69ha
Launton Amenity Greenspace	0.91ha
Launton Road Park	3.19ha
Lawrence Way Amenity Greenspace	0.10ha
Leach Road Amenity Greenspace	0.05ha
Mallards Way Amenity Greenspace	16.41ha
Manorsfield Road Amenity Greenspace	0.89ha
Middleton Stoney Road Amenity Greenspace	0.08ha
Nuffield Close Amenity Greenspace	0.01ha
Peregrine Way Amenity Greenspace	0.06ha
Pond Close Amenity Greenspace	0.23ha
Redwing Close Amenity Greenspace	0.07ha
Rest Harrow Mead Amenity Greenspace	0.03ha
Scampton Close Amenity Greenspace	0.39ha
Severn Close Amenity Greenspace	0.16ha
Shackleton Close Amenity Greenspace	0.18ha
Shakespeare Drive Amenity Greenspace	0.18ha
Shelley Close Amenity Greenspace	0.04ha
Southwold Amenity Greenspace	3.34ha
Sunderland Drive Amenity Greenspace	0.22ha
Thames Avenue Amenity Greenspace	0.12ha
The Bramblings Amenity Greenspace	0.10ha
The Oval Amenity Greenspace	0.17ha
Tweeds Crescent Amenity Greenspace	0.05ha
Wadham Close Amenity Greenspace (1)	1.18ha
Wadham Close Amenity Greenspace (2)	0.02ha
Wear Road Amenity Greenspace	0.11ha
Windle Gardens Amenity Greenspace	0.17ha
Woodfield Close Amenity Greenspace	0.15ha
Wye Close Amenity Greenspace	0.04ha

d) *Provision for children and young people:*

<i>Site</i>	<i>Size</i>
Ashdene Road Play Area	0.20ha
Banbury Road Play Area	0.06ha
Banbury Road Park Play Area	0.04ha
Betony Way Play Area	0.02ha
Bicester Play Area	0.68ha
Blythe Place Play Area	0.10ha
Bryony Road Play Area	0.03ha
Burdock Close Play Area	0.02ha
Campion Place Play Area	0.02ha
Chaffinch Road Play Area	0.03ha
Corncrake Way Play Area	0.02ha
Damwell Walk Play Area	0.01ha
Dunlin Court Play Area	0.04ha
Dunnock Close Play Area	0.01ha
Fieldfare Close Play Area	0.01ha
Fluellen Place Play Area	0.01ha
Foxglove Close Play Area	0.01ha
Gallingale Close Play Area	0.02ha
Garth Park Play Area	0.17ha
Garth Park Skateboard Park	0.08ha
Gemander Walk Play Area (1)	0.03ha
Gemander Walk Play Area (2)	0.02ha
Gentian Close Play Area	0.03ha
George Street Play Area	0.10ha
Graham Road Play Area	0.14ha
Goldfinch Close Play Area (1)	0.02ha
Goldfinch Close Play Area (2)	0.04ha
Grebe Road Play Area	0.04ha
Hamilton Road Play Area	0.01ha
Keble Road Play Area	0.09ha
Larkspur Square Play Area	0.01ha
Launton Road Play Area	0.06ha
Lily Close Play Area	0.02ha
Lucerne Avenue Play Area	0.06ha
Mallards Way Play Area	0.05ha
Meredith Close Play Area	0.28ha
Merganser Drive Play Area	0.12ha
Mullein Road Play Area	0.02ha
Nuthatch Way Play Area	0.01ha
Orchard Close Play Area	0.04ha
Oxlip Leys Play Area	0.02ha
Poppylands Play Area	0.02ha
Purslane Drive Play Area	0.04ha
Redwing Close Play Area	0.06ha
Saffron Close Play Area	0.02ha
Sanderling Close Play Area	0.01ha

<i>Site</i>	<i>Size</i>
Shakespeare Drive Play Area	0.09ha
Siskin Road Play Area	0.02ha
Spitfire Close Play Area	0.05ha
Sunderland Drive Play Area	0.07ha
The Bramblings Play Area	0.01ha
West Harrow Mead Play Area (1)	0.02ha
West Harrow Mead Play Area (2)	0.02ha
Woodfield Play Area	0.02ha
Woodpecker Close Play Area	0.03ha
Woodruff Close Play Area	0.01ha

e) **Outdoor sports facilities:** Excluding playing pitches.

- **Tennis courts:**

<i>Site</i>	<i>Number</i>
Bicester Tennis Club, The Garth	3 Tarmac
Cooper School, Anson Way	4 Tarmac

- **Bowling greens:**

<i>Site</i>
Bicester BC (The Garth)

- **Golf courses:** None.

f) **Allotments:**

<i>Site</i>	<i>Size</i>
Anson Way Allotments	0.46ha
Leach Road Allotments	1.92ha
Wren Way Allotments	0.72ha

g) **Cemeteries and churchyards:**

<i>Site</i>	<i>Size</i>
Bicester Cemetery	2.25ha
St. Edburgh's Church	0.49ha

h) **Green corridors:** None.

3) **Kidlington sub-area:**

a) **Parks and gardens:** None.

b) **Natural/semi-natural greenspace:**

<i>Site</i>	<i>Size</i>
-------------	-------------

Kidlington Nature Reserve	7.57ha
---------------------------	--------

c) **Amenity greenspace:**

<i>Site</i>	<i>Size</i>
Astell Close Amenity Greenspace	0.36ha
Cherry Close Amenity Greenspace	0.07ha
Cherwell Green Amenity Greenspace	0.43ha
Chorefields Amenity Greenspace	0.12ha
Croxford Gardens Amenity Greenspace	0.63ha
Exeter Hall Amenity Greenspace	0.22ha
Foxdown Close Amenity Greenspace	0.21ha
Holy Close Amenity Greenspace	0.29ha
Langford Corner Amenity Greenspace	0.32ha
Lyne Road Amenity Greenspace	0.17ha
Partridge Close Amenity Greenspace	0.10ha
Spruce Road Amenity Greenspace	0.16ha
St. Mary's Fields	2.22ha
The Broadway Amenity Greenspace	0.22ha
The Coppice Amenity Greenspace	0.92ha
The Moorlands Amenity Greenspace	0.17ha
The Phelps Amenity Greenspace (1)	0.03ha
The Phelps Amenity Greenspace (2)	0.06ha
West Kingston Amenity Greenspace	0.10ha
Yarnton Court Amenity Greenspace	0.26ha

d) **Provision for children and young people:**

<i>Site</i>	<i>Size</i>
Croft Avenue Play Area	0.03ha
Croxford Gardens Play Area	0.05ha
Mead Way Recreation Ground Play Area	0.02ha
Orchard Play Area	0.03ha
South Park Play Area	0.08ha
West Kingston Play Area	0.02ha
Yarnton Court Recreation Ground Play Area	0.14ha

e) **Outdoor sports facilities:** Excluding playing pitches.

- **Tennis courts:**

<i>Site</i>	<i>Number</i>
Exeter Hall	2 Tarmac

- **Bowling greens:**

<i>Site</i>
Kidlington BC (Exeter Close)

- **Golf courses:** None.

f) *Allotments:*

<i>Site</i>	<i>Size</i>
Barnham Road Allotments	0.23ha
Cherry Close Allotments	0.79ha
Gravel Pits Allotments	0.74ha
Hazelwood Allotments	0.43ha
Laburnum Crescent Allotments	0.48ha
North Kidlington Allotments	0.55ha

g) *Cemeteries and churchyards:*

<i>Site</i>	<i>Size</i>
Kidlington Cemetery	1.17ha
St. Mary's Church	0.68ha

h) *Green corridors:*

4) *Rural North sub-area:*

a) *Parks and gardens:* None.

b) *Natural/semi-natural greenspace:*

<i>Site</i>	<i>Size</i>
Adderbury Lakes	0.97ha
Bloxham Nature Reserve	2.04ha
Broughton Woods	3.01ha
Giant's Cave, North Newington	2.34ha
Ironworks Nature Reserve, Wroxton	12.84ha
Kenhill Road Greenspace, Shenington	1.34ha
Sibford Gower Pond	0.04ha
South Newington Greenspace	1.31ha
Tadmarton Woods	2.50ha
Wardington Natural Greenspace	0.38ha
Water Lane Natural Greenspace, Adderbury	1.56ha
Well Lane Natural Greenspace, Shenington	0.76ha

c) *Amenity greenspace:*

<i>Site</i>	<i>Size</i>
A422 Amenity Greenspace, Wroxton	0.06ha
Adderbury Village Green	0.40ha
Arden Close Amenity Greenspace, Drayton	0.18ha
Bareford Road Amenity Greenspace, Bloxham	0.20ha
Berry Hill Amenity Greenspace, Adderbury	0.08ha
Birch Road Amenity Greenspace, Bodicote	0.03ha
Bloxham Road Amenity Greenspace, Milcombe	0.47ha
Bodicote Flyover Amenity Greenspace	0.46ha

<i>Site</i>	<i>Size</i>
Bourne Lane Amenity Greenspace, Hook Norton	0.28ha
Buck Hill Amenity Greenspace, Hook Norton	0.04ha
Burdtop Amenity Greenspace, Sibford Gower	0.25ha
Chapel Lane Amenity Greenspace, Milton	0.10ha
Chapel Lane Amenity Greenspace, Cropredy	0.05ha
Church Lane Amenity Greenspace, Hanwell	0.12ha
Creampot Crescent Amenity Greenspace, Cropredy	0.12ha
Cropredy Lock Gardens	0.03ha
Crossways Amenity Greenspace, Shutford	0.19ha
Cumberford Close Amenity Greenspace, Bloxham	0.07ha
Cup and Saucer Amenity Greenspace	0.05ha
Dairyground Amenity Greenspace, Shutford	0.29ha
Epwell Amenity Greenspace	0.08ha
Furlong Town Amenity Greenspace, Bodicote	0.16ha
Gascoigne Way Amenity Greenspace, Bloxham	0.24ha
Great Bourton Village Green	0.02ha
Greenhills Park Amenity Greenspace, Bloxham	0.07ha
Highlands Amenity Greenspace, Tadmarton	0.10ha
Holybush Road Amenity Greenspace, Hook Norton	0.05ha
Hook Norton Recreation Ground	0.39ha
Ironstone Amenity Greenspace, Hook Norton	0.39ha
Kenhill Road Amenity Greenspace, Shenington	0.57ha
Lake Walk Amenity Greenspace, Adderbury	0.07ha
Lower End Amenity Greenspace, Shutford	0.06ha
Main Street Amenity Greenspace, Hanwell (1)	0.14ha
Main Street Amenity Greenspace, Wroxton (2)	0.10ha
Middle Lane Amenity Greenspace, Wroxton	0.26ha
Millers Lane Amenity Greenspace, Hornton	0.01ha
Mollington Amenity Greenspace, Cropredy	0.10ha
Orchard Road Amenity Greenspace, Hook Norton	0.04ha
Orchard View Amenity Greenspace, Cropredy	0.23ha
Page Lane Amenity Greenspace, Hornton	0.08ha
Park Close Amenity Greenspace, Hanwell	0.14ha
Park End Court Amenity Greenspace, Bodicote	0.04ha
Park End Court Amenity Greenspace, Wroxton	0.09ha
Park Hill Amenity Greenspace, Hook Norton	0.04ha
Portland Road Amenity Greenspace, Milcombe	0.04ha
Queen's Crescent Amenity Greenspace, Drayton	0.07ha
Rawlands Close Amenity Greenspace, Adderbury	0.10ha
Ropeway Amenity Greenspace, Hook Norton	0.19ha
Round House Amenity Greenspace, Adderbury	0.04ha
Rydes Close Amenity Greenspace, Bodicote	0.05ha
School Lane Amenity Greenspace, North Newington	0.13ha
Shutford Green Amenity Greenspace	0.05ha
Sibford Village Hall Field	0.25ha
South Newington Amenity Greenspace	0.21ha
Stant Hill Spring Amenity Greenspace, Tadmarton	0.03ha
The Avenue Amenity Greenspace, Bloxham	0.10ha

<i>Site</i>	<i>Size</i>
The Crescent Amenity Greenspace, Adderbury	0.35ha
The Firs Amenity Greenspace, Wroxton	0.04ha
The Green, Hornton	0.02ha
The Green, Swalcliffe	0.11ha
The Rise Amenity Greenspace, Adderbury	0.25ha
The Rydes Amenity Greenspace, Wroxton	0.12ha
Tithings Amenity Greenspace, Swalcliffe	0.10ha
Ushercombe View Amenity Greenspace, Tadmarton (1)	0.09ha
Ushercombe View Amenity Greenspace, Tadmarton (2)	0.14ha
Vicarage Gardens Amenity Greenspace, Cropredy	0.19ha
Walton Avenue Amenity Greenspace, Adderbury	0.05ha
Wardington Amenity Greenspace	0.11ha
Wiggington Grass Amenity Greenspace	0.71ha

d) *Provision for children and young people:*

<i>Site</i>	<i>Size</i>
Adderbury Recreation Ground Play Area	0.19ha
Bodicote Recreation Ground Play Area	0.02ha
Church Lane Play Area, Hanwell	0.09ha
Claydon Recreation Ground Play Area	0.09ha
Cotswold Close Play Area, Sibford Ferris	0.70ha
Cup and Saucer Play Area, Cropredy	0.05ha
Epwell Recreation Ground Play Area	0.07ha
Hook Norton Basketball Court	0.04ha
Hook Norton Play Area	0.11ha
Little Bourton Play Area	0.15ha
Lower Heyford Sports & Social Club Play Area	0.04ha
Milcombe Play Area	0.09ha
North Newington Play Area	0.03ha
Rectory Road Play Area, Hook Norton	0.11ha
Sibford Gower Primary School Play Area	0.24ha
South Newington Recreation Ground Play Area	0.03ha
Spiceball Country Park Play Area & Skate Park	0.25ha
The Rise Play Area, Adderbury	0.07ha
Wardington Play Area	0.07ha
West End Play Area, Hornton	0.08ha

e) *Outdoor sports facilities:* Excluding playing pitches.

- *Tennis courts:*

<i>Site</i>	<i>Number</i>
Banbury West End TC, Meadow View, Adderbury	7 Tarmac
Cropredy Recreation Ground	2 Tarmac
Hook Norton TC, Hook Norton Playing Field	3 Artificial Grass

- **Bowling greens:**

<i>Site</i>
Adderbury BC (Twyford Gardens)
Bloxham BC (The Ridgeway)

- **Golf courses:**

<i>Site</i>	<i>Number</i>
Banbury Golf Club	27 holes
Rye Hill Golf Course	18 holes
Tadmarton Heath GC	18 holes

f) **Allotments:**

<i>Site</i>	<i>Size</i>
Bodicote Allotments	1.05ha
Claydon Allotments	0.12ha
Cropredy Allotments	0.19ha
Horley Road Allotments, Wroxton	0.32ha
Lampitts Green Allotments, Wroxton	0.25ha
Miller Lane Allotments, Hornton	0.44ha
Shenington Allotments	2.57ha
Wardington Allotments	1.41ha
Wiggington Allotments	0.12ha
Wroxton Allotments	0.35ha

g) **Cemeteries and churchyards:**

<i>Site</i>	<i>Size</i>
Adderbury Church	0.41ha
All Saint's Church, Wroxton	0.25ha
Bodicote Cemetery	0.39ha
Bodicote Church	0.34ha
Broughton Church Cemetery	0.17ha
Claydon Church	0.19ha
Cropredy Burial Ground	0.27ha
Cropredy Churchyard	0.56ha
Drayton Parish Church	0.24ha
Epwell Church	0.23ha
Great Bourton Church	0.24ha
Holy Trinity Church, Shenington	0.39ha
Holy Trinity Church, Sibford Gower	0.49ha
Hook Norton Baptist Church	0.55ha
Hornton Church	0.07ha
Horley Road Cemetery, Wroxton	0.20ha
Milton Church	0.16ha
Mollington Church	0.29ha
Quaker Meeting House, Sibford Gower	0.46ha

<i>Site</i>	<i>Size</i>
Park Hill Cemetery, Hook Norton	0.94ha
Rope Way Church, Hook Norton	0.12ha
St. Etheldreda's Church, Horley	0.37ha
St. Laurence Church, Milcombe	0.21ha
St. Martin's Church, Shutford	0.12ha
St. Mary Magdalene, Wroxton	0.28ha
St. Mary's Church, Bloxham	0.79ha
St. Mary's Church, Bloxham	0.92ha
St. Mary's Church, Broughton	0.30ha
St. Nicholas Church, Tadmarton	0.25ha
St. Peter's Church, Hanwell	0.40ha
St. Peter's Church, Hook Norton	0.08ha
South Newington Church	0.28ha
The Chapel, Hook Norton	0.08ha
Wiggington Church	0.16ha
Wordington Church	0.76ha

h) *Green corridors:*

<i>Site</i>	<i>Size</i>
River Cherwell Corridor	1.83ha
Old Railway Line	0.19ha

5) *Rural Central sub-area:*

a) *Parks and gardens:* None.

b) *Natural/semi-natural greenspace:*

<i>Site</i>	<i>Size</i>
Ardley Wood	39.49ha
Ardley Wood Natural Greenspace	1.89ha
Bainton Road Natural Greenspace, Bucknell	0.34ha
Caversfield Pond	0.24ha
Church Close Natural Greenspace, Fringford	0.91ha
Cottisford Fishery	2.92ha
Daeda's Wood, Deddington	3.59ha
Deddington Castle Natural Greenspace (1)	1.23ha
Deddington Castle Natural Greenspace (2)	2.74ha
Fringford Fishpond, Cottisford	0.71ha
Fringford Natural Greenspace, Cottisford	1.05ha
Fringford Pond	0.24ha
Fullwell Road Natural Greenspace, Finmere	0.12ha
Homelands Farm Natural Greenspace, Bucknell	0.49ha
Old Shaw's Woodland, Souldern	4.05ha
North Aston Road Natural Greenspace	0.05ha
Souldern Pond	0.05ha
Stoke Lyne Natural Greenspace	0.79ha

<i>Site</i>	<i>Size</i>
Stoke Wood	35.87ha
The Bottoms Natural Greenspace, Fringford	3.57ha
Valley Road Natural Greenspace, Finmere	0.27ha
Walnut Rise Natural Greenspace, Somerton	0.10ha
Wharf Lane Natural Greenspace, Somerton	2.48ha
Willaston Spinney, Fringford	2.36ha
Willow Farm Natural Greenspace, Stratton Audley	2.77ha

c) *Amenity greenspace:*

<i>Site</i>	<i>Size</i>
Ardley-with-Fewcott Amenity Greenspace	0.81ha
Chapel Close Amenity Greenspace, Deddington	0.04ha
Deddington Market Place Amenity Greenspace	0.05ha
Fewcott Road Open Space, Fritwell	0.13ha
Fritwell Road Amenity Greenspace, Ardley-with-Fewcott	0.39ha
Goose Green Amenity Greenspace, Deddington	0.05ha
Hethe Road Amenity Greenspace, Hardwick	0.03ha
Hempton Green	0.16ha
Hempton Road Amenity Greenspace, Deddington	0.24ha
Hethe Road Amenity Greenspace, Cottisford	0.10ha
Kenhill Close Amenity Greenspace, Fringford	0.63ha
Laurence Fields Amenity Greenspace, Steeple Aston	0.07ha
Lower Heyford Village Hall Amenity Greenspace	0.19ha
Main Street Amenity Greenspace, Hethe (1)	1.43ha
Main Street Amenity Greenspace, Hethe (2)	0.08ha
Manzel Road Amenity Greenspace, Caversfield	0.26ha
Middleton Road Amenity Greenspace, Bucknell	0.35ha
Nizewell Head Pocket Park, Steeple Aston	0.09ha
North Aston Amenity Greenspace, Duns Tew	1.07ha
North Street Amenity Greenspace, Fritwell (1)	0.08ha
North Street Amenity Greenspace, Fritwell (2)	0.07ha
Salvia Close Amenity Greenspace, Stoke Lyne	0.53ha
St. Michael Village Green, Barford	0.05ha
St. Peter's Close Amenity Greenspace, Stoke Lyne	0.05ha
Secret Garden, Souldern	0.10ha
Stable Close Amenity Greenspace, Finmere	0.10ha
The Astons Park and Gardens (1)	0.66ha
The Astons Park and Gardens (2)	0.23ha
Town Well, Hethe	0.02ha
Upper Heyford Village Green	0.38ha
Valley Road Amenity Greenspace, Finmere	0.06ha
Water Lane Amenity Greenspace, Ardley-with-Fewcott (1)	0.06ha
Water Lane Amenity Greenspace, Ardley-with-Fewcott (2)	0.32ha
Willow Lodge Amenity Greenspace, Stratton Audley	0.04ha
Wimborn Close Amenity Greenspace, Deddington	0.13ha
Windmill Street Amenity Greenspace, Deddington	0.17ha
Wise Crescent Amenity Greenspace, Fringford	0.04ha

d) *Provision for children and young people:*

<i>Site</i>	<i>Size</i>
Ardley Road Recreation Ground Play Area, Bucknell	0.02ha
Ardley Recreation Ground Play Area (1), Ardley-with-Fewcott	0.03ha
Ardley Recreation Ground Play Area (2), Ardley-with-Fewcott	0.02ha
Cherry Close Play Area, Stratton Audley	0.10ha
Finmere Recreation Ground Play Area	0.06ha
Fringford Play Area	0.02ha
Fritwell Recreation Ground Play Area	0.07ha
Lower Street Play Area, Barford	0.03ha
Millennium Park Play Area, Steeple Aston	0.09ha
Shutford Play Area	0.05ha
Souldern Play Area	0.07ha
Stable Close Play Area, Finmere	0.02ha
Stoke Lyne Play Area (1)	0.01ha
Stoke Lyne Play Area (2)	0.01ha
Thompson Drive Play Area. Caversfield	0.15ha
Upper Heyford Play Area	0.05ha
Wimborn Close Play Area, Deddington	0.01ha
Windmill Community Centre Play Area (1), Deddington	0.02ha
Windmill Community Centre Play Area (2), Deddington	0.12ha

e) *Outdoor sports facilities:* Excluding playing pitches.

- *Tennis courts:*

<i>Site</i>	<i>Number</i>
Deddington Tennis Club, The Windmill Centre	3 Tarmac

- *Bowling greens:*

<i>Site</i>
Deddington Beeches BC (Windmill Centre)
Lower Heyford BC (Station Road)

- *Golf courses:* None

f) *Allotments:*

<i>Site</i>	<i>Size</i>
Deddington Allotments	1.23ha
Goose Green Allotments, Hempton	0.35ha
Lower Heyford Allotments	2.63ha
North Aston Allotments	0.40ha
Old Butchers Allotments	0.53ha
Shutford Allotments	0.17ha
Souldern Charity Allotments	0.78ha
South Field Lane Allotments, Steeple Aston	0.66ha
Steeple Aston Allotments	0.69ha

Upper Heyford Allotments	0.68ha
--------------------------	--------

g) **Cemeteries and churchyards:**

<i>Site</i>	<i>Size</i>
Barford St. Michael's Church	0.03ha
Bucknell Churchyard	0.21ha
Caversfield Church	0.24ha
Deddington Church	0.61ha
Deddington Cemetery	0.39ha
Hardwick Church	0.20ha
Lower Heyford Church	0.29ha
Mixbury Churchyard	0.25ha
St. Edmund & St. George Church, Hethe	0.20ha
St. James Church, Somerton	0.31ha
St. Mary's Church, Ardley-with-Fewcott	0.22ha
St. Mary's Church, Upper Heyford	0.38ha
St. Mary's Church, Fringford	0.18ha
St. Mary Magdalene Church, Duns Tew	0.56ha
St. Mary the Virgin Church, North Aston	0.17ha
St. Mary the Virgin Church, Souldern	0.60ha
St. Mary & St. Edburga Church, Stratton Audley	0.29ha
St. Michael and All Angels Church, Fringford	0.28ha
St. Olaves Church, Fritwell	0.52ha
St. Peter's Church, Stoke Lyne	0.27ha
St. Peter & St. Paul's Church, Steeple Aston	0.72ha
South Newington Road Church, Barford	0.29ha
Upper Heyford Cemetery	0.33ha
Valley Road Churchyard, Finmere	0.29ha

h) **Green corridors:** None.

6) **Rural South sub-area:**

a) **Parks and gardens:** None.

b) **Natural/semi-natural greenspace:**

<i>Site</i>	<i>Size</i>
Ambrosden Natural Greenspace	1.06ha
Ambrosden Peat Pits	13.14ha
Arcott Wood	13.46ha
Busby's Spinney, Kirtlington	4.95ha
Cassington Road Natural Greenspace, Yarnton	0.17ha
Church Lane Natural Greenspace, Weston-on-the- Green	0.50ha
Heyford Road Pond, Kirtlington	0.12ha
Island Pond Wood	4.17ha
Kirtlington Quarry/Washford Pits	6.85ha
Noke Natural Greenspace	0.64ha
Norton Pond, Weston-on-the-Green	0.08ha
Shipton-on-Cherwell Natural Greenspace	1.36ha
Thrupp Woods	5.07ha

Weir Lane Natural Greenspace, Blackthorn	0.60ha
------------------------------------------	--------

c) *Amenity greenspace:*

<i>Site</i>	<i>Size</i>
Birch Road Amenity Greenspace, Ambrosden	0.08ha
Bletchington Village Green	0.30ha
Bloxham Driving range, Ambrosden	0.11ha
Cassington Road Amenity Greenspace, Yarnton (1)	0.13ha
Cassington Road Amenity Greenspace, Yarnton (2)	0.20ha
Charlton-on-Otmoor School Playing Field	0.68ha
Chesterton Village Green	0.05ha
Chesterton Village Hall Field	0.57ha
Elm Close Amenity Greenspace, Ambrosden	0.44ha
Fencott Amenity Greenspace	0.24ha
Forge Close Amenity Greenspace, Merton	0.05ha
Glebe Close Amenity Greenspace, Kirtlington	0.08ha
Grossway Field Amenity Greenspace, Kirtlington	0/06ha
Heyford Road Amenity Greenspace, Kirtlington (1)	0.09ha
Heyford Road Amenity Greenspace, Kirtlington (2)	0.19ha
Heyford Road Amenity Greenspace, Kirtlington (3)	0.19ha
Jerome Way Amenity Greenspace, Shipton-on-Cherwell	0.25ha
Kidlington Road Amenity Greenspace, Islip (1)	0.07ha
Kidlington Road Amenity Greenspace, Islip (2)	0.03ha
Langton Avenue Amenity Greenspace, Ambrosden	0.39ha
Little Blenheim Road Amenity Greenspace, Yarnton	0.06ha
Lower Road Amenity Greenspace, Blackthorn	0.54ha
Mill Lane Amenity Greenspace, Arcott	0.14ha
Oddington Village Green	0.11ha
Ploughley Road Amenity Greenspace, Ambrosden (1)	0.16ha
Ploughley Road Amenity Greenspace, Ambrosden (2)	0.27ha
Ploughley Road Amenity Greenspace, Ambrosden (3)	0.21ha
Poplars Amenity Greenspace, Launton	0.07ha
Quinton Avenue Amenity Greenspace, Chesterton	0.01ha
River Ray Amenity Greenspace, Islip	0.13ha
Ryder Close Amenity Greenspace, Yarnton	0.67ha
Shipton-on-Cherwell Amenity Greenspace	0.02ha
Sycamore Road Amenity Greenspace, Launton	0.07ha
The Glades Amenity Greenspace, Launton	0.04ha
The Green Amenity Greenspace, Horton-cum-Studley	0.19ha
The Orchard Amenity Greenspace, Merton	0.04ha
The Paddocks, Yarnton	0.62ha
Tubbs Lane Amenity Greenspace, Chesterton	0.07ha
Valentia Close Amenity Greenspace, Ambrosden (1)	0.06ha
Valentia Close Amenity Greenspace, Ambrosden (2)	0.03ha
Westlands Avenue Green, Weston-on-the-Green	0.10ha
Weston-on-the-Green Amenity Greenspace	0.05ha
Willow Road Amenity Greenspace, Ambrosden (1)	0.07ha
Willow Road Amenity Greenspace, Ambrosden (2)	0.90ha
Willow Road Amenity Greenspace, Ambrosden (3)	0.13ha
Willow Road Amenity Greenspace, Ambrosden (4)	0.14ha

Woodpiece Road Amenity Greenspace, Arncott	0.06ha
--------------------------------------------	--------

d) *Provision for children and young people:*

<i>Site</i>	<i>Size</i>
Arncott Recreation Ground Play Area	0.02ha
Begbroke Sports Club Play Area	0.14ha
Bletchington Recreation Ground Play Area	0.04ha
Chesterton Recreation Ground Play Area	0.03ha
Doctor South Primary School Play Area, Islip	0.07ha
Five Acres Play Area, Murcott	0.08ha
Gosford School Play Area (1)	0.32ha
Gosford School Play Area (2)	0.11ha
Green Lane Play Area, Arncott	0.04ha
High Street Recreation Ground Play Area, Charlton-on-Otmoor	0.14ha
Horton-cum-Studley Recreation Ground Play Area	0.04ha
Islip Village Hall Play Area	0.05ha
Kirtlington Play Area	0.07ha
Langton Avenue Play Area, Ambrosden	0.05ha
Meadow View Play Area, Wendlebury	0.09ha
Merton Recreation Ground Play Area	0.03ha
Middleton Stoney Play Area	0.02ha
Ryder Close Play Area, Yarnton (1)	0.06ha
Ryder Close Play Area, Yarnton (2)	0.01ha
Thame Road Play Area, Blackthorn	0.07ha
Yarnton Recreation Ground Play Area	0.18ha

e) *Outdoor sports facilities:* Excluding playing pitches.

- *Tennis courts:*

<i>Site</i>	<i>Number</i>
Horton-cum-Studley Recreation Ground	1 Tarmac
Launton Recreation Ground	1 Tarmac

- *Bowling greens:*

<i>Site</i>
Begbroke BC (Begbroke Lane)

- *Golf courses:* None

<i>Site</i>	<i>Number</i>
Bicester Golf and Country Club, Chesterton	18 holes
Kirtlington GC	18 holes
North Oxford Golf Course	18 holes
Studley Wood GC, Horton-cum-Studley	18 holes

f) *Allotments:*

<i>Site</i>	<i>Size</i>
Bletchington Allotments	1.98ha
Chesterton Allotments	2.49ha
Islip Allotments	0.59ha
Kirtlington Allotments	1.82ha
Lower End Allotments, Piddington	0.29ha
Merton Allotments	0.09ha
Mill Lane Allotments, Charlton-on-Otmoor	0.33ha
Yarnton Allotments	0.50ha

g) *Cemeteries and churchyards:*

<i>Site</i>	<i>Size</i>
Ambrosden Congregational Church	0.03ha
Arcott Church	0.28ha
Bethel Congregational Church	0.08ha
Charlton-on-Otmoor Cemetery	0.19ha
Charlton-on-Otmoor Church	0.15ha
Holy Cross Church, Kirtlington	0.15ha
Middleton Stoney Church	0.39ha
Sibford Gower Methodist Church	0.05ha
St. Andrew's Church, Oddington	0.17ha
St. Barnabas Church, Horton-cum-Studley	0.26ha
St. Giles Church, Hampton Poyle	0.13ha
St. Giles Church, Noke	0.13ha
St. Mary's Church, Chesterton	0.50ha
St. Mary's Church, Bletchington	0.58ha
St. Mary's Church, Kirtlington	0.39ha
St. Mary's Church, Kirtlington	0.15ha
St. Mary's Church, Weston-on-the-Green	0.52ha
St. Mary's Church, Launton	0.50ha
St. Mary the Virgin Church, Ambrosden	0.66ha
St. Michael's Church, Begbroke	0.94ha
St. Nicholas Church, Islip	0.10ha
St. Nicholas Church, Piddington	0.45ha
St. Nicholas Cemetery, Piddington	0.13ha
St. Swithun's Church, Merton	0.25ha
Wendlebury Church	0.28ha
Yarnton Church	0.17ha

h) *Green corridors:*

<i>Site</i>	<i>Size</i>
Ares Ditch Path	0.40ha

APPENDIX 11: COMPILATION OF GREEN SPACES DATA

Introduction

- 1) This section describes how the data on green spaces in Cherwell district was compiled and the consultative processes that accompanied the development of the Green Spaces strategy.

PPG17 Study

- 2) **Introduction:** The PPG17 Study undertaken in 2005-2006 compiled information of green spaces as follows:
 - a) Local consultations.
 - b) Site audits.
- 3) **Local consultations:** The following consultations were carried out:
 - a) 5,000 questionnaires were sent to a random sample of households throughout the district, exploring user and non-user attitudes to the range of green spaces near to consultees' homes and their views on quantity, quality and accessibility.
 - b) 'Drop in' neighbourhood sessions across the district to elicit further views.
 - c) Press releases, a dedicated e-mail address and text messaging service were set up, to allow the general public to provide comments on green spaces.
 - d) A survey of local sports clubs was undertaken, to ascertain their views on provision.
 - e) One-to-one consultations with Council officers.
- 4) **Site audits:** The following work was undertaken:
 - a) Over 800 green space sites were visited and assessed for quantity, quality, accessibility and value, using a standard matrix and definitions.
 - b) Surveys were sent to all town and parish councils to verify the accuracy of the site information in their respective areas.
 - c) Each open space site was then digitised as a polygon using GIS software and its associated ratings and characteristics were recorded on an Access database.
- 5) **Site details:** Full details of the green space sites in the district are available in the appendix to the PPG17 Study, which is available on the Council's website.

Green Spaces Strategy

- 5) The subsequent compilation of the Green Spaces Strategy in 2007-2008 involved the following additional data compilation and consultation:
- a) A survey was sent to all town and parish councils to obtain more detailed information on outdoor sports facilities and to verify that the site data from the PPG17 Study remained accurate and current.
 - b) Once the draft strategy was compiled, a further survey was circulated to town and parish councils to establish whether:
 - The assessment of the adequacy of current and future provision matched their perceptions of the situation in their respective areas.
 - They could identify any specific local opportunities for meeting identified shortfalls, in terms of upgrading or expanding existing provision or sites where additional green spaces might be provided.
 - c) Once the draft action plan was compiled, a consultative meeting was held with town and parish councils to present the material, including mapped site data for each area.
 - d) A series of follow-up meetings was held with individual town and parish councils (including the main urban areas of Banbury, Bicester and Kidlington) to discuss and agree individual action plan details.