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## 1. Introduction

Open space, sport and recreation facilities, if well located, accessible, well designed and maintained, can make a positive contribution to ensuring that villages, towns and cities are attractive places in which to live, work and visit and that people have adequate opportunities to maintain healthy lifestyles.

In today's society the need to provide a range of different types of quality accessible green space is increasingly important. The provision of areas for organised sports, children's play and passive recreation pursuits can improve and maintain physical and mental health and well being, provide areas for socialising as well as contributing to the quality of the environment.

The aims of the study are to provide a robust assessment of needs and deficiencies in open spaces in order to provide an up to date evidence base which can be maintained to aid implementation of the policies and the provision of open spaces during the Local Plan period. This will provide the framework to enable the positive planning of accessible open space in order to meet the needs of local communities and visitors to the District. This evidence will be used as part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Allocations document.

This report provides:

- An audit and assessment of a variety open spaces typologies;
- Assesses the long term requirements in terms of the quantity and quality of the various types of open spaces for future provision to meet local need where appropriate, and through establishing minimum standards to be achieved; and
- Analyses open space in terms of the existing situation and identifies areas with deficiencies and surpluses.

The Lichfield District Local Plan (consisting of the adopted Local Plan Strategy and forthcoming Local Plan Allocations) covers the period 2008-2029. With this in mind, and to ensure that planning policy delivers the open space requirements to meet the existing need as well as forecasted population growth, both the Local Plan Strategy and Local Plan Allocations policies will need to be sufficiently flexible and subject to review, as the evidence is updated and monitored throughout the plan period.

## 2. Methodology

### 2.1 Overall Aim of the Study

The aims of this assessment is to provide a robust assessment of needs and deficiencies in open spaces in order to establish local provision standards and create an up to date evidence base which can be maintained to aid implementation of the policies and the provision of open spaces during the Local Plan period. This study will:

- Provide a clear picture of the existing situation in relation to open space, in terms of provision both in quantity and quality;
- Identify existing deficiencies/surpluses;
- Consider the standards to be achieved in new developments; and
- Set out other mechanisms and ways of improving the quantity and quality of open space within areas shown to be deficient.


### 2.2 Structure of the Study

The approach to carrying out the assessment builds upon the methodology used within the Open Space Assessment 2012 ( which at the time was derived from 'Assessing Needs and Opportunities,' the companion guide to PPG17). Whilst PPG17 has been replaced by the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) the accompanying companion guide has not been superseded and still provides the best guidance on the carrying out of local open space assessments. The methodology for assessing the different type of open spaces, sport and recreation varies slightly dependant on the typology being assessed in order to best obtain relevant accurate information. Summaries of the methodology undertaken can be found at the start of each section. Overall the methodology broadly follows the steps set out below:

| Methodology |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Step 1: Identifying Local Needs | - Review existing strategies, guidance and their impact. <br> - Review existing policies, standards and their effectiveness. |
| Step 2: Audit of Local Provision | - Plan and undertake audit of open spaces, sport and recreational facilities. |
| Step 3: Set Provision Standards | - Determine quantity, quality and accessibility standards. <br> - Determine minimum acceptable size and design standards. <br> - Determine hierarchy of open space provision. <br> - Determine normalised costs. |
| Step 4: Apply the Provision Standards | - Identify deficiencies against quality and accessibility standards. <br> - Identify deficiencies against quality standards. <br> - Identify local opportunities for improved sport and recreation. |
| Step 5: Recommendations |  |

Table 2.1 Methodology

### 2.2.1 Step 1: Identifying Local Needs

Policy Context: The initial starting point in undertaking this assessment is to consider the broad policy framework within which open space is set, and to this end national through to district wide plans and strategies have been reviewed.

Consultation: In order to assess local needs, a variety of methods were used. In 2011 extensive studies were undertaken including local surveys, consultation with Parish Councils, organised local groups/clubs, external consultants, as well as utilising local knowledge and information from a variety of officers within the District Council.

### 2.2.2 Step 2: Audit of Local Provision

In order to build up an accurate picture of the current open space and play provision in Lichfield District, an initial desktop audit of the open space assets was carried out, this included:

- Analysis of existing GIS data held by Lichfield District Council; and
- Desktop mapping of open space from aerial photography.

A number of site visits have been undertaken over a number of years. Information was also collected through the use of a number of questionnaires and postal surveys targeting local residents, together with information from providers, land owners and Parish Councils. The information collected has resulted in audits which have assessed the quantity, quality and the accessibility of the different types of open space.

This study covers all forms of public open space (not including playing pitches which are considered in a separate document). Indoor Facilities are not included. Indoor sports facilities and outdoor sports and playing pitches are covered in two separate reports:

- Playing Pitch, Tennis and Bowls Strategy was published in 2012 and provides a detailed position of the outdoor playing pitch, bowling green and tennis court provision across the District; and
- A Swimming Pool and Sports Hall Feasibility Study (2013) was produced as a result of the Facilities Planning Model (January 2010) to update the assessment of the current supply of indoor sports provision and the supply required in the future.

These two studies along with this Open Space Assessment will combine to provide a detailed picture of the open space, sport and recreation provision within Lichfield District.

Open Space covered by this Study: The Open Space categories within this study are shown in the list below. Each category below has their own chapter and detailed definitions are included in the relevant chapters. Briefly they include the following:

- Natural and semi-natural greenspaces - for wildlife conservation, biodiversity and environmental education awareness;
- Amenity greenspace - for informal activities close to home or work, and which enhance the appearance of an area;
- Green corridors - for walking, cycling or riding for leisure and travel and as wildlife corridors;
- Urban Fringe - accessible open areas on the edge of Lichfield, Burntwood and large settlements;
- Provision for children's play and young people - for play and social interaction such as equipped play, ball courts, skateparks;
- Allotments - for growing own produce;
- Parks and Gardens - provide high quality opportunities for informal recreational and community events;
- Cemeteries and churchyards - provide quiet areas and for wildlife conservation;
- Civic spaces - provide a setting/settings for civic buildings for public and community events; and
- Water spaces - lakes, ponds, rivers and canals.

There is no minimum size threshold for site inclusion within the audit as it is recognised that even relatively small spaces can serve a practical and valuable function within a community. These can include a range of green infrastructure functions which meet wider sustainability objectives such as mitigating the causes of and adapting to the impacts of climate change.

Sites with clear evidence of frequent public use, regardless of whether there are formal access arrangements are included in the audit.

Sites without public access are included where they are deemed to make an important and identifiable contribution in terms of their size and character to the settlement form or an important contribution to one or a number of wider benefits that open spaces are recognised to entail. Inclusion of these sites should not however be interpreted to imply that the Council endorses the recreational use of such sites.

### 2.2.3 Step 3 and Step 4: Setting and Applying Provision Standards

Local provision standards have been set, with three components, embracing:

- Quantity;
- Accessibility; and
- Quality.

Quantity: The GIS database and mapping has been used to assess the existing provision of open space across the study area. The existing levels of provision are considered alongside findings of previous studies, the local needs assessment and consideration of existing and national standards or benchmarks. The key to developing robust local quantity standards is that they are locally derived, based on evidence and most importantly achievable. Typically, standards are expressed as hectares per 1000 people. The recommended standards are then used to assess the supply of each type of open space across the study area.

Key changes between the 2012 and this (2016) audit owe primarily to the audit having been updated to reflect:

- Previous omissions which have since come to light;
- New sites delivered as part of or alongside new developments within the District;
- New sites or enhancements to existing sites resulting from planned investment;
- Updated Ordnance Survey information which has enabled more accurate plotting; and
- Sites which are known to have been lost to development or other uses; or changed circumstances for a given site where known.

Accessibility: Evidence from previous studies, the needs assessment and consideration of national benchmarks are used to develop access standards for open space. Typically, standards are expressed as straight line walk times. A series of maps assessing access for different typologies are presented in the report.

Quality: Quality standards have been developed drawing on previous studies, national benchmarks and good practice, evidence from the consultation and the findings of the quality audits.

As a result of the detailed assessments in relation to quality, quantity and accessibility of the various types of open space, locally based recommendations have been set for equipped children's playspace, amenity greenspace, parks and gardens, natural and semi natural greenspaces and allotments.

Further work has been carried out in relation to qualitative assessments of equipped children's play areas aimed more specifically at assessing 'quality of the play experience' and the equipment and type of play areas available. This was initially conducted during 2011/12 and uses criteria to base qualitative assessments that have arisen from engaging young people and others directly in involved in play provision. The qualitative assessment has been updated in this Open Space Assessment.

It has not been possible or practicable to set standards for all types of open space, for example green corridors, cemeteries and churchyards. These typologies contribute to the overall framework of open space and this does not exclude their significance when considering proposals for development or improvement within the District.

It should be noted that there are other types of open space that cannot be categorised but are still significant in terms of accessibility and community use. An example of such sites would be Curborough Sprint Course. The importance of such facilities should be recognised where there is clear evidence of local support and usage of such sites.

Standards suggested in this assessment reflect the existing provision and consideration of views gathered. Settlement summaries within the Appendices set out the existing situation in relation to the various types of open space facilities.

## Step 5: Recommendations

This section outlines higher level strategic options which address five key areas:

- Existing provision to be protected;
- Existing provision to be enhanced;
- Opportunities for re-location/re-designation of open space;
- Identification of areas for new provision; and
- Facilities that may be surplus to requirement.


## 3. Policy Context

This section sets out a brief review of the most relevant national and local policies related to the study, which have been considered in developing the methodology and findings of the study. Policies and strategies are subject to regular change, therefore the summary provided in this section was correct at the time of writing. Lichfield District Council reserve the right to change and update this section as policies change.

This policy overview considers the District Council's existing strategies and policies. It also includes a review of other strategies of relevance at national and local levels and their implications for the provision of open space.

### 3.1 National Strategic Context

### 3.1.1 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

The NPPF sets out the Government's planning policies for England and how they should be applied and replaced all national planning policy guidance (including PPG17: Open Space, Sport and Recreation). This new planning framework places emphasis on Local Planning Authorities to provide robust assessments of the needs and opportunities for open spaces which will inform planning policies. The NPPF states that local audits of open space should consider both the quantitative and qualitative aspects of open space provision so that local standards may be set.

The NPPF identifies the importance that open spaces and opportunities for sports and recreation have in contributing to the health and well being of communities in paragraphs $58,73,75,109$ and 114.

### 3.1.2 Green Infrastructure

In 2009 Natural England produced their Green Infrastructure Guidance which identifies Natural England's position in relation to green infrastructure planning and delivery, which is recognised as an essential part of sustainable spatial planning. Despite this study being surpassed by the NPPF, Natural England's definition of Green Infrastructure remains relevant:
"Green Infrastructure is a strategically planned and delivered network comprising the broadest range of high quality green spaces and other environmental features. It should be designed and managed as a multifunctional resource capable of delivering those ecological services and quality of life benefits required by the communities it serves and needed to underpin sustainability. Its design and management should also respect and enhance the character and distinctiveness of an area with regard to habitats and landscape types.

Green Infrastructure includes established green spaces and new sites and should thread through and surround the built environment and connect the urban area to its wider rural hinterland. Consequently it needs to be delivered at all spatial scales from sub-regional to local neighbourhood levels, accommodating both accessible natural green spaces within local communities and often much larger sites in the urban fringe and wider countryside.'

### 3.2 Local Policy

### 3.2.1 Lichfield District Local Plan Strategy 2008-2029

The Lichfield Local Plan Strategy was adopted on $17^{\text {th }}$ February 2015 and covers the period 2008-2029 and along with saved policies from the previous constitutes the development plan for Lichfield. The saved policies as listed in Appendix J of the Local Plan Strategy will be replaced by the Local Plan Allocations document.

The Local Plan Strategy includes policies to direct development and identify areas of protection within the District to 2029. These policies draw from the evidence and recommendations contained within the 2012 Open Space Assessment along with the Playing Pitch Strategy and other relevant evidence, plans and strategies. This updated Open Space Assessment will help to inform the Local Plan Allocations document.

The following Local Plan Strategy policies are relevant to the provision of open spaces and opportunities for participation in sport:

- Policy HSC1: Open Space Standards supports proposals which improve the quantity, quality and accessibility of green spaces especially where deficiencies have been identified. This policy also protects existing open space and sets minimum standards.;
- Core Policy 10: Healthy and Safe Lifestyles seeks to enable people to lead a healthy lifestyle by facilitating access to a range of high quality and well maintained open spaces, playing pitches, sport and recreation, play facilities and cultural assets which are relevant to and meet the needs of local communities; and
- Core Policy 11: Participation in Sport and Physical Activity whereby the Council seeks to encourage, protect and enhance existing sport facilities and other assets which encourage participation in physical activity, safeguarding sites for the benefit of local communities.

The saved policies from the 1998 Local Plan which are relevant to open space are as follows and include a number of policies relating to particular sites. These policies are however due to be replaced by the Local Plan Allocations document:

- R1 - Open Space Provision;
- R3 - Recreational Buildings;
- R4 - Sports playing fields;
- R5 - Loss of Sports pitches/Recreation grounds;
- L35, L36, B22 - Recreation Zones;
- L37-Lichfield Linear Park;
- B24 - Chasewater Country Park;
- L49 - Framework Open Space;
- L50 - Landscape Improvements in Framework Open Space;
- EA14 - Tame and Trent Valley; and
- Emp11 - Wyrley and Essington Canal.


### 3.2.2 Infrastructure Delivery Plan

The Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) is designed to support the Lichfield Local Plan to ensure the Plan is robust and deliverable and support the requirement that are needed to make places function in a way that creates sustainable communities. The IDP is split into 3 sections, physical, green and social and community with the infrastructure requirements also being divided into strategic (facilities serving a wide area i.e. improvements to trunk roads, water, sewerage, gas etc.) and local (services essential in meeting the day to day needs of the population is local green spaces).

### 3.2.3 Community Infrastructure Levy

The Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) is a planning charge, introduced by the Planning Act 2008 and came into force on 6th April 2010 through the 'Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010'. The District Council adopted the CIL on 19th April 2016 and commenced charging on $13^{\text {th }}$ June 2016. CIL is a charge levied on certain new buildings and extensions to buildings according to their floor area (per square meter). In this way money is raised from development to help the Council contribute towards the infrastructure required to ensure the District grows sustainably.

As part of the administration of CIL, Regulation 123 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (as amended) sets out the requirement for the CIL Charging Authority to publish a list of the infrastructure which may in whole or in part be funded through the CIL. This list prevents double funding, as items on this list cannot be funded through S106 agreements. Open Space has been included in the Regulation 123 list to enable funding through CIL. On site open space requirements for new development continue to be delivered through Section 106 agreements or planning conditions.

### 3.2.4 Developer Contributions Supplementary Planning Document

The Developer Contributions Supplementary Planning Document was adopted on $17^{\text {th }}$ May 2016. This details the relationship between CIL and Section 106, and where obligations may be required for playing pitches, open space standards, Cannock Chase SAC and sports facilities.

### 3.2.5 Lichfield District Council Strategic Plan 2016-2020

Lichfield District Council Strategic Plan 2016-2020 seeks to contribute to three priorities:

- A vibrant and prosperous economy
- Healthy and safe communities
- Clean, green and welcoming places to live

The Strategic Plan under the 'Clean green and welcoming place to live' priority aims to implement the Local Plan to ensure controlled and balanced growth, maintain parks and open spaces and encourage residents to enjoy the outdoors, restore historic open spaces and consider the best way to manage open spaces into the future by working with partner organisations. This also complements the 'Healthy and safe communities' priority which seeks to increase the number of physically active people and encouraging the development of clubs to increase leisure opportunities across the District.

### 3.2.6 Open Space Assessment 2012

The 2012 Open Space Assessment built on the assessment in the 2008 Open Space Assessment which provided the evidence which led to the standard recommended walking distances to open space of 10 minutes or 480 metres. These standards are now enshrined in the Local Plan Strategy Policy HSC1: Open Space Standards.

The 2012 Open Space Assessment undertook a SWOT (strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats) analysis to examine the views on open space provision in Lichfield. Some of the key conclusions are set out below:

| An Overview of | Open Space Provision |
| :---: | :---: |
| Strengths | - A good level of infrastructure has been secured in new development areas; <br> - The District has a well-established and tested system of securing provision in conjunction with major development sites - good experience of using Section 106 Agreements; <br> - The District has several valuable parks; <br> - The District has a good number and range of accessible open spaces; and <br> - High level of biodiversity in open spaces. |
| Weaknesses | - There is a deficiency of open space in most parts of the District but particularly in terms of children's equipped play provision; <br> - Poor perception of open spaces; <br> - Limited resources for example developer contributions towards open space maintenance have affected the quality of maintenance of new open space; <br> - The overall quality of open space has suffered due to a lack of resources; <br> - Lack of communication, coordination and promotion for open spaces; <br> - Lack of specific facilities such as skate parks and equipped play areas; <br> - Narrowly focussed Local Plan Policy has limited the opportunity for appropriate developer contributions towards open space; and <br> - There is a lack of assessment of needs and opportunities for open space, sport and recreation and a lack of an overarching strategy. |
| Opportunities | - Easy access to high quality countryside around the urban centres; <br> - Potential economic, social and health benefits from improving open spaces; <br> - Range of funding opportunities including developer, lottery etc.; <br> - Potential for innovative approaches to managing open spaces by working with other organisations; <br> - Increased community involvement; <br> - New spaces with different purposes, i.e. new public squares in the urban areas; and |


|  | $\bullet$ | Enhanced biodiversity. |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Threats | $\bullet$ | Vandalism; |
|  | $\bullet$ | Perceived fear of crime; |
|  | $\bullet$ | Development on open spaces; |
|  | $\bullet$ | Lack of funding; |
|  | $\bullet$ | Lack of political priority; and |
|  | $\bullet$ | Pressure to use previously developed land. |

Table 3.1 SWOT overview of Open Space Provision
Monies have been secured via external grants and other sources to improve open spaces, such as ERDF, Heritage Lottery Fund as well as developer contributions. Work is ongoing to improve open spaces through these means.

With regard to new open spaces provided as part of new development, the District Council is no longer adopting these spaces. As part of a Section 106 agreements, the Council requires the developer to provide a management company to take on the management of these area in perpetuity.

### 3.2.7 Greens and Open Spaces Strategy (2008)

The Greens and Open Spaces Strategy sets out the District Council's vision for the District including the provision and enhancement of the parks and green public spaces within the area, along with an action plan, methods and time needed to meet this vision. In order to ensure that the strategy is delivered, the vision is translated into a series of aims and objectives set within an action plan which can then be monitored. The Strategy is outcome focused with identified actions and milestones. It also forms part of a wider consideration on how Lichfield District develops within the Local Plan period.

## 4. Setting Local Standards and Local Evidence

### 4.1 Setting Local Standards

Open space standards are best set locally to reflect local circumstances such as differing demographic profiles, popular local/regional activities and the extent of existing built development in an area. The NPPF states that policies should be based on robust and up to date assessments of the need for open space, sports and recreation facilities and opportunities for new provision.

Having carried out an assessment of local needs and an audit of existing provision and opportunities it is then possible to set locally derived standards for the provision of open space. Local standards should include:

- A local quantity standard for each typology (how much new provision may be needed);
- A local quality standard or vision against which to measure the need for enhancement of existing facilities, including a standard to which new facilities should be built. Some typologies are more difficult to assess and to set specific standards such as natural and semi natural spaces and cemeteries or churchyards. In some instances a descriptive quality standard is set out to which sites should aspire; and
- A local accessibility standard including distance thresholds. This considers how far residents should be expected to travel to the variety of typologies together with consideration of the cost of using a facility.

Setting robust local standards based on assessments of need and audits of existing facilities will form the basis for redressing the quantitative and qualitative deficiencies through the planning process.

### 4.2 Open Space Assessment 5 Step Process:

Whilst PPG17 has now been superseded, the accompanying companion guide "Assessing Needs and Opportunities" still remains relevant. The companion guide sets out the principle that Local Authorities should set standards for open space, sport and recreational needs, and provide good practice guidance on producing robust Open Space Assessments. The guidance states that standards should be informed by robust assessment of needs and opportunities. Specifically, standards should cover the accessibility and quality of open space and facilities as well as the quantity. In line with this guidance, a comprehensive audit and assessment of open space and sport and recreational facilities has been undertaken to inform and support local planning policy.

As such the 5 step process outlined in the companion guide is still considered to be best practice in producing robust local open space assessments and is shown at Table 2.1 and summarised in Chapter 2. It was this process previously used in earlier open space assessments upon which this study builds.

The three components quantity, accessibility and quality standards have been set but are not without issue and a number of assumptions have been made:

Quantity: assessing what is the appropriate quantity for different types of open space is not simple as some typologies are easier to define in terms of quantity than others as this may be over simplistic. Quantitative need can also vary between settlements due to the nature, size, historic provision and locations as well as parish/community involvement. These variations can result in some settlements having higher quantities of some open spaces/recreational facilities than others.

In some instances certain categories are easier to quantify and set standards such as children's equipped play and amenity open space. Whereas standards for civic spaces, allotments, green corridors and churchyards are more difficult to quantify and may in some instances result in no standard being set. For the purposes of this study and depending on the open space category, some standards may vary across the District between the urban areas of Lichfield and Burntwood and between the key rural settlements and the smaller rural settlements. Whilst setting minimum standards it is important that they are flexible enough to reflect different local circumstances that may exist or be identified when evidence is updated throughout the plan period.

Quality: the quality of open spaces depends on many factors, its fitness for purpose in terms of its design, management, maintenance as well as the expectations of the end users. Qualitative information has been gathered from users of certain spaces such as equipped play areas, amenity open spaces and parks and gardens. Information gathering will be an ongoing process with a need to update qualitative information already gathered as well as programming resources to enable the collection of information from site users.

The approach to establishing and setting the qualitative criteria against which to assess and set standards varies. The qualitative approach to amenity green space and in part to children's equipped play spaces considers and scores the quality of elements such as surfaces and boundary treatments (both hard and soft), accessibility within the site, street furniture including seating, lighting, bins, car parking, toilets, interpretation and cleanliness.

In scoring the quality of children's equipped play, the quality of the play experience was also scored. Details of the criteria used to score this element of quality is set out in the equipped play chapter.

Other typologies are more difficult to assess including natural and semi natural green spaces (many of which are important for biodiversity), green corridors and water spaces. In terms of quality many of the typologies are subject to a variety of complex external influences as a result of their nature, ownership and/or specific management requirements or plans.

Accessibility: It is important to ensure that residents are able to access open spaces within a reasonable distance of their home. Appropriate thresholds should relate to the particular type of open space. In assessing appropriate accessibility thresholds, consideration has been given to published guidance together with feedback from community and residents' information gathering exercises. This approach will mean that different types of open space may have different thresholds. It is more likely that shorter distances and times would be appropriate in accessing amenity green spaces and children's equipped play areas as they
are far more likely to be visited on foot, whereas other types of open space may have a larger catchment as they are visited by car or other forms of transport.

Accessibility thresholds are based on straight line distances and it is recognised that barriers may exist which impair accessibility such as roads, railway lines and canals. To this end accessibility distances have been measured using a GIS map based system within which it has been possible to gauge accessibility to different types of open space. This also therefore identifies those areas which are not within a reasonable distance. These areas outside the accessibility thresholds for a particular type of open space are considered to be deficient ${ }^{1}$.

In general, feedback from residents has indicated that in most instances a 10 minute walk time, which roughly equates to around 480 metres is considered acceptable in accessing most types of open space where access is on foot.

### 4.3 Local Needs

Key to producing a robust local assessment is the emphasis that is placed on reflecting and taking into account local needs in the process of assessing the quantity and quality of open spaces. This forms a key element of the evidence to underpin any related strategies and importantly reflect the standards set.

In order to assist in assessing local needs, various methods were used to engage residents, organisations, users and owners involved in or having an interest in open space within the District. These have been enshrined in Policy HSC 1: Open Space Standards in the adopted Local Plan Strategy. This document is therefore an update to the previous Open Space Assessment which was used to set the standards within the adopted Local Plan Strategy. Any standards referred to in this document were previously considered through the Open Space Assessment 2012.

[^0]
## 5. Natural and Semi Natural Greenspace

### 5.1 Definition

Natural and semi natural greenspaces have a primary purpose of wildlife conservation and biodiversity. This type of open space includes woodlands, urban forestry, scrubland, grasslands (eg downlands, commons and meadows), wetlands, open and running water, nature reserves and wastelands.

All those sites identified within this assessment are managed to some degree through both formal agreements and informally.

Sites of semi-natural greenspace include sites of European, National, County and Local significance for wildlife. In terms of designations of landscape significance which fall within the definition of Natural and Semi Natural Greenspace, these included within this calculation are:

- Local/National Nature Reserves;
- Biodiversity Alert Sites (BAS);
- Sites of Biological Interest (SBI);
- Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB);
- Ancient and Semi natural Woodland;
- Woodland Trust sites;
- Trent and Mersey Conservation Area;
- Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI);
- National Forest Sites; and
- Special Areas of Conservation (SAC).

Opportunities for assessing natural and semi natural greenspaces can only be identified on a site by site basis, through Phase 1 habitat surveys and biodiversity audits. Phase 1 surveys carried out in the 1990's were reviewed in 2003. In 2009 an Ecological Assessment was carried out by Staffordshire Ecological Services as part of the evidence gathering for the Local Plan, and concentrated primarily on potential growth locations.

Whilst the primary purpose of natural and semi natural greenspaces is their importance in terms of their biodiversity value, the recreational opportunities provided by these spaces are also important. Such spaces also contribute to the health and well-being of the population that lives near to or use these spaces as well as having a positive impact on the visual amenity of the locality.

Natural and semi natural greenspaces also play a positive role as 'green infrastructure'. The District Council's partners, including Natural England, the National Forest, the Forest of Mercia, Woodland Trust and Wildlife Trust are working towards creating a greener environment which includes a multi-functional and linked network of green spaces within the District.

### 5.2 Assessment of Quantity:

The total amount of natural and semi natural greenspace throughout the District is 2,039.22 hectares (ha) giving a provision of 19.97 ha per 1,000 head of population. This has reduced marginally since the previous 2012 Open Space Assessment due to the growth of the Districts population. Designations included in the calculation are noted in 5.2 above.

Whilst every effort has been made to ensure that all such spaces are identified it must be recognised that not all privately or publicly owned land is included. Due to the nature of the District there are likely to be large areas of land that are publicly accessible but whose primary use is not that of open space e.g. accessible farmland. In addition there are other areas that have known biodiversity value such as churchyards.

Natural and semi natural open space can frequently be found within other open space types, and in some instances there may be some sites classified as amenity green space or parks that have a secondary function as natural and semi natural open space sites. This serves to highlight the overlap between typologies. Natural open spaces also fulfil similar roles to parks.

As Map 5.1 below shows, there is a wide spread of sites identified as semi natural greenspace within the District of varying types and sizes. Some part of the District have more than others with the eastern area having fewer greenspaces, but those greenspaces are of a larger size.


Map 5.1 District wide Natural and Semi Natural Green Space

### 5.3 National Standards

For Natural Green Space, there are a number of national standards recommended by Natural England and the Woodland Trust, which are summarised below.

For this purpose of this study, it is recognised that the analysis should include both the Natural England ANGSt and the Woodland Trust standards to identify current levels of provision and gaps.

### 5.3.1 Natural England Accessible Natural Green Space Standards (ANGSt)

Key standards relating to the provision of natural and semi-natural greenspace have been developed by Natural England and focused on urban greenspaces. The Natural England standards are set out below. It is accepted that such measures are not likely to be achieved in the short term but that they should be included as a long term aim. The Natural England standards suggest that there should be at least:

- One accessible 20 ha site within 2 km of home;
- One accessible 100 ha site within 5 km of home;
- One accessible 500 ha site within 10 km of home;
- 2 ha of accessible natural greenspace no more than 300 m ( 5 minutes' walk) from home; and
- A statutory Local Nature Reserve at a minimum level of 1 ha per 1000 population.

Maps 5.2 to 5.4 show the above Natural England Standards when applied to areas of natural and semi natural greenspace across Lichfield District.


Map 5.2 Natural and Semi Natural Green Space over 2ha with 300m buffer

Large areas of the District have limited accessibility to natural and semi natural greenspace of 2 ha or more. This is evident when a 300 m accessibility buffer is applied.


Map 5.3 Natural and Semi Natural Green Space over 20ha with 2km buffer

There are 17 sites identified within the District that are 20 ha or more. When the 2 km buffer is applied to existing sites, a large proportion of the District's population has access to this size of natural and semi natural greenspace with the exception of areas around Shenstone and Stonnall to the south, the rural eastern part of the District and areas to the north around Colton and Hamstall Ridware.


Map 5.4 Natural and Semi Natural Green Space over 100ha with 5km buffer
There are 4 sites identified within the District that are 100 ha or more and comprise Hopwas Wood, Gentleshaw Common, Chasewater and parts of Cannock Chase. When mapped alongside a $5 \mathrm{~km}(5,000 \mathrm{~m})$ buffer there are distinct areas with no access. These include most of the north and eastern area together with a large swathe to the south west of the District. There are 3 further sites which exceed 100 ha but are outside the District boundary: Sutton Park, Blithfield Reservoir and Kingsbury Water Park which are accessible from some areas of the District and provide access for populations residing in the north and south of the District. There is however still a gap in provision in the east of the District.


Map 5.5 Natural and Semi Natural Green Space over 500ha with 10km buffer

There are four sites of 500ha or more that impact on the District, Cannock Chase straddling the western boundary of Lichfield District with the other three located outside the District boundary. The four sites being Sutton Park, Blithfield Reservoir and Kingsbury Water Park and Cannock Chase.

When mapped alongside a 10 km the majority of the District has access to 500ha sites, with the exception of a small area to the east of the District.

### 5.3.2 Woodland Trust

To complement the Natural England Standards, separate standards for woodland have been developed by the Woodland Trust ${ }^{2}$. These are:

- No person should live more than 500 m from at least one area of accessible woodland of less than 2 ha in size.
- There should also be at least one area of accessible woodland of no less than 20 ha within 4 km of a home.

While a range of different types of accessible greenspace is valuable, the Woodland Trust believes woods are of particular value. In urban areas in particular, their visual prominence can create a balance between the built and natural environment. Data from the Woodland Trust ${ }^{3}$ illustrates how Lichfield District fares in comparison to county and national levels of accessibility. Basic levels are:

|  | Lichfield <br> District | Staffordshire <br> County | England |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \% of population with access to a 2ha+ wood within <br> 500m | 10.2 | 14.3 | 16.8 |
| \% of population with access to a 2Oha+ wood <br> within 4km | 84.5 | 57.9 | 65.8 |
| \% extra population with access to a 2ha+ wood <br> within 500m if existing woods opened | 29.9 | 37.3 | 34.3 |
| \% extra population with access to a 20ha+ wood <br> within 4km if existing woods opened | 14.3 | 39.1 | 22.4 |
| \% population requiring new woodland to be able <br> to access a 2ha+ wood within 500m | 59.9 | 48.3 | 48.8 |
| \% population requiring new woodland to be able <br> to access a 20ha+ wood within 4km | 1.3 | 4.0 | 11.9 |
| Total area of new 2ha+ woods needed to meet <br> 500m access standard (hectares) | 136 | 956 | 41523 |
| Total area of new 20ha+ woods needed to meet <br> 4km access standard (hectares) | 40 | 200 | 15265 |

Table 5.1 Woodland Trust: Woodland Access and Targets
Table 5.1 shows that as a District, Lichfield residents have low availability of 2ha+ woodlands within 500 m however they have substantially higher levels of accessibility to larger woodland (20ha + ) within 4 km than at either county or national levels with almost $85 \%$ of the population being able to access woodlands of this scale.

### 5.4 Establishing a Local Standard for Natural and Semi Natural Greenspace

### 5.4.1 Quantity

In terms of considering a quantity standard approach to Lichfield District the starting point should be that there is no loss in the overall amount of natural and semi natural greenspace

[^1]as identified within this assessment. In addition opportunities that arise to increase provision through creating new public access to areas not currently accessible should be considered with each site being considered in relation to the type of natural and semi natural greenspace. It is unlikely that large areas of natural and semi natural greenspace will be created close to existing built up areas, however the District Council will seek to encourage additional natural and semi natural greenspace and improve the quality and accessibility of existing natural and semi natural greenspaces where opportunities arise. Projects that the District Council are involved in include:

- Creation of Local Nature Reserves (such as Christian Fields, Lichfield);
- Heathland creation; and
- Biodiversity offsetting.

There may be further opportunities to contribute to this objective through a number of partnership projects within the District such as the Central Rivers Initiative, National Forest and Forest of Mercia.

### 5.4.2 Quality

In terms of quality and in view of the variety of criteria needed to assess all different types of natural and semi natural greenspace it is not possible to set a single quality standard.

Quality of natural and semi natural greenspace is important and assessments can potentially highlight areas that people are not using or areas of overuse and thus can influence changes to existing management practises to improve the quality of areas. Examples of where semi natural greenspaces are carefully managed include Chasewater and Gentleshaw Common SSSIs both of are managed within Environmental Stewardship Schemes and utilising sustainable management policies.

Whilst there are no national standards for the quality of natural and semi natural greenspace, it is expected that land should be managed to conserve and enhance the landscape, biodiversity and local heritage. The majority of sites included within this designation are either owned, influenced, protected or managed by organisations whose role it is to safeguard such sites.

Given the difficulty in setting a detailed standard that encompasses the various types of natural and semi natural greenspaces a broad qualitative standard is considered appropriate. Quality of natural and semi natural greenspaces should be gauged taking account of:

- High value aesthetics - clean, no litter, no vandalism, with opportunities for seating, footpaths signage and interpretation.
- Habitat - protect and encourage biodiversity and links between sites.
- Sustainable Management - where appropriate sites should be managed.


### 5.4.3 Accessibility

The 2011 Citizens survey identifies that $66.25 \%$ of respondents stated that there was either 'more than enough' or 'about right' amount of natural greenspaces within the District, with residents of both Lichfield and Burntwood being slightly less satisfied with the level of natural greenspace than their counterparts in the rural areas.

There are also issues relevant to the District in terms of managing the impact that local communities have whilst visiting certain natural and semi natural greenspaces. In particular the harmful effect on the Cannock Chase Special Area of Conservation which lies within the wider Cannock Chase AONB. Work by the various organisations involved in the management of Cannock Chase is ongoing, with the formation of a Cannock Chase SAC Partnership to deal with effects of additional visitors generated through planned residential development as contained within the Local Plans of authorities within a defined zone of influence. The results of this work will need to be take into account when considering future protection, management and improvements.

Where possible opportunities to increase access to existing natural and semi natural greenspaces should be encouraged, especially by sustainable methods. Access to areas of significant biodiversity importance should be carefully managed and monitored to avoid any potential conflicts.

### 5.4.4 Setting the Standard

By the very nature of the different types of greenspace included in this typology there are a number which are sensitive in terms of biodiversity and therefore it is difficult to set rigid standards. It is accepted that certain parts of the District (especially the east) have few sites and thus reflect poor accessibility levels. However this is a rural area and there is access to the wider countryside on the doorstep via the public rights of way network. Importantly all natural and semi natural greenspaces identified should be protected and opportunities for increasing provision in areas where which are underprovided should be encouraged, in particular sites that are within reasonable walking distance of residential areas.

It is important to take into account a variety of issues in developing a standard for natural and semi natural greenspace. There are many types of accessible natural and semi natural greenspaces spread throughout the District, however there are areas where there is low accessibility (particularly in the east) when using the standards set by Natural England. When using those advocated by the Woodland Trust in terms of access to existing woodland, the population of the District has little access to woodland sites of 2 ha or more within a 500 metres when compared to both County and National figures. The data in Table 5.1 shows that the District would need to provide an additional 136 ha of new woodland to achieve access for residents within 500 m and an additional 40 ha of woodland to achieve accessibility within 4 km .

### 5.4.5 Priorities

All identified natural and semi natural greenspaces should be safeguarded and opportunities to increase the provision of accessible natural and semi natural greenspace should be encouraged. In addition, links between natural and semi natural greenspaces should be considered.

The current quantity of 2,039.22 hectares of natural and semi natural greenspace should be protected and natural and semi natural greenspaces the current amount of 20 ha per 1000 head of population should be maintained.

The District Council should continue to work with other organisations in improving and increasing the provision of natural and semi natural greenspaces in the District.

Ensure that where development takes place which would impact on existing natural and semi natural greenspaces, that measures are in place to ensure that appropriate planning conditions and/or planning contributions are made to improve, maintain and protect natural and semi natural greenspaces likely to be affected.

## 6. Amenity Greenspace

### 6.1 Definition

Amenity Greenspace is mainly found in housing areas where it is used to enhance the appearance of an area and provide opportunities for informal activities such as jogging, dog walking and children's play space close to home. This type of open space is also present in town and city centres where they are used by workers and visitors for informal recreation and relaxation.

Amenity greenspaces provide an important feature within the local environment, they are often multi-functional. Their function may be dependent on their size, location and how they are laid out. They are commonly used for informal recreation including children's play and other passive pursuits such as walking. Typically these areas have no physical boundary, and comprise of mown grass, occasional planted areas and trees. Amenity greenspace is a key feature within the built environment and as well as being used and enjoyed by those who work and visit these areas, contribute to the overall visual amenity of an area.

The distribution of amenity greenspaces mapped within the District's settlements are shown on Map 6.1. It shows that with only a few exceptions most settlements within the District contain amenity greenspace, often combined with other more formal uses such as play or sporting facilities.

### 6.2 Assessment of Quantity

There are 242 sites spread throughout the District which have been surveyed as part of the assessment. These sites total 161.5 ha and range from 0.02 ha to 11.02 ha and gives an average existing provision of 1.57 ha per 1000 head of population in 2016 based on a District population of 102,500 . This is higher than the National Playing Fields Association recommended minimum standard ${ }^{4}$ for children's play spaces of 0.6 ha per 1000 head of population. Map 6.1 shows all amenity greenspaces within the District are located within settlements. The majority of the District settlements have some amenity greenspace, however those with no such space include Hamstall Ridware, Wigginton and Little Aston.

By 2029 it is estimated that the population of the District will be $107,762^{5}$ which at current levels of amenity greenspace results in 1.49 ha per 1000 head of population. It is considered that in the creation of new amenity greenspaces and identification of areas which are deficient, accessibility to existing spaces should also be considered. Some settlements that have generous amounts of existing amenity greenspace may have very poor accessibility for large parts of the community where it is concentrated in one location, such is the case in Alrewas and Shenstone.

Ideally there should be a range of amenity greenspaces that contribute to the overall aesthetic quality of an area. The presence, location and type of amenity greenspace is largely

[^2]governed by historic development patterns, most being found within and as a result of residential development.

It is important therefore that sufficient amounts of accessible amenity greenspaces are provided particularly within new developments and that opportunities to increase amenity greenspaces in areas where there are existing identified deficiencies are explored.

### 6.3 Assessment of Quality

Quality amenity greenspace should be located close to housing and be easily accessible, clear of dog fouling and containing appropriate ancillary accommodation such as benches and litter bins. There should be varied vegetation including trees and shrubs with grassed areas being well kept and large enough to accommodate informal play.

Details of assessments are listed in Appendix A and shows the overall score for each amenity open space. Sites were scored in relation to a number of elements, namely the quality of:

- Boundaries;
- Roads and paths;
- Planted and grassed areas;
- Presence of bins and seats;
- Parking, toilets, lighting and cleanliness; and
- Information and events programming.

Each amenity open space was given a maximum total score as many open spaces may not have been suitable for features such as toilets, parking and events programming. As such these features have been removed from the assessment for certain sites and an overall percentage score has been calculated for each site.

The 2011 Citizens survey showed that across the District $58 \%$ of respondents felt that access to amenity greenspace is acceptable. Those living in rural areas and Lichfield City are more satisfied than those living in Burntwood.

The quality of amenity greenspace varies considerably throughout the District. Areas with poor assessment scores, ie below $40 \%$, include sites within Lichfield, Burntwood and Fazeley. Areas of high scoring open space are also found within Lichfield and Burntwood along with some of the rural settlements in the north of the District.

Map 6.1 illustrates the distribution of amenity greenspace across the District as well as identifying those which scored below $40 \%$. This demonstrates that the quality of greenspace varies across the District with concentrations of poorer quality spaces found within Lichfield, Burntwood, Fazeley, Alrewas, Armitage with Handsacre and Fradley.


Map 6.1 Lichfield District Amenity Greenspace with $480 \mathrm{~m} / 10$ minute walk time buffer.

### 6.4 Assessment of Accessibility

The Local Plan Strategy in Policy HSC1: Open Space Standards of the Local Plan Strategy 2008-2029 adopted in February 2015, requires a $480 \mathrm{~m} / 10$ minute walk time to amenity greenspace. Map 6.1 also shows the location of existing amenity greenspace throughout the District together with a $480 \mathrm{~m} / 10$ minute walk time buffer. This accords with the recommendations in the Fields in Trust 'Guidance for Outdoor Sport and Play: Beyond the Six Acre Standard' 2015 which recommends a minimum of 0.6 ha per 1000 head of population with 480 m walking distance from residential dwellings.

Using the $480 \mathrm{~m} / 10$ minute walk time around existing amenity greenspaces within settlement boundaries, it shows that only small areas are not accessible. Hamstall Ridware and Wigginton have no amenity greenspace along with parts of Lichfield, Shenstone, Little Aston, Armitage with Handsacre, Burntwood and areas within some of the smaller rural settlements. These areas can be seen in more detail in Sections 6.5 and 6.6 below.

### 6.5 Provision by Settlement

### 6.5.1 Burntwood

Quantity: Within Burntwood there is approximately 30 ha of amenity greenspace on 49 sites, ranging in size from 0.05 ha to 3.6 ha at Church Street. Using 1.43 ha as a minimum standard for amenity greenspace as contained in Policy HSC1 of the Local Plan Strategy, and the census 2011 population for Burntwood of 26,049, an additional 7.2 ha of amenity greenspace would be required.

It should be noted however that immediately to the south of the Burntwood Bypass lies Chasewater Country Park covering 360 ha, and categorised as natural and semi natural green space, however this site also functions as a destination for amenity recreation. Equally to the north lies Gentleshaw Common and the wider Cannock Chase AONB both of which also fall within the natural and semi natural green space category but also fulfils an amenity recreation role.

Quality: Of the 49 amenity greenspace sites within Burntwood, 15 sites score below 40\%, with $55 \%$ of the sites scoring between $40 \%$ and $55 \%$. Those of the poorest quality include New Road, and land at Pooles Way, which whilst generally clean reflect the poor scoring against entrances, paths and boundaries, bins and seating.

Those that record higher scores include Church Street, land around Chasetown Football Club and Burntwood Park. These scores reflect a mixture of good quality planted and grassed areas, availability of parking along with bins and seating.

In general the quality of grass, planted areas and cleanliness within Burntwood amenity greenspace appears to be good, however the quality of boundaries and paths was more variable. There appears to be a lack of bins and seats present however this if often dependent on the location and size of greenspace.

Opportunities to improve the quality of any site scoring below $40 \%$ should be explored whilst any additional potential to improve other sites through the addition of seating and bins should also be encouraged.

Accessibility: In terms of accessibility to amenity greenspace the majority of Burntwood residents have access to some form of amenity greenspace within $480 \mathrm{~m} / 10$ minute walk time, as shown on Map 6.2. However this map also demonstrates that fewer and smaller areas of amenity greenspace are located within the south of the settlement especially to the south of the Cannock Road (A5190).


Map 6.2 Burntwood Amenity Greenspace with $480 \mathrm{~m} / 10$ minute walk time buffer.
Priorities for Action: Priorities include:

- Addressing those lower scoring sites by focussing on the individual elements which are causing the lower scores such as benches and bins;
- Exploring opportunities for additional sites within the settlement particularly in the south of the Cannock Road; and
- Whilst most of Burntwood is within $480 \mathrm{~m} / 10$ minute walk time of an amenity greenspace, there are a number of busy roads which may impair accessibility therefore consideration should be given to opportunities to improve pedestrian access.


### 6.5.2 Lichfield



Map 6.3 Lichfield Amenity Greenspace with $480 \mathrm{~m} / 10$ minute walk time buffer.
Quantity: Within Lichfield there is approximately 82 ha of open space on 81 sites ranging from 0.02ha to 11 ha at Darnford Park. Using 1.43ha as a minimum standard for amenity greenspace as contained in Policy HSC1 of the Local Plan Strategy, and the census 2011 population of Lichfield at 32,219 , Lichfield exceeds this minimum standard, in fact providing 2.5 ha of amenity greenspace per 1000 head of population. There are several large areas of amenity greenspace within Lichfield which results in the higher levels of provision. As can be
seen from Map 6.2 there are large sites around Beacon Park, Eastern Avenue within Lichfield. Although not yet built and as such not considered in this assessment, 3 of the 4 Strategic Development Allocations within Lichfield as contained within the Local Plan Strategy concept statements contain substantial areas of greenspace.

Quality: The quality of the 82 sites within Lichfield varies considerably. It is important that the quality of sites is raised above $40 \%$. The improvement of grassed and planted areas, bins and seats which can typically influence the attractiveness and usability of sites should be considered.

Accessibility: Lichfield City has a total coverage within the $480 \mathrm{~m} / 10$ minute walk time. Map 6.2 illustrates the wide range in size of amenity greenspace within the City with a number of larger sites being located on the edges of the settlement. The major priority for Lichfield City will be to ensure that future development continues to provide complete coverage in terms of accessibility. As noted above the large development sites within Lichfield City as contained within the Local Plan Strategy have substantial areas of open space.

It should be recognised that as is the case with most large settlements there are a number of obstacles such as busy roads and railway lines which can prove barriers to access. As such any opportunities to improve pedestrian links to amenity greenspace should be considered.

Priorities for Action: Priorities include:

- opportunities to improve pedestrian links to amenity greenspace should be considered; and
- Ensure future development continues to provide complete coverage in terms of accessibility.


### 6.5.3 Key Rural Settlement: Alrewas



Map 6.4 Alrewas Amenity Greenspace with $480 \mathrm{~m} / 10$ minute walk time buffer.
Quantity: In total there are 12 sites within Alrewas covering 7.4ha, with sites ranging in size from 0.02 ha to 3.5 ha. The majority of amenity greenspace located within Alrewas is around the edges of the settlement with the largest being largely rough grassland to the north and in the south land adjacent to the cricket ground.

Quality: In qualitative terms the scores range from $29 \%$ up to $46 \%$ however as the majority of these sites are confined to grassed areas with little or no infrastructure, this has influenced
the scoring. In general the grass quality is good. Opportunities should be sought to implement improvements to existing sites where necessary particularly to those scoring below 40\%.

Accessibility: Alrewas has complete coverage when the $480 \mathrm{~m} / 10$ minute walk time buffer is applied to existing areas of greenspace. There is little greenspace in the north east quadrant of Alrewas.

Alrewas also has the benefit of a canal running through the settlement with accessible towpaths. Whilst not counted in the study of amenity greenspace, the canal and its towpath act as a valuable walkway and green corridor.

Priorities for Action: Priorities include:

- Opportunities for additional spaces should be explored where possible or in response to an identified need such within the northeast of Alrewas; and
- Consideration of safe crossing points across Main Street to enable safer links between north and south.


### 6.5.4 Key Rural Settlement: Armitage with Handsacre

Quantity: In total there are 23 sites within Armitage with Handsacre covering 12.2ha, with sites ranging in size from 0.02 ha to 4.6 ha . Armitage with Handsacre has the largest amount of amenity greenspace within any of the key rural settlement, thanks largely to the 4.6ha of greenspace concentrated at Shropshire Brook Road. There is however no greenspace in the west of the settlement until Hawksyard development is reached which is outside the settlement boundary.

Armitage with Handsacre also has the benefit of a canal running through the settlement. However the towpath is on the north side of the canal and as such is only accessible at select points where the canal is bridged. Whilst not counted in the study of amenity greenspace, the canal and its towpath act as a valuable walkway and green corridor.

Quality: In qualitative terms the scores range from $23 \%$ up to $62 \%$ with the lower scoring sites confined to smaller pockets of amenity greenspace within residential areas. These areas were on the whole low scoring in cleanliness as well as the lack of benches and bins, although these may not necessarily be appropriate on some of these smaller sites. The higher scoring sites are generally the larger sites such as Shropshire Brook Road, Millmoor Avenue and the relatively newly constructed Hawksyard amenity greenspace.

Accessibility: Armitage with Handsacre has almost a complete coverage for the $480 \mathrm{~m} / 10$ minute walk time. The exception to this is to the west of the settlement around Chapel Road, Church Lane and Upper Lodge Road. Although outside the settlement boundary, a Residential Mobile Home Park exists and this has no coverage either by the Hawksyard development to the west or the main settlement of Armitage to the east.


Map 6.5 Armitage with Handsacre Amenity Greenspace with $480 \mathrm{~m} / 10$ minute walk time buffer.

Priorities for Action: Priorities include:

- Opportunities for additional amenity greenspace should be explored where possible or in response to an identified need such within the west of Armitage with Handsacre;
- Consideration of safe crossing points across Main Street to enable safer links from the north; and
- Opportunities to improve the quality of the smaller greenspaces in the east of the settlement should be considered if opportunities arise.


### 6.5.5 Key Rural Settlement: Fradley



Map 6.6 Fradley Amenity Greenspace with $480 \mathrm{~m} / 10$ minute walk time buffer.

Quantity: In total there are 6 sites within Fradley covering 3.5ha, with sites ranging in size from 0.01 ha to 1.5 ha and concentrated in the north of the settlement. The Worthington Road site is considered to fall within the equipped play category and is therefore not considered in the amenity greenspace typology.

Fradley is another key rural settlement serviced by a canal and links Fradley and Fradley Junction with other settlements such as Whittington. Whilst not counted in this instance, as amenity greenspace, the towpath nevertheless acts to provide valuable linkages and a green corridor. The Fradley Strategic Development Allocation concept statement contained within the Local Plan Strategy seeks to provide accessible open space as part of this new development of circa 1,250 dwellings.

Quality: In qualitative terms the scores range from 32 to $72 \%$. The amenity space around Hay End Lane scores highly due to the infrastructure provided. Those low scoring sites are generally due to the lack of infrastructure although the quality of the grass and cleanliness are high scoring.

Accessibility: Fradley has complete coverage for the $480 \mathrm{~m} / 10$ minute walk time. The larger amenity greenspace are on the whole centrally located and therefore provide convenient access for most of Fradley residents. However in this situation, as opposed to other settlements, the two canal bridges provide the barrier to accessing these larger sites from the south of the settlement.

## Priorities for Action

Priorities include:

- Opportunities for additional amenity greenspace should be explored where possible or in response to an identified need; and
- Improvement to elements of the greenspaces should be considered if opportunities arise.


### 6.5.6 Key Rural Settlement: Fazeley, Mile Oak \& Bonehill

Quantity: Despite being the largest of the District's rural settlements in terms of population, Fazeley has few amenity greenspaces. In total there are 11 sites within Fazeley covering 2.7 ha in total, all below 1 ha in size, the largest being 0.7 ha. The majority of which are concentrated in Fazeley with less provision in Mile Oak or Bonehill.

Like many of the 6 key rural settlements in Lichfield District, Fazeley has canals. It is in fact the junction of the Coventry Canal with the Birmingham and Fazeley Canal both of which have towpaths which provide links to the northwest, northeast and south of the settlement. Whilst not counted as amenity greenspace these canals act as valuable linkages and green corridors.

Quality: Scores range from $23 \%$ to $73 \%$ with the highest scoring site being the relatively recently constructed Laurel House open space. On the whole the greenspaces are limited in size, number and are relatively low scoring.

Accessibility: Largely due to the linear form of Fazeley, Bonehill and Mile Oak, the settlement has almost complete coverage when the $480 \mathrm{~m} / 10$ minute walk time buffer is applied. In terms of accessibility to the larger spaces, namely Laurel House, Mayfair Drive and Victory Terrace these are located in the east of the settlement and as such are not easily accessible by residents of Mile Oak. Additionally the greenspace to the rear of Victory Terrace is not
easily accessible as it is separated from the majority of the settlement by busy road, and it is also hidden from view leading to concerns about natural surveillance and safety.


Map 6.7 Fazeley, Mile Oak \& Bonehill Amenity Greenspace with $480 \mathrm{~m} / 10$ minute walk time buffer.

Priorities for Action: there is scope to provide additional good quality multifunctional amenity greenspace particularly located in the centre of the settlement for accessibility. Priorities should include:

- Improve provision of greenspace accessible to Bonehill and Reindeer Road residents;
- Improvement to elements of the greenspaces should be considered if opportunities arise; and
- Provision of safe routes to existing spaces particularly those in the east of the settlement.


### 6.5.7 Key Rural Settlement: Shenstone



Map 6.8 Shenstone Amenity Greenspace with $480 \mathrm{~m} / 10$ minute walk time buffer
Quantity: In terms of its size, Shenstone has only 4 amenity greenspaces, much less than the other key rural settlements. These 4 spaces covering 6.4 ha , the largest at 5.6 ha being the

Lammas Land to the north. This space provides a large accessible area of amenity greenspace. Two of the other areas of greenspace are also alongside the village boundary forming primarily a linear visual and physical buffer between the Birmingham Road and adjacent residential area. There is a clear lack of accessible greenspace within the bulk of the settlement, except for the Recreation Grounds which also contributes to equipped play.

Quality: Three of the four amenity greenspaces score above $40 \%$. The two spaces alongside the Birmingham Road score $39 \%$ and $42 \%$ and due to their visual amenity and physical buffering function it may not be possible to increase these scores as the provision of bins, seating and pathways is likely to be inappropriate.

Accessibility: Despite the lack of existing amenity greenspace the overall perception of Shenstone is one of a high quality settlement with areas of established tree coverage. There is a small area to the south west of the settlement which does not have a $480 \mathrm{~m} / 10$ minutes walk time access to amenity greenspace. As the two areas of greenspace alongside the Birmingham Road are purely buffering function it could be inferred that access to amenity greenspace by residents in the south of Shenstone is limited.

Priorities for Action: In terms of opportunities and potential improvements:

- The provision of additional spaces should be explored where possible to accommodate a variety of informal uses particularly within the south of the settlement; and
- Any future development should contribute towards providing amenity greenspace.


### 6.5.8 Key Rural Settlement: Whittington

Quantity: There are six amenity greenspaces located within Whittington covering around 1.9 ha with the largest being 1.4 ha which is located around Peregrine Close created as part of a residential development on a former Severn Trent Water site. The remaining 4 greenspaces are centrally located within existing residential areas, with no amenity greenspace within the north and south of the settlement. There are however other types of open spaces within these areas including 2 equipped play areas, the canal which skirts the east and north of the settlement, and playing fields to the south.

Whittington as with many of the key rural settlement is accessible to the canal network, bordered by the Coventry Canal. The towpath allows access to Fradley and Fradley junction to the north and south to Hopwas.

Quality: Overall the quality of the amenity greenspaces in Whittington is good with no sites scoring below $40 \%$ due in part to grass and planted areas generally being of good quality. Benches and bins could be provided in appropriate spaces to improve their scoring.

Accessibility: The entirety of Whittington falls within the $480 \mathrm{~m} / 10$ minute walk time.

## Priorities for Action:

- Opportunities for additional greenspaces accessible to the northern part of the settlement; and
- Opportunities for improvement of existing sites through benches and bins where appropriate.


Map 6.9 Whittington Amenity Greenspace with $480 \mathrm{~m} / 10$ minute walk time buffer.

### 6.5.9 Northern Rural Settlements



Map 6.10 Rural North Amenity Greenspace with $480 \mathrm{~m} / 10$ minute walk time buffer.
Quantity: The quantity of amenity greenspace varies across the smaller rural settlements in terms of the number and size of the sites. The only settlement with no amenity greenspace is Hamstall Ridware. Upper Longdon has one very small space ( 0.02 ha ) with Longdon having 2 amenity greenspaces within the settlement the largest being 0.04 ha , with 4 smaller greenspaces on the outskirts bordering the A51. Kings Bromley has 5 amenity greenspaces the largest being on the football grounds of almost 1.5ha, with the remaining 5 scattered throughout the settlement but generally east of the A515. Colton has 3 amenity greenspaces
all of which are relatively large but are located around the church and school which when applying the $480 \mathrm{~m} / 10$ minute walk time buffer results in a lack of provision in the north of the settlement.

Quality: The majority of sites within the rural north score relatively well, with only 2 sites, one in Longdon and one in Colton scoring below $40 \%$. The site in Colton scores relatively poorly as this is a field with no provision for public access but is considered to contribute positively to the character of the village. The other 2 sites in Colton scored well along with sites in Kings Bromley.

Accessibility: There are only areas in the north of Colton, and Upper Longdon which are not within the $480 \mathrm{~m} / 10$ minute walk time from an amenity greenspace, although it must be noted that the site in Upper Longdon is particularly small.

## Priorities for Action:

- Opportunities to increase provision where there is an identified need to ensure all residents have access to amenity greenspace.
- Ensure amenity greenspace is not lost especially where it provides a setting for village character.


### 6.5.10 Eastern Rural Settlements

Quantity: Within the rural east of the District only Wigginton has no amenity greenspace. Hopwas and Harlaston have 2 spaces, Elford and Clifton Campville have 3, and Edingale 9 of varying size. Clifton Campville has the largest greenspace provision with a block of 9.4 ha to the south of the village which although outside the village boundary helps to provide total coverage.

Quality: The majority of sites across the rural east of the District score above $40 \%$ with many scoring between $50 \%$ and $65 \%$. Large area of amenity greenspace in Clifton Campville and Elford score relatively poorly as these are fields crossed by public footpaths but with no infrastructure provision. However these area of amenity greenspace are considered important due to their positive contribution to the character and setting of these villages. Similarly the same situation also applies to the field fronting the church in Hopwas.

Accessibility: With the exception of Wigginton residents and residents to the far west of Hopwas, there is almost complete $480 \mathrm{~m} / 10$ minute walk time coverage. In addition pedestrian movement around and within these settlements is generally good.

## Priorities for Action:

- Opportunities to increase provision where there is an identified need to ensure all residents have access to amenity greenspace; and
- Ensure amenity greenspace is not lost especially where it provides a setting for village character.


Map 6.11 Rural East Amenity Greenspace with $480 \mathrm{~m} / 10$ minute walk time buffer.

### 6.5.11 Southern Rural Settlements

Quantity: The only rural settlements located within the south of the District are Drayton Bassett and Hints. Drayton Bassett has 3 areas of amenity greenspace and Hints two spaces.

Quality: the only site scoring below $40 \%$ is founds in Hints and is a large wooded area to the rear of the church. The quality of the remaining sites is generally good.

Accessibility: Both settlements has full $480 \mathrm{~m} / 10$ minutes walk time coverage.

Priorities for Action:

- Opportunities for improvement of existing sites through benches and bins where appropriate.


Map 6.12 Rural South Amenity Greenspace with $480 \mathrm{~m} / 10$ minute walk time buffer.

### 6.5.12 Western Rural Settlements



Map 6.13 Rural West Amenity Greenspace with $480 \mathrm{~m} / 10$ minute walk time buffer
Quantity: Within this area there are only 2 settlements, Hammerwich and Stonnall with 2 and 3 areas of amenity greenspace respectively. The largest site being around the Playing Fields at Stonnall and providing 0.6 ha.

Quality: The sites within these 2 villages all score over $40 \%$ with the Playing Fields at Stonnall scoring the highest at $52 \%$.

Accessibility: Stonnall has complete $480 \mathrm{~m} / 10$ minute walk time coverage despite the linear form of the settlement although 2 of the amenity areas are very small. The Playing Fields at Stonnall are centrally located and easily accessible to most of the village. Hammerwich also has complete $480 \mathrm{~m} / 10$ minute walk time coverage.

## Priorities for Action:

- Opportunities for improvement of existing sites through benches and bins where appropriate.


### 6.6 Standards for Amenity Greenspace

Due to the nature of this typology and its usual location within residential developments, it is difficult to set rigid standards. Where locations do not currently have access to amenity greenspace it may not be possible to create new spaces due to the built up nature of an area. Ideally residents should have access to a variety of types of good quality amenity greenspaces of various sizes which can be accessed safely within $480 \mathrm{~m} / 10$ minute walk time from home, which can accommodate a range of informal uses.

It is important that existing amenity greenspaces are protected and any loss compensated for within a suitable area. In some cases where these amenity greenspaces form a setting for a village or conservation area their loss should be resisted. Any opportunities to increase the quantity of provision particularly in areas where a deficiency has been identified should be encouraged.

Regarding the quality of amenity greenspace sites should aim to achieve as high a score as possible given the nature of the site although it must be recognised that improvements such as benches, paths and bins may not be suitable for all amenity greenspace sites. The qualitative criteria for scoring amenity greenspaces should be considered and monitored so that spaces able to be improved will score higher. Those scoring under $40 \%$ should be assessed for suitability for improvement.

At a local level it is important for local communities to influence amenity greenspace provision as needs will vary between communities.

## 7. Green Corridors

### 7.1 Definition

This type of open space is mainly used for environmentally sustainable forms of transport such as walking and cycling. It provides linkages between housing areas and makes use of linear routes such as public rights of way using bridleways, cycle routes, discussed railway lines, roads, canals and river banks.

Green corridors provide opportunities for walking, cycling or horse riding for leisure or travel purposes and offering routes for wildlife migration. Such corridors are important as they promote environmentally friendly means of travelling through the District. It was suggested through the Companion Guide to PPG17 that planning policies promote the use of green corridors to link housing to areas to the national cycle network, towns and city centres, places of employment and community facilities.

Such corridors contribute to delivering sustainable transport links connecting towns and villages with community facilities, employment locations, shops and a wider range of assets. It is important where opportunities to improve these links are maximised.

Long distance footpaths, bridleways and cycleways can also provide recreational opportunities and activities as well as important social, health and economic benefits. There is substantial evidence that links the natural environment with good physical, emotional and mental health.

Within the District there are also opportunities for green corridors to link areas of wildlife importance to reduce fragmentation of habitats. This is recognised and addressed in Policies NR3 and NR6 of the Local Plan Strategy 2008-2029.

Green corridors forms part of the Green Infrastructure chapter within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan which looks at large strategic green infrastructure and how this will be delivered into the future.

### 7.2 Public Rights of Way

There are currently 1145 rights of way in Lichfield District totalling 460km. In addition there are also 190 km of cycle routes within the District which connect the main urban settlements of Lichfield and Burntwood and to settlements outside of Lichfield District such as Cannock, Rugeley and Tamworth. Notable and well known long distance routes which cross Lichfield District being the Heart of England Way, the Staffordshire Way and National Cycle Route 54.

Staffordshire Country Council under Section 60 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act publish a Rights of Way Improvement Plan (ROWIP). The ROWIP establishes a framework for managing the rights of way network and sets out priorities for improving it to meet the needs of users. The plan proposes a series of actions to help achieve priorities and guides the targeting of resources in future. Funding as always remains the main obstacle and the ROWIP recommends continuing existing and increasing partnership working along with the involvement of local people and communities to harness their resources and knowledge.

### 7.2 Canals

Lichfield District is crossed by three canals, namely the Coventry Canal, Birmingham and Fazeley Canal and the Trent and Mersey Canal. Whilst initially constructed for the transportation of goods, the canals in more recent years have become a destination for leisure boaters, walkers and cyclists as well as operating as efficient green corridors.


Map 7.1 Canal and Public Rights of Way Network within Lichfield District Several settlements within the District are situated along these canals and include Armitage with Handsacre, Fradley, Alrewas, Whittington, Hopwas and Fazeley. In addition there is also extensive ongoing work to restore and reopen the Lichfield Canal by the Lichfield and Hatherton Canals Trust.

Within Staffordshire canal towpaths have been linked to the footpath network to deliver 2 long distance routes:

- Millennium Way; and
- Staffordshire Way.

Many of the canals run by the Canal and River Trust are open to cyclists, however within Lichfield there are no formal cycle routes running along existing canal towpaths.

Continued support and promotion of the canal network should be maintained in order to raise their profile in terms of their importance in contributing to the sustainable transport network as well as in providing efficient and effective green corridors.

### 7.3 Rivers

Lichfield District is crossed by the rivers Tame and Trent, both of which are part of the wider Central Rivers Initiative (CRI) area and which also stretches across Tamworth Borough and East Staffordshire District.

The CRI is a rural regeneration project seeking to secure the multi-functional end use for post sand and gravel extraction sites. In May 2016, the CRI partnership submitted a $£ 3$ million funding application 'Transforming the Trent Valley' to the Heritage Lottery Fund to undertake a wide range of environmental, cultural and community-led projects within the Trent valley over a 5 year period. In October 2016 development the first stage of the grant has been approved providing funding to support the development of a larger proposal to be submitted for approval in 2018. This project will:

- Create a more robust and attractive landscape for local people and for visiting tourists to enjoy with access to sites of wildlife and cultural interest.
- Reveal the archaeological and industrial heritage that has shaped the river valley landscape
- Restore characteristic river valley landscape features such as meandering river channels, water meadows and waterside trees
- Create new and improved wildlife habitats such as reed beds, wet pastures and woodland encouraging species such as bittern, osprey and waders on land formerly quarried for sand and gravel
- Improve accessibility on foot, cycle and horseback with new opportunities for recreation and sport.


Map 7.2 Central Rivers Initiative

### 7.4 Cycleways, Walkways and Bridleways.

Cycling and walking are critical in creating an integral and balanced transport network. As well as providing a healthy and sustainable mode of transport they also help to reduce pollution and congestion.

Two important cycle routes pass through the District:

- Cycle Route 5 - An 8 mile route connecting Lichfield to Chasewater via Burntwood.
- Cycle Route 54 - An 18 mile route connecting Lichfield north into Derbyshire via Fradley, Alrewas and Barton under Needwood.

The Lichfield District Council Integrated Transport Strategy 2011-2026 published by Staffordshire County Council places emphasises the promotion of sustainable links to encourage residents of the District to use alternative forms of transport.

Existing canals are important sustainable transport corridors however within Lichfield District there are no towpath cycle routes at present. Should this be considered it could provide links between settlements located along the canal routes.


Map 7.3 Cycle Network

### 7.5 Summary

### 7.5.1 Quantity

There are inherent difficulties in setting standards for green corridors, not least because of the variety of types and end users of these corridors. It is therefore recommended that no provision standard should be set. Corridors such as those described above are important for many reasons and whilst no quantitative standard is recommended good maintenance and management of routes is important. Green corridors are most likely to be demand-led and a result of the planning process. Developments need to be designed to integrate with the existing network and to take account of implications for biodiversity.

### 7.5.2 Quality

While it is inappropriate to measure the area of green corridors, quality is central to their use and value both as a recreational resource and also as a means of enhancing wildlife. Similarly to quantity standards, it is not considered appropriate to set a definitive quality standard due to the diversity of type and uses of green corridors together with the ownership and maintenance being in the hands of other organisations and private owners.

Whilst no quality standard is to be set it is envisaged that they should be clean and well managed and maintained based on the type of green corridor. Popular corridors regularly used by the public should be safe and accessible in particular those which link other areas of green infrastructure. Where appropriate additional infrastructure such as signage, bins, benches and lighting should be provided.

### 7.5.3 Accessibility

No accessibility standard will be set in relation to this typology given the varied nature of green corridors. Planning policy should aim to facilitate the delivery of an integrated network of high quality green corridors linking open spaces and communities together, providing opportunities for informal recreation and means of sustainable transport. Consideration should also be given to the provision of effective wildlife corridors, enabling the migration of species across the landscape.
It is important that routes are well maintained to ensure there are no obstructions which limit accessibility, such as the A38 preventing National Cycle Route 54 accessing the National Memorial Arboretum.

## 8．Urban Fringe

## 8．1 Definition

Urban fringes are areas of countryside around towns which can be a valuable resource for sport and recreation．Local authorities should encourage the creation of sports and recreational facilities in such areas．

## 8．2 Lichfield Recreation Zones

 ）：是展至

## Lichfield City

Urban Fringe and Recreation Zones

|  | Half Hourly Bus Route | Forest of Mercia |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $=$ | National Cy cle Route | Beacon Park |
| $=$ | Links to National Cycle Network |  |
| $=$ | Lichfield District boundary |  |
| $=$ | Lichfield Canal restoration route |  |
| $\square$ | Public Rights of Way |  |
|  | Recreation Zones |  |



## Map 8.1 Lichfield City Urban Fringe

On the periphery of Lichfield there are a number of urban fringe spaces including three areas designated within the 1998 Lichfield Local Plan as recreation zones. Two of these areas have been developed for recreation and sport, namely the Northern and Eastern Recreation Grounds. The Western Recreation Zones currently remains as agricultural land, this has the benefit of extant planning permission for residential development. The future of this recreation zone will be considered through the Local Plan Allocation process.

The two functioning recreation zones around Lichfield City contain the following uses:

- Eastern Recreation Zone: Lichfield Rugby Club, Tennis Club, 9 and 18 hole golf course and driving range.
- Northern Recreation Zone: Lichfield Cricket and Hockey Club, and Lichfield Archery Club. Christian Fields Local Nature Reserve is also found within this zone.


### 8.3 Burntwood Recreation Zones

Three recreation zones have been designated around Burntwood in the Local Plan. Only the Hospital Road site has been developed for recreation, through the provision of facilities for football. Farewell Lane and Wharf Lane zones remain in agricultural use. The future designation of these recreation zones will be considered through the Local Plan Allocation document.

There remains a need to consider the relevance of recreation zone designations for the delivery of outdoor sport and recreation, either existing sites identified in the 1998 Local Plan or new/ additional sites. Several factors need to be considered including:

- Is there a need for further pitch and outdoor recreation provision?;
- Can they help deliver outdoor sport and recreation facilities where no specific designation exists?;
- Are the recreation zones in the best locations;
- Consideration in terms of planning policy - these uses are already acceptable within the countryside without the need for specific policies; and
- The recommendations of the Playing Pitch Strategy (2012).

The emphasis of the promotion of these urban fringe sites relates to the fact that they provide valuable and accessible (by foot, bike and public transport) open areas in sustainable locations for those living within adjacent urban areas and more importantly they can provide a valuable resource for sport and recreation particularly where there are limited opportunities in the urban areas themselves. Outdoor sports facilities are often a focal point of a local community, functioning as a recreational and amenity resource in addition to a formal sports facility.

However these designated zones in which sport and recreation uses have been located were all home to an existing sport/recreation use prior to designation. It is challenging to deliver sports/recreation facilities where the landowner or interested parties are pursuing different forms of development. The strategic locations for built development have been set out in the Local Plan Strategy with additional sites to be identified through the Local Plan Allocations process.

All of the recreation zones are located within the Green Belt. In terms of sport and recreation uses together with essential facilities are acceptable forms of development in the countryside and Green Belt. Potentially by supporting such uses in urban fringe locations accessible by public transport, on foot, bicycle and car and resisting other uses this may bring forward additional facilities.


Map 8.2 Burntwood Urban Fringe

### 8.4 Recommendations

Recreation zones are no longer considered to be an appropriate mechanism in delivering outdoor sport and recreation on the fringes of Lichfield and Burntwood. The Playing Pitch Strategy recognises the success of some of the existing recreation zones and can see the potential to deliver further or improved facilities particularly those that incorporate existing successful sports clubs and through co-location of such facilities. The recreation zones are located within the Green Belt where proposals for sport and recreation are considered to be appropriate development (provided they maintain the openness of the Green Belt.

Other smaller settlements may also have suitable sites for such development, with this in mind it is recommended that outside the strategic development locations as identified within the Local Plan Strategy, support for outdoor sport and recreation should be given on the fringes of settlements. A key consideration should be ease of access of the sites by foot, cycle, public transport and car.

## 9. Provision for Children and Young People

### 9.1 Definition

Areas specifically for children and young people to ensure that they have opportunities to interact with their peers and learn social and movement skills within their home environment.

This typology encompasses a vast range of provision, from small areas of green space with a single piece of equipment (similar to the typology of amenity greenspace) to large, multipurpose play areas. It considers equipped provision only.

Ideally a variety of good quality spaces/facilities should be well located in order to maximise access from within local communities.

The following table provides definitions for the different types of site which provide for children and young people and based on the National Playing Fields Association categories.

| Type of Play | Definition | Minimum Size |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Local Areas of Play <br> (LAP) | Sites designed specifically for younger <br> children (up to the age of around 6). | 100 sq m |
| Local Equipped <br> Areas of Play (LEAP) | Play areas which are designed for children <br> between 4 and 8 years old. | 400 sq m |
| Neighbourhood <br> Equipped Areas of <br> Play (NEAP) | Sites to serve older children. | 1000 sq m |
| Other Outdoor <br> Provision | This will catch any site which is not defined <br> above such as skateparks, stand along <br> MUGAs and bmx tracks. | 800 sq m |

The assessment of existing equipment will identify areas where there are deficiencies in the provision, quality and accessibility of play spaces and that standards are set where appropriate to assist in addressing these deficiencies. In addition it will set minimum requirements which should be specified when creating new play spaces.

It must be noted that although this section refers specifically to equipped play, the role of amenity greenspace must be recognised which when combined with equipped play can result in a larger open space offering a more varied play experience. It is also acknowledged that some play spaces contain more than one type of play and or open space. Where this is the case the play area has been included into the designation it closely matches.

### 9.2 Context

From the 2011 Census, within Lichfield District there were 16,419 children (16\%) 14 years old and younger. Of these $32 \%$ are 0-4 years, $19 \% 5-7$ years, $13 \% 8-9$ years and $35 \% 10-14$ years. This is a slight decrease from 2001 but is projected to rise by 2028 to 18,000. The number of 15-19 year olds was 5888 a fall of around 1000 since 2001.

Notwithstanding the provision of a variety of types of equipped play, it must be noted that children often play where there is space which does not necessarily contain formal equipment.

### 9.3 Survey Findings and Views of Users

In addition to residents and children who use spaces, information has been sought regarding local deficiencies in quality, quality and accessibility from Parish Councils, who have particular local knowledge of their individual areas. In the past residents' surveys were carried out as part of the Household Survey, Omnibus, Best Value Performance and the Place Survey with the Fit for the Future consultation of 2104 providing evidence that managing parks and open spaces was important to the respondents. Those aged 55 and above were more keen to stop managing development projects such as play areas than their younger counterparts.

A consistent theme of various surveys carried out over the years is the need for facilities for teenagers. The 2011 Citizens survey clearly demonstrated 54\% across the District felt that there was either 'nearly enough' or 'not enough' provision for young people and teenagers. The conclusions of the Play Strategy 2007-2012 although now out of date are still pertinent in that local play areas are very important to local communities, and whilst access to equipped play areas is desirable, access to larger more informal outdoor spaces is equally important enabling opportunities for a more varied and better quality of play experience.

In order to provide attractive equipped play spaces it is important that sites specifically aimed at children and young people contain elements which they consider contribute to the quality of play. Views from children were sought during the production of the Play Strategy along with other representations which have been used as the basis to set criteria against which to score the play value of equipped play spaces. A survey of the more physical elements of these sites has also been undertaken which in combination with the quality scoring provide an overall picture of each site.

The Local Plan Strategy 2008-2029 reinforces this position with its Open Space Standards in Policy HSC1, whereby all residents living within the District's settlements should be within $480 \mathrm{~m} / 10$ minutes' walk time of an equipped play facility.

### 9.4 Assessment of Quantity

There are a total of 66 equipped play spaces throughout the District ranging in size from small play areas in rural villages to large areas with numerous facilities such as Beacon Park. Due to the classification of play areas, there may be more than one type on each open space. In total there is approximately 12.7 ha of equipped play space within the District. The accuracy of measuring the size of equipped play areas is not straightforward as the boundaries of some sites are not clearly defined, this is especially the case where the sites can be categorised as 'natural play' or when the range of equipment is spread across a larger greenspace.

It is possible for smaller sites to score highly where there is a variety of good quality equipment set in a well-designed and maintained environment which is conducive to physical and imaginative play.

In the past assessment of quantity has had regard to a variety of published sources including the NPFA 'Six Acre Standard' (2001) using Locally Equipped Areas for Play (LEAPs) and Neighbourhood Equipped Areas for Play (NEAPs).

The NPFA has now produced 'Beyond the Six Acre Standard (2015) and provides a useful starting point when considering the standards. The standard for equipped children's play space being 0.25 ha per 1000 population. Lichfield District does not reach this standard with concern expressed regarding the lack of provision is some of the rural villages and within the urban areas of Lichfield and Burntwood. As previously noted surveys have consistently highlighted the need for additional facilities for teenagers.

Working to the standard of 0.25 ha per 1000 population, the District should have 25.5 ha of equipped children's play space. Lichfield currently has 0.126 ha per 1000 population, virtually half of the amount recommended by the NPFA. However from survey work, the general consensus of feedback is that there is sufficient children's play space although there are issues surrounding the accessibility of certain play spaces in Lichfield and Burntwood.

The traditional square metre per head of population is a generalist approach and is not considered to be the best in delivering the right amount of equipped space in the right locations as it does not reflect local circumstances or aspirations. It is considered that a more appropriate way forward is to deliver those aspects that children consider important namely play value and physical quality. This moves the focus away from a purely 'equipped play area of a particular size which could potentially offer a poor quality of experience to a more flexible approach which can allow equipped play areas of a range of sizes where the focus is high quality play. This together with providing emphasis on accessible play spaces within a $480 \mathrm{~m} / 10$ minute walk time would deliver a better end result.

An approach that focuses on ensuring that sufficient spaces are delivered in the most appropriate locations to maximise accessibility is preferred. In addition, applying the qualitative standards in conjunction with local community involvement it is envisaged would lead to better equipped play space provision and this could enable some equipped play spaces to be set within or adjacent to less formal amenity greenspaces which allow for non equipped play.

### 9.5 Assessment of Quality

The quality of play spaces is dependent on a number of factors including the layout, design, surfacing, planting, type and amount of play equipment, degree and perception of safety, management, maintenance and the local environment. These all contribute to the play value users place on spaces. To this end two separate qualitative surveys have been undertaken, one relating to more physical appearance, presence of street furniture and maintenance and the second relating to play value from a user's perspective. Together, surveys undertaken of existing equipped areas will assist in establishing a qualitative standard for equipped play areas. In addressing quality two factors were assessed: play value; and physical quality.

### 9.5.1 Quality - Play Value

In terms of scoring 'play,' seven themes were identified to be assessed through the Open Space Assessment 2012 (listed below). These themes were derived through combining local knowledge from individuals, groups and other organisations involved in the provision and design of equipped play areas (often involving consultation with local communities), the District Councils Play Leaders involved in community play schemes and, importantly, the views of local children. The seven themes which effect the qualities of 'playability' have been used to give a percentage score to existing equipped play sites. These are:

- Degree to which the site is overlooked: there is the perception of safety from a child's point of view from having a play location that is near to and clearly visible from residential or other properties such as community buildings, even regularly used footpaths or from passing traffic on low speed residential streets. Conversely from a parent/guardian point of view the more visible and less isolated the play site the more likely they are to let children play;
- Degree to which the site is inclusive: this includes elements such as whether the site is open/accessible during daylight hours, whether movement within the site is not hampered by poor surfaces particularly for push chairs and wheelchair users, whether there is sufficient seating both formal and informal (informal includes boulders, grass mounds etc.);
- Proximity to other services/facilities: potential to encourage opportunities to visit play areas en route to other destinations such as shops, community buildings, schools and other leisure uses;
- Catchment: amount of residential coverage that falls within a $480 \mathrm{~m} / 10$ minute walk time buffer of an equipped play area;
- Accessibility: whether there are any physical barriers which impede safe access, such as busy roads with fast traffic speeds and/or no safe crossing points, railways, lack of footpaths radiating from equipped play areas to surrounding residential areas;
- Play Value Children's Criteria: (must have at least 5 to score 100\%)

1. somewhere for running and walking;
2. opportunities to play ball games such as football/cricket;
3. Hard surface to play basketball, cycle, roller skate/skateboard;
4. somewhere to sit and 'hang out;'
5. older children ( $8+$ ) - risky play -climbing, jumping from high up, swinging high, balancing, dens;
6. younger children-swings and slides;
7. natural features - grass, trees, flowers;
8. looked after properly, bins for rubbish that are regularly emptied; and

- Equipment: good quality play equipment that it is full working order.

Also highlighted in the Play Strategy in relation to quality is the concept of 'risk'. Play providers often feel that health and safety considerations are more important than the needs and aspirations of children and young people. It is the job of play providers to look at and manage the level of risk so that children and young people can be given the chance to challenge themselves and test and develop their abilities.

In addition there is a need to consider whether play encompasses 'inclusive play', in terms of meeting the needs of children of differing physical and intellectual abilities.

These qualitative elements within equipped children's play sites have been scored by percentages, with a total score being derived for each site.

Whilst 'on site' surveys have been used to assess existing equipped play areas, the individual criteria and elements scored are also useful when considering new schemes where new equipped play areas are being provided as well as improvements to existing sites. In addition sites will need to be monitored on a regular basis as some of the 'Play Value' elements assessed may change from year to year (assessment carried out 2016).

### 9.5.1 Quality - Physical Elements

A detailed assessment of quality has been carried out of all equipped play and children's open play spaces and their quality has been scored against set criteria, the result for individual sites and the detailed assessment form are set out within the Appendices. This qualitative assessment involved scoring particular elements of equipped play spaces, including:

- Quality of boundaries;
- Surfacing and maintenance;
- Provision of furniture such as bins, seating;
- Interpretation and information points, toilets on or near to site;
- Availability of parking and street lighting; and
- Cleanliness.

Physical elements of the quality scoring uses the same scoring criteria used for Amenity Green Spaces. It is felt that this will combine with the play value score to provide a detailed assessment of the quality of the District's play areas. Each site is given a maximum score which the site could achieve. This allows a final percentage to be calculated and provides an indication of the potential for improvements at sites.

Whilst there is no particular emphasis in terms of individual elements and order of importance, some may have a more direct and obvious impact and influence on perceived quality of an equipped playspace, such as the presence and quality of seating, grassed areas, paths and bins etc. Maintenance also influences quality and enjoyment of equipped playspaces. It is considered that maintenance of sites is reflected in these scores but it is also important to remember that the surveys are a snapshot in time and may not necessarily reflect the maintenance regime or timetable of works. It is also important to note that seasonal changes can also affect the overall appearance and thus quality scores.

It is envisaged that, in terms of the overall physical elements, the District Council needs to aspire to serve the needs of the District and to ensure quality and safety are maintained a regular monitoring system will help to assess the condition of equipped play sites.

### 9.6 Improvements to Equipped Play Areas

A number of specific spaces have been targeted for a variety of improvements over recent years by the District Council including sites associated with residential development. Sites
improved include; Stowe Croft, Lichfield; Laurel House, Fazeley; Shropshire Brook Road and Millmoor Road, Armitage; and Burntwood Leisure Centre with new facilities associated with new development being provided at Hawksyard, Armitage.

### 9.7 Accessibility

Accessibility to open spaces used for play by children and young people is particularly important, influencing the amount of use these spaces receive. Along with design, accessibility can influence the perception of whether play areas are safe. Irrespective of its quality, a poorly located playspace may not be used to its full potential if children cannot, or are not allowed, to play there.

The degree to which a site is accessible is not only influenced by its location but can be affected by the availability of pedestrian safe routes and physical barriers which in turn impact on the distances which can be travelled/time taken. Ideally play spaces aimed at very young children need to be within a short walking distance of their home, however, it is most likely that they would be accompanied by an adult. It is reasonable to assume that play areas aimed at older children and teenagers can involve longer walking distances, often without adult supervision. Ideally, the best solution would be to ensure that residents are able to safely and conveniently access equipped playspaces within a reasonable distance of their home

When looking at accessibility, and in applying the NPFA standards LAPs ( 100 m ), LEAPs ( 400 m ) and NEAPs ( 1000 m ) and Other Play Spaces (skateparks, MUGAs) 700 m , the Map 9.1 shows the extent of coverage of the District's play areas (shown in more detail for Lichfield, Burntwood and Key Rural Settlements later on within the relevant sections).

### 9.8 Funding

For larger developments, the provision of onsite play spaces will be funded through legal agreements to make the development acceptable in planning terms. Offsite provision and the improvement of existing spaces will be funded through the Community Infrastructure Levy.


Map 9.1 Children's Equipped Play categorised by NPFA Buffers


Map 9.2 Equipped Play with $480 \mathrm{~m} / 10$ minute walk time buffer
In the Lichfield District Local Plan Strategy 2008-2029, accessibility of equipped play spaces is set at $480 \mathrm{~m} / 10$ minutes' walk time. This has been derived from consideration of both national standards and survey responses by residents. Most equipped play spaces within the smaller rural settlements can be accessed within a 10 minutes' walk time.

In summary and shown on Map 9.2, whilst not all areas have access to existing play spaces ( $480 \mathrm{~m} / 10$ minute walk time), Lichfield City has a greater coverage than Burntwood. Within the key rural settlements (Armitage with Handsacre, Alrewas, Fradley, Fazeley, Shenstone
and Whittington), Map 9.2 shows not all areas are within a 480 m buffer of equipped play space.

Due to a number of variables including the form and scale of smaller rural settlements it is inappropriate to apply the $80 \mathrm{~m} / 10$ minute walk time buffer. Alternatively play provision is best tailored to the individual requirements of each settlement. Many existing play areas within rural settlements are the responsibility of the Parish Councils and as such, any future provision should include consultation with the Parish Councils and local communities. With this in mind it should be noted that the Play Strategy recommended that all rural settlements should have at least one children's play area.

### 9.9 Lichfield City

### 9.9.1 Quantity

Within Lichfield City recent improvement schemes and new sites have increased the total amount of equipped play space. In 2012 there were 19 equipped play spaces on 15 sites totalling 4 ha. The increase from 2012 can be accounted for through the delivery of a new skatepark at Beacon Park, and a linear play space at Stowe Croft.

As noted earlier, some equipped play spaces are not easily defined with equipment sited within a much larger open space and differing types of play on the same site. Table 9.1 shows the best fit.

As previously stated, the question of relating quantity solely in relation of square metres per 1000 population may not lead to the best results in terms of provision. A large play space in one area may not be readily accessible to a large proportion of residents and therefore a mixture of play spaces spread across the wider area is preferable. In Lichfield the play areas vary considerably in size, however it does not always equate that a small site provides a poorer quality play experience. The size of play spaces should be based on the need to provide good quality play value and through community involvement.

## Lichfield City Equipped Play Quantity Recommendation

In terms of quantity, measures to improve existing sites should continue alongside exploring opportunities for additional sites within those areas with no access to an existing site within $480 \mathrm{~m} / 10$ minute walk time.

### 9.9.2 Quality

The overall quality of play spaces within Lichfield City is good with a number of sites having benefitted from improvements in recent years. There is a wide range of sites which on the whole offer a good range of play sites which on the whole offer a good range of play opportunities from formal to natural play.

Play Value: The sites which scored lowest with regard to play value are Darnford Park and Beech Gardens. Darnford Park has old and outdated play equipment although well maintained, and would benefit from redesign and replacement. The low score also stems from its location on the edge of the settlement. Beech Gardens is a small play area and situated within an area of open space in the centre of a residential crescent. Although scoring relatively well due to its location and other facilities available, as these facilities are at a
community centre, David Garrick Gardens would also benefit from the provision of additional play equipment.

Physical Quality: The standards vary considerably from $38 \%$ and $39 \%$ for Darnford Park and Beech Gardens respectively to $96 \%$ for Beacon Park. Darnford Park suffers from being on the edge of the settlement and therefore its catchment is limited and although well maintained, the equipment is old and in need of replacement. Beech Gardens is a small local play area in greenspace within a residential crescent which therefore has limited capacity for expansion. At the other end of the spectrum, Beacon Park is a large flagship site for the District, having attained a GreenFlag for the past 6 years and has a large regional catchment.

Table 9.1 Lichfield City Equipped Play.

|  |  |  | Play Value |  | Physical Score |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Location | Type | Area <br> (ha) | Score | Est <br> Max <br> Score |  | Comments |
| Darnford Park | LEAP | 0.02 | 440 | 550 | $\begin{aligned} & 38 \% \\ & 18 / 47 \end{aligned}$ | Play area is old and is need of replacement. |
| David Garrick Gardens | LEAP | 0.03 | 710 | 750 | $\begin{aligned} & 53 \% \\ & 30 / 57 \end{aligned}$ | Well maintained and well used. Large space with potential for more equipment for older children |
| Curborough | NEAP | 0.08 |  |  |  |  |
| Saddlers Wood Park | LEAP | 0.68 | 630 | 710 | $\begin{aligned} & 41 \% \\ & 18 / 44 \end{aligned}$ | Improve footpaths for comfort to wheeled users. Lack of seating and bins around the MUGA. A crossing over Roman Way would improve the site's accessibility. |
| Heather Close | Other | 0.03 | 590 | 730 | $\begin{aligned} & 57 \% \\ & 25 / 44 \end{aligned}$ | Potential for adjacent green space to have some equipped play |
| Oakenfield / James Greenway | LAP | 0.14 | 740 | 800 | $\begin{aligned} & 43 \% \\ & 20 / 47 \end{aligned}$ | Despite small site play equipment to suit all ages. Equipment in need of refurbishment. |
| Thomas Greenway | Other | 0.04 |  |  |  |  |
| Stowe Field | NEAP | 0.07 | 510 | 760 | $\begin{aligned} & 42 \% \\ & 20 / 47 \end{aligned}$ | Equipment old and in need of replacement. Potential to improve access and play opportunities within the wider greenspace. |
| Stowe Field | LEAP | 0.03 |  |  |  |  |
| Beech Gardens | LEAP | 0.03 | 615 | 750 | $\begin{aligned} & 39 \% \\ & 13 / 33 \end{aligned}$ | Good condition however offers little play opportunity. Potential for additional equipment. |
| Stychbrook Park | NEAP | 0.06 | 520 | 580 | $\begin{aligned} & 57 \% \\ & 27 / 47 \end{aligned}$ | Excellent condition. Potential to increase further play opportunities within the wider green space. |
| Shortbutts Park | NEAP | 0.67 | 800 | 800 | $\begin{aligned} & 71 \% \\ & 37 / 52 \end{aligned}$ | Range of play opportunities for all ages. Excellent site with good maintenance. |
| Stowe Croft Linear Play | NEAP | 0.14 | 760 | 760 | $\begin{aligned} & 53 \% \\ & 25 / 47 \end{aligned}$ | Well located and provides natural play opportunities. Limited variety within the site. |


| City Wharf | LAP | 0.04 | 700 | 700 | $\begin{aligned} & 57 \% \\ & 27 / 47 \end{aligned}$ | Site is good quality but small so limited in its potential to offer further play opportunities. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Beacon Park Skate Park | Other | 0.22 | 740 | 740 | $\begin{aligned} & 96 \% \\ & 55 / 57 \end{aligned}$ | Excellent park which offers a wide variety of play opportunities |
| Beacon Park | NEAP | 1.06 |  |  |  |  |
| Sante Foy Av Darwin Park | Other | 0.44 | 590 | 690 | $\begin{aligned} & 63 \% \\ & 28 / 44 \end{aligned}$ | Excellent facility to the area, particularly for older children. Would benefit from seating. |
| Lightwood Rd, Darwin Park | LEAP | 0.28 | 790 | 800 | $\begin{aligned} & 74 \% \\ & 35 / 47 \end{aligned}$ | Excellent site for younger children. |
| Burton Road, Streethay | LEAP | 0.29 | 465 | 540 | $\begin{aligned} & 55 \% \\ & 24 / 44 \end{aligned}$ | Important facility to the residents of Streethay. Good range of equipment for a small site. Potential to improve the visibility into site by reducing the hedge height. |
|  |  | Good site |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Good site but could be improved |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Site needs improving |  |  |  |  |

## Lichfield City Equipped Play Quality Recommendation

The District Council aims to encourage the provision of good quality equipped play sites. Sites should seek to achieve their maximum potential score for both play value and physical quality, with an aim of reaching a minimum $50 \%$ score for physical quality.


Map 9.3 Lichfield City Equipped Play with $480 \mathrm{~m} / 10$ minute walk time buffer

### 9.9.3 Accessibility

Accessibility to equipped play areas in Lichfield City is shown on Map 9.3 and demonstrates that there are areas of the City most notably in the north east and south that are not within $480 \mathrm{~m} / 10$ minute walk time of an equipped play area. There are also other areas which are unable to reach a play area within this timeframe due to physical barriers such as railway lines and busy roads with no safe crossing points. In those areas where there is no access or restricted access to play space, consideration should be given to the provision of new facilities or making access easier to existing spaces.

It is noted that Beacon Park acts as a destination equipped play space serving a much wider area beyond the City itself and where distances travelled are far in excess of the $480 \mathrm{~m} / 10$ minute walk time assumed for other play spaces.

## Lichfield City Equipped Play Accessibility Recommendation

Where possible opportunities should be sought to create new play spaces where development opportunities arise, particularly in areas not within $480 \mathrm{~m} / 10$ minute walk time buffer. Given the existing built form and limited opportunities for new sites arising in these areas consideration should be given to provide equipment on other suitable greenspaces.

### 9.10 Burntwood

### 9.10.1 Quantity

Within Burntwood there are seven areas of equipped play space (including a site at Chasewater) totalling 0.57 ha . This is about a third of the number of sites within Lichfield City and $a 7^{\text {th }}$ of the area despite having a similar population. The site at Chasewater is set apart from the main town and is considered a destination play area specifically for users visiting Chasewater and not within $480 \mathrm{~m} / 10$ minute walk time of Burntwood residents. There has however been a number of improvements and additions to Burntwood play facilities over last few years, including the provision of Parkour equipment at the Youth Centre next to the Burntwood Leisure Centre.

As demonstrated by Map 9.4, there are in fact large areas of Burntwood which do not have access to play spaces within $480 \mathrm{~m} / 10$ minute walk time from home. The majority of the play facilities are found to the north of the settlement with only the Leisure Centre/youth Centre provision to the south. The play facilities on site are limited for younger children with better availability of play experience via the skatepark and parkour for older age groups.

Whilst sites should not necessarily be measured in terms of square metres per head of population it is important that there are a sufficient number of sites available and accessible to local communities. A priority in Burntwood therefore is to increase the number and variety of equipped play spaces within those areas with no access to an existing site within $480 \mathrm{~m} / 10$ minute walk time, particularly in the southern part of the settlement. Burntwood Neighbourhood Plan currently in an early stage of development recognises the need for play spaces within new residential development.

## Burntwood Equipped Play Quantity Recommendation

The size of new play spaces should be derived from the need to provide good quality sites and through community involvement. Additional play spaces are required to address the shortage of equipped play spaces in Burntwood and ideally located within those areas with no access within the $480 \mathrm{~m} / 10$ minute walk time buffer. Consideration should be given to facilities for all age groups. Opportunities for new sites should be explored including consideration of the potential for co-locating with other amenity greenspace where appropriate.

### 9.10.2 Quality

Table 9.2 Burntwood Equipped Play.

| Location | Type | Area <br> (ha) | Play Value |  | Physical Score | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Score | Est <br> Max <br> Score |  |  |
| Redwood Park | LEAP | 0.10 | 710 | 770 | $\begin{aligned} & 40 \% \\ & (19 / 47) \end{aligned}$ | Good site, providing a range of equipment, for a range of ages. Overall setting could be enhanced. |
| Chase Terrace Park | LEAP | 0.03 | 735 | 735 | $\begin{aligned} & 47 \% \\ & (22 / 47) \end{aligned}$ | Excellent site - provides play opportunities for range of ages. Potential to increase natural play and informal seating. |
| Chase Terrace Park | Other | 0.03 |  |  |  |  |
| Youth Centre Skatepark | Other | 0.17 | 740 | 770 | $\begin{aligned} & 40 \% \\ & (19 / 47) \end{aligned}$ | Good site offering facilities for older children and teenagers. |
| Youth Centre Parkour | Other | 0.09 |  |  |  |  |
| Chasewater | LEAP | 0.06 | 320 | 320 | $\begin{aligned} & 70 \% \\ & (40 / 57) \end{aligned}$ | This site scores well, however due to its location certain aspects are limited (e.g. catchment). |
| Burntwood Leisure Centre | LEAP | 0.02 | 660 | 800 | $\begin{aligned} & 75 \% \\ & (43 / 57) \end{aligned}$ | Children's play area is small given the size of the leisure centre site. Potential to fence play area. |
| Burntwood Park | LEAP | 0.07 | 645 | 700 | $\begin{aligned} & 39 \% \\ & (22 / 57) \end{aligned}$ | Somewhat hidden from view which may affect perceptions of safety. Lack of footpath through site. |


|  | Good site |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | Good site but could be improved |
|  | Site needs improving |

Play Value: Within Burntwood itself the play value at Chase Terrace Park, Chasewater and the Youth Centre for older children is good. Opportunities to improve existing sites should be explored given the lack of sites throughout the town.

As shown in Table 9.2 there are opportunities to improve the play quality and setting of a number of sites, most notably Burntwood Park which whilst it is within a residential area suffers from old equipment, and is relatively isolated being in the centre of the park which can contribute to poor perceptions of safety.

Physical Quality: All sites score well for cleanliness, with the lower scoring sites generally due to issues relating to boundaries and pathways. The physical quality scores are comparable
with those from Lichfield City. One of the two higher scoring sites, namely Chasewater is outside Burntwood conurbation itself and serves those using the Country Park as opposed to residents local to the site.

## Burntwood Equipped Play Quality Recommendation

The District Council aims to encourage the provision of good quality equipped play sites. Sites should seek to achieve their maximum potential score for both play value and physical quality, with an aim of reaching a minimum $50 \%$ score for physical quality

Qualitative improvements are needed to improve the physical and play value of certain sites as identified in Table 9.2.

### 9.10.3 Accessibility

In applying the $480 \mathrm{~m} / 10$ minute walk time and factoring that there are only 5 equipped sites within Burntwood itself, this is a third of the amount available in Lichfield City and around a $7^{\text {th }}$ of the area available. The proportion of the settlement having access to a play space within $480 \mathrm{~m} / 10$ minute walk time is also low.

Large densely developed residential areas in the east and a ribbon from north to south of Burntwood have no access to an equipped play space. Within the southern half of the settlement only the Leisure Centre and neighbouring Youth Centre provide play opportunities, with a large play area within Hammerwich Parish also helping to provide some coverage.

## Burntwood Equipped Play Accessibility Recommendation

There are too few equipped play space locations within Burntwood, resulting in a substantial percentage of the settlement lying outside $480 \mathrm{~m} / 10$ minute walk time to an equipped play space. Opportunities to create new play spaces should be sought where development opportunities arise particularly in area where there is no access within $480 \mathrm{~m} / 10$ minute walk time.


Map 9.4 Burntwood Equipped Play with $480 \mathrm{~m} / 10$ minute walk time buffer

### 9.11 Rural Areas

The rural areas of Lichfield District are home to a number of settlements ranging in size and function and the provision of equipped play also varies across the settlements. The Local Plan Strategy identifies Key Rural Settlements, which are the focus of growth within the rural areas, with other settlements considered to be smaller 'other' rural settlements. The Key Rural Settlements are: Alrewas, Armitage with Handsacre, Fradley, Fazeley, Shenstone and Whittington.

Whilst most settlements have at least one equipped play space, there are settlements with no provision. It may be the case that some of the smaller rural settlements due to their demographics or physical size have little or no demand. Settlements with no provision include Hamstall Ridware, Longdon, Upper Longdon, Hints, Canwell, Chorley and Wall. In consultation with Parish Council's Wall and Canwell have confirmed no provision is required however Shenstone Woodend has been highlighted as having an identified need for children's play. These situations are fluid and this may change in the future which highlights the need to liaise with Parish Council's and the local community.

Table 9.3 Key Rural Settlements Equipped Play.

|  |  |  |  | Play Value |  | Physical Score |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Key Rural | Name | Type | Area (ha) | Score | Est <br> Max <br> Score |  | Comments |
| Alrewas | Chaseview <br> Road | LEAP | 0.07 | 620 | 630 | $\begin{aligned} & 73 \% \\ & (29 / 40) \end{aligned}$ | Well maintained. Provides a range of play facilities but only for part of the village due to its edge of settlement location. Explore potential for another play area in the east of village |
| Armitage with Handsacre | Village Hall, Shropshire Brook Road | Other <br> LEAP | 0.14 0.08 | 670 | 800 | $\begin{aligned} & 66 \% \\ & (31 / 47) \end{aligned}$ | Recently improved but scope to extend site further. Lack of bins and seating. |
| Armitage with Handsacre | Upper Lodge <br> Road | LAP | 0.02 | 310 | 710 | $\begin{aligned} & 48 \% \\ & (20 / 42) \end{aligned}$ | Site is in very poor condition, appears unused and not maintained. |
| Armitage <br> with <br> Handsacre | St Barbara's <br> Road | Other <br> LEAP | 0.18 0.07 | 700 | 800 | $\begin{aligned} & 65 \% \\ & (26 / 40) \end{aligned}$ | Good site. Needs seating. |
| Armitage with Handsacre | Hawksyard | LEAP | 0.12 | 700 | 700 | $\begin{aligned} & 83 \% \\ & (33 / 40) \end{aligned}$ | New site which provides great play opportunities for the new housing estate. |
| Armitage <br> with <br> Handsacre | Millmoor Avenue | LEAP | 0.09 | 640 | 720 | $\begin{aligned} & 64 \% \\ & (27 / 42) \end{aligned}$ | Good condition offering good play value. potential to increase the size of this play area |
| Fazeley | Laurel House | LEAP | 0.41 | 590 | 740 | $\begin{aligned} & 73 \% \\ & (27 / 37) \end{aligned}$ | New play area. Well maintained. Appearance that it is within a gated settlement. |
| Fazeley | Victory <br> Terrace (Off <br> Tamworth Road) | LAP | 0.08 | 630 | 710 | $\begin{aligned} & 40 \% \\ & (16 / 40) \end{aligned}$ | Poor site hidden behind adjacent flats and separated from the wider residential area. Equipment is in poor repair and need of replacing. |
| Fazeley | Mile Oak Recreation Ground | NEAP <br> Other <br> Other | 0.17 0.11 0.04 | 570 | 680 | $\begin{aligned} & 62 \% \\ & (32 / 52) \end{aligned}$ | Well located close to other facilities and serves a significant residential area. Much of play equipment broken and maintenance poor, with uneven ground, long grass and no footpath. MUGA and BMX track are in excellent condition. |


| Fradley | Worthington <br> Road | NEAP | 0.71 | 670 | 720 | $93 \%$ <br> $(39 / 42)$ | Excellent site in very good <br> condition. Potential to reduce <br> hedgerow in the centre of the site <br> to increase visibility. |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Fradley | Hay End <br> Lane | Other | 0.18 | 610 | 650 | $60 \%$ <br> $(27 / 45)$ | Good quality site which provides a <br> different type of recreation. <br> Potential to introduce other types <br> of play and benches/bins. |
| Whittington | Jubilee Park | Other | 0.78 | 550 | 550 | $95 \%$ <br> $(42 / 44)$ | An excellent site, which offers a <br> unique facility within the village, <br> and the District. Beautifully <br> maintained. |
| Whittington | Noddington <br> Lane | LAP | 0.15 | 630 | 700 | $60 \%$ <br> $(27 / 45)$ | Good site mainly targeted at small <br> children with court for older <br> children. Some maintenance <br> required. |
| Whittington | Swan Road | NEAP | 0.17 | 580 | 790 | $91 \%$ <br> $(40 / 44)$ | Very good play area offering play <br> opportunities to different ages. <br> The site is well maintained but on <br> the edge of the settlement. |
| Whittington | Football <br> Ground | NEAP | 0.05 | 470 | 600 |  |  |


|  | Good site |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | Good site but could be improved |
|  | Site needs improving |

### 9.11.1 Quantity

It is expected that in these larger rural settlements, there is likely to be a requirement for more than one equipped play space. Typically due to their size and/or form, they need more than one play space to achieve full 480/10 minute walk time coverage. Key rural settlement shave the largest population with regard to rural settlements. Alrewas and Shenstone only have one equipped play space each, whereas at the other end of the scale Whittington has 4 and Armitage 5.

The Local Plan Strategy 2008-2029 recognises the inequality of play provision in key rural settlements and to this end has provided policies to address these issues:

| Policy | Wording |
| :--- | :--- |
| Shen2 | 'Provision of additional equipped play and amenity greenspace, space <br> for informal play and sport .... particularly in the southern part of <br> Shenstone'. |


| Faz 2 | 'Improvements to the range and quality of equipped play facilities will <br> be supported particularly around Bonehill and Deer Park and to the <br> south west of Mile Oak along Sutton Road'. |
| :--- | :--- |
| Arm2 | 'Initiatives to improve or provide new equipped play will be <br> supported, particularly relating to the areas around Upper Lodge <br> Road and Millmoor Avenue and including the relocation and <br> subsequent improvement of the Upper Lodge Road play area'. |
| Alr2 | 'Initiatives to improve the amount of equipped play spaces and <br> amenity green space in the village particularly to the north to increase <br> local accessibility will be supported where this does not conflict with <br> other policies in the Local Plan'. |

### 9.11.2 Quality

The quality of equipped play within the key settlements varies between sites and settlements. Those that scored highly in terms of play value and physical scores being the more recently installed sites such as Laurel House, Fazeley; Jubilee Park, Whittington; Hawksyard, Armitage and Worthington Road, Fradley. Additional improvements have also been undertaken to Millmoor Avenue and the Village Hall site in Armitage with Handsacre

There remain two sites as shown in Table 9.3 which are poor scoring sites in terms of both play value and physical condition namely Upper Lodge Road, Armitage and Victory Terrace, Fazeley.

In terms of maintenance this is key to creating and sustaining high quality sites. Problems in relation to physical quality are often easier to identify that play quality although it must be noted that one can affect the other.

## Key Rural Equipped Play Quality Recommendation

The District Council aims to encourage the provision of good quality equipped play sites. Sites should seek to achieve their maximum potential score for both play value and physical quality, with an aim of reaching a minimum $50 \%$ score for physical quality.

Qualitative improvements are needed to improve the physical and play value of certain sites as identified in Table 9.3.

### 9.11.3 Accessibility

All of the key rural settlements have areas which do not have access to equipped play spaces within $480 \mathrm{~m} / 10$ minute walk time however the extent of accessibility varies significantly with the most deprived being Alrewas and Shenstone.

## Key Rural Equipped Play Accessibility Recommendation

Opportunities to create new play spaces should be sought where development opportunities arise particularly in area where there is no access within $480 \mathrm{~m} / 10$ minute walk time.

### 9.11.4 Settlement Summaries

## Alrewas



Map 9.5 Alrewas Equipped Play with $480 \mathrm{~m} / 10$ minute walk time buffer
Around $50 \%$ of Alrewas is outside the walk time buffer as the play space is found on the south western edge of the settlement.

## Alrewas Play Recommendation

Opportunities to locate an additional equipped play area within the eastern or north eastern half of the settlement should be considered. This may need to include the need to explore the co-location of existing amenity greenspace.

## Armitage with Handsacre



Map 9.6 Armitage with Handsacre Equipped Play with $480 \mathrm{~m} / 10$ minute walk time buffer
There are five equipped play spaces located within Armitage with Handsacre including the play space on the Hawksyard development which does not form part of the main village of Armitage with Handsacre. The smallest play space is at Upper Lodge Road at 0.02ha, it also poor in terms of both play value and physical quality. Consideration needs to be given to its future and this is highlighted in Policy Arm 2 of the Local Plan Strategy (see 9.11.1). Both Millmoor Avenue and the Village Hall play areas have been improved since the 2012 Open Space Assessment.

## Armitage with Handsacre Play Recommendation

There is a need to consider the future of the Upper Lodge Road play space. It is also necessary to explore opportunities for additional play in the south east of the settlement which currently does not have access to a play space within $480 \mathrm{~m} / 10$ minute walk time.

## Fazeley, Mile Oak and Bonehill



Map 9.7 Fazeley, Mile Oak and Bonehill Equipped Play with $480 \mathrm{~m} / 10$ minute walk time buffer

There are three equipped play areas within Fazeley, Mile Oak and Bonehill. However due to the linear nature of the settlement this does not provide complete accessibility to play spaces for all areas of the settlement. Map 9.7 shows that an area in the centre of the
settlement which is area of higher density residential development space and the ribbon development along the A453 do not have access to a play space.

The site at Mile Oak Recreation Ground scores relatively well, however it is the facilities for older children which are in good repair with the children's play area having broken equipment and being poorly maintained. The play area to the rear of Victory Terrace is also in poor condition and is poorly located.

## Fazeley, Mile Oak and Bonehill Play Recommendation

Improvements re required in terms of both quantity and quality, particularly to those existing sites which score poorly. A play area is required to address deficiencies in both the centre (Deer Park Road and Bonehill) and south west of the settlement.

## Fradley

New development in Fradley over the previous years has lead to the creation of two new play areas at Hay End Lane and Worthington Road which provide opportunities for age appropriate play. Both score highly in terms of play value and physical quality. Fradley has two main centres split by the canal. Worthington Road provides full coverage for the southern part of the settlement with Hay End Lane providing some coverage for the northern part of the settlement. However this is a MUGA and skatepark, unsuitable for smaller children. As such there is no age appropriate play space in the northern part of Fradley for younger children. Added to this as shown on Map 9.8 there is the issue of the canal providing a barrier to accessing the Worthington Road play space.

It should be noted that the Fradley Strategic Development Allocation concept statement requires the provision of appropriate open space, including equipped play areas to be provided as part of the development.

## Fradley Play Recommendation

The provision of an additional equipped play space for younger children should be considered in the north of Fradley.


Map 9.8 Fradley Equipped Play with $480 \mathrm{~m} / 10$ minute walk time buffer

## Shenstone

There is only one equipped play space within Shenstone, located on the east of the Recreation Ground. This is a small play space considering the size of the settlement. It is also located to the north eats of the settlement as such a large area of southern Shenstone does not have access to a play space within $480 \mathrm{~m} / 10$ minute walk time.

There is very little amenity greenspace within southern Shenstone which combined with the lack of equipped play shows there is little opportunity for play. The lack of amenity greenspace also reduces the opportunities for the provision of new play facilities.

Shenstone Play Recommendation
Opportunities for the provision of additional equipped play in the southern half of Shenstone should be explored along with consideration of further possibilities to increase the play value of the existing play at the Recreation Grounds.


Map 9.9 Shenstone Equipped Play with $480 \mathrm{~m} / 10$ minute walk time buffer

## Whittington

There are four play spaces within Whittington with coverage of the majority of the settlement. The quality of the play on the Football/Cricket Ground is poor however the remaining three play spaces, two of which are new, provide a varied and high quality play provision.


Map 9.10 Whittington Equipped Play with $480 \mathrm{~m} / 10$ minute walk time buffer

## Whittington Play Recommendation

Reconsideration of the provision at the cricket/football ground is required. Explore opportunities to provide an additional play space to serve the far west of the village.

### 9.12 Other Smaller Rural Settlements

In most cases equipped play spaces within rural settlements are owned and managed by the local Parish Council. Many improvements to such spaces have been the result of local community involvement alongside the work of the Parish Councils. This approach is supported as it allows changes to be made at local level to reflect local needs.

### 9.12.1 Quality

Table 9.4 Smaller Rural Settlements Equipped Play.

|  |  |  |  | Play Value |  | Physical Score |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Key Rural | Name | Type | Area (ha) | Score | Est Max Score |  | Comments |
| Clifton Campville | Millennium Green | NEAP | 0.06 | 77\% | 580 | 640 | Good green space which is excellently maintained. Equipped play element limited but potential to extend. |
| Colton | Village Hall, <br> Bellamour <br> Way | LEAP | 0.03 | 82\% | 620 | 670 | Caters mainly for younger children. Some equipment old and in need of replacement. Potential to increase play value through natural play. |
| Comberford | Millenium Green | LEAP | 0.11 | 85\% | 490 | 600 | Potential to improve this site by increasing the amount of equipment. |
| Drayton <br> Bassett | off Rectory Close | Other | 0.05 |  |  |  | Site which offers a good play value and is well located |
| Drayton Bassett | off Rectory Close | LAP | 0.12 | 75\% | 650 | 740 | within the settlement. MUGA and some equipment requires some maintenance. |
| Edingale | Moores Croft | LEAP | 0.02 |  |  |  | Well maintained site, offering play opportunities |
| Edingale | Moores Croft | Other | 0.01 | 73\% | 650 | 760 | for a range of ages. <br> Footpath through the site would make it more |
| Edingale | Adventure <br> Park | NEAP | 0.10 |  |  |  | accessible for wheeled users. |
| Elford | Brickhouse <br> Lane | LEAP | 0.08 | 67\% | 665 | 700 | Not ideally located within the settlement, however it provides an excellent facility to the village. Well maintained. |
| Gentleshaw | No equipped play areas |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hammerwich | Mansion Drive | NEAP | 0.06 | 76\% | 540 | 600 | Relaxed, quiet play area with wooden equipment providing mainly natural play. Well maintained. Potential to extend the play and provide seating. |
| Hammerwich | Hospital <br> Road | NEAP | 0.08 | 76\% | 625 | 800 | Site offers lots of play equipment for a range of ages, all equipment is in excellent condition. |
| Hamstall Ridware | No equipped play areas |  |  |  |  |  |  |

$\left.\left.\begin{array}{|l|l|l|l|l|l|l|l|}\hline \text { Harlaston } & \text { Manor Lane } & \text { LEAP } & 0.06 & 67 \% & 540 & 670 & \begin{array}{l}\text { Site could be significantly } \\ \text { improved though the } \\ \text { refurbishment of equipment } \\ \text { and the addition of seating. }\end{array} \\ \hline \text { Hill Ridware } & \begin{array}{l}\text { Uttoxeter } \\ \text { Road }\end{array} & \text { LEAP } & 0.04 & 66 \% & 740 & 760 & \begin{array}{l}\text { Good play opportunities to } \\ \text { village. Equipment in need } \\ \text { of refurbishment. }\end{array} \\ \hline \text { Hopwas } & \text { Nursey Lane } & \text { LEAP } & 0.08 & 67 \% & 580 & 640 & \begin{array}{l}\text { Well positioned site, well } \\ \text { maintained but majority of } \\ \text { the equipment is in need for } \\ \text { refurbishment. }\end{array} \\ \hline \text { Kings Bromley } & \text { Village Hall } & \text { LEAP } & 0.11 & 71 \% & 695 & 775 & \begin{array}{l}\text { A good site with equipment } \\ \text { in good condition. Small site } \\ \text { with limited potential to } \\ \text { further improve this site } \\ \text { with additional play }\end{array} \\ \text { equipment }\end{array}\right] \begin{array}{l}\text { Excellent site offering a } \\ \text { range of play opportunities. } \\ \text { Well maintained. Potential } \\ \text { to create an additional play } \\ \text { area located more centrally } \\ \text { within the settlement to }\end{array}\right]$

### 9.12.1 Quantity

The majority of the smaller rural settlements across the District have some form of equipped play space of varying sizes and type. In most instances this is a reflection of local circumstances and local community involvement. Some settlements have a dedicated play space whilst others have play equipment associated with green space and/or village halls.

There are a few settlements that have no equipped play spaces including:

- Hamstall Ridware;
- Gentleshaw;
- Longdon;
- Shenstone Wood End; and
- Upper Longdon.

Some settlements however have indicated that there is no demand for an equipped play space whilst other others such as Longdon, and Shenstone Wood End have expressed a need
for such space. The Longdon Parish Pre-submission neighbourhood plan includes a policy dedicated to the provision of a children's playground within the Parish.

Other Rural Equipped Play Quantity Recommendation
The Council should seek to encourage the provision of at least one equipped children's play space within each rural settlement.

### 9.12.2 Quality

The size of the play spaces within the rural settlements occupy varying sizes, from 0.03 in Colton to almost 3ha in Little Aston, however size is no necessarily a gauge for play value or quality. Some settlements have combined their play spaces with a wider recreational facility such as playing pitches, green space and MUGAs. Such settlements include Stonnall and Drayton Bassett.

## Other Rural Equipped Play Quality Recommendation

The District Council aims to encourage the provision of good quality equipped play sites. Sites should seek to achieve their maximum potential score for both play value and physical quality, with an aim of reaching a minimum $50 \%$ score for physical quality.

### 9.12.3 Accessibility

The following maps show the distribution of equipped play spaces across the rural district split by rural north, south and east. Together then show the District wide distribution of play provision as well as the proportion of each settlement covered by the $480 \mathrm{~m} / 10$ minute walk time buffer. Almost all of the settlements with play areas fall within the $480 \mathrm{~m} / 10$ minute walk time buffer, except small parts of Colton, Kings Bromley, Stonnall and Drayton Bassett.

The location of play spaces varies within rural settlements and as such the access routes to these facilities also varies and issues arise which are generally not found within larger settlements such as lack of pavements and crossings. Elford for example has in part, no pavements, and many rural settlements also rely on public footpaths to reach the play areas. Settlements with heavier traffic such as Kings Bromley and Hopwas tend to have pedestrian crossings. Accessibility to Little Aston play area is poor despite the good quality of the play area. However within Little Aston there is little prospect of a better located site coming forwards.

## Other Rural Equipped Accessibility Recommendation

Explore opportunities for the provision of safe pedestrian access to equipped play spaces whether creating more direct access routes from existing or new residential areas.


Map 9.11 Rural North Equipped Play with $480 \mathrm{~m} / 10$ minute walk time buffer


Map 9.12 Rural East Equipped Play with $480 \mathrm{~m} / 10$ minute walk time buffer


Map 9.13 Rural South Equipped Play with $480 \mathrm{~m} / 10$ minute walk time buffer

### 9.13 Conclusion

Ideally there should be sufficient good quality children's play spaces that are well located to maximise coverage of local communities, are accessible by safe pedestrian routes and that meet the play needs of children and young persons in the local community.

In delivering play spaces it is important that local communities including local children work with those involved in play provision to deliver equipped play spaces that reflect local requirements.

## 10. Civic Spaces

### 10.1 Introduction

Civic spaces are the formal areas of open space such as squares or promenades which create the setting for civic buildings such as town halls, and can be used as outdoor markets and public events. Civic spaces are normally provided on an opportunistic and urban design led basis and it is desirable therefore for planning authorities to promote urban design frameworks for town and city centre areas.

Research carried out by Commission for the Built Environment (CABE) showed that $85 \%$ of people surveyed felt that the quality of public space and the built environment has a direct impact on their lives and the way they feel. Having access to public space is not all that matters, just as important are the planning, design and management of these spaces. In 'Better Civic Buildings and Spaces' CABE also emphasises that the drive towards better civic buildings and spaces must be understood in the context of attempts to revitalise our towns and cities with good design being high on the agenda.

Many people visit the District's civic spaces however due to their location it is likely that they are visited as part of an associated trip, such as to visit the District's heritage assets, use the shops and services, eat out, socialise or take part in another leisure activity.

### 10.1.1 Quantity

The only identified civic spaces within the District are:

- Market Square outside St Mary's Church, Lichfield
- Part of Bore Street outside the Guildhall, Lichfield
- Garden of Remembrance, Lichfield
- Memorial Gardens, Minster Pool Walk, Lichfield
- Speakers Corner, Dam Street/Minster Pool Walk, Lichfield
- Cathedral Close, Lichfield
- Garrick Square, Lichfield
- Square fronting Fazeley Town Hall, Fazeley.

With the creation of the new Friarsgate development in Lichfield additional new civic space will be provided.

There are no civic spaces identified in Burntwood however support should be given to the creation of new civic spaces as part of the creation of an enlarged town centre should the opportunity arise.

It is noted that within many of the District's other settlements that village greens, village centres, war memorials and other key spaces within settlements play an important role in bringing communities together. The importance of such spaces should be recognised and local communities may wish to define their own civic spaces within community-led plans.


Map 10.1 Lichfield City Civic Spaces

### 10.1.2 Quality

The quality of civic spaces in Lichfield City have been greatly improved through a repaving scheme in the City Centre and a Heritage Lottery Fund/Big Lottery funded Historic Parks Project which refurbished Minster Pool Walk and the Garden of Remembrance. The square at Fazeley has also received improvement through Section 106 funding.

### 10.1.3 Accessibility

Due to the rural nature of Lichfield District, civic spaces are confined to Lichfield City Centre and Fazeley. It is notable that no civic spaces have been identified in Burntwood which is a town of similar size to Lichfield. Accessibility to civic spaces in Lichfield City is good with bus
and train stations in close proximity and limited traffic through the city centre enhanced through a paving scheme. Fazeley is also served well by bus routes between Tamworth and Birmingham and Tamworth Railway Station is accessible by bus.


Map 10.2 Fazeley City Civic Spaces

### 10.1.4 Standards

No specific standards are to be set with respect to civic spaces, however periodic reviews of existing spaces should be undertaken to ensure that they continue to be improved and maintained to a high standard. Opportunities to create new civic space in Burntwood through the creation of an enlarged town centre should be considered.

## 11. Allotments

### 11.1 Introduction

In 2010 the LGA and CLG published 'A Place to grow' which sets out that allotments are considered as valuable green spaces offering opportunities for local people to grow their own produce and that there are benefits in terms of health and well-being. Allotments can benefit the environment, provide valuable green spaces particularly within towns and cities as well as contributing to biodiversity by providing varied and valued habitat for animals and plants.

Rising housing densities and the consequential reduction in size of many gardens together with growing interest in organic food production has contributed to an increase in the popularity and demand from people to grow their own produce in allotments. It is expected that allotments will continue to be popular and demand will remain strong. Since the 2012 Open Space Assessment, there has been an increase in the number of allotments within the District from 17 in 2012 to 21 in 2016.

The allotments within Lichfield District are concentrated mainly in Lichfield City and Armitage with Handsacre. The majority of the provision is found in the northern half of the District. With growing awareness of allotments there has been recent interest by a number of Parish Councils' in considering providing allotments within their Parishes. The practical value of an allotment stems from the direct benefits provided by access to affordable, fresh vegetables, physical exercise, fresh air and social activity.

### 11.2 Supply and Demand

Most allotments are well established and historically provided and managed by Parish Councils or the Local Authority. Allotments is Lichfield City are leased by Lichfield City Council to the Lichfield and District Allotment Society, and demand far outweighs supply. In other areas plot sizes have been reduced in an attempt to meet demand and there is a lengthy waiting list for plots within Lichfield.

In terms of identifying further demand elsewhere in the District there are no formal records available. More recently additional allotments sites have opened in Stonnall, Armitage with Handsacre and Alrewas which all appear to be fully let.

The 2011 Citizen's questionnaire highlighted that across all areas of the District there was a perceived shortfall in allotment provision with $79 \%$ of respondents believing there is insufficient provision.

### 11.3 Quantity

There are currently 21 recorded allotment sites in Lichfield District ranging in size from 0.09 ha to 2.2 ha. These sites are found in the following locations:

| Settlement | Name | Area (ha) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Alrewas | Mill End Lane | 0.20 |
| Alrewas | Somerville Road | 0.30 |
| Armitage | Old Road | 0.40 |
| Armitage | A513 | 0.59 |
| Armitage | Rugeley Road | 1.23 |
| Armitage with Handsacre | Lichfield Road | 0.41 |
| Burntwood | Norton Lane | 0.36 |
| Burntwood | Coulter Lane | 0.54 |
| Burntwood | Peters Lane | 0.54 |
| Clifton Campville | Main Street | 0.53 |
| Clifton Campville | Netherseal Road | 0.54 |
| Hill Ridware | Oaklands Close | 0.29 |
| Lichfield | Cherry Orchard | 0.36 |
| Lichfield | Netherstowe | 1.51 |
| Lichfield | The Moggs | 1.34 |
| Lichfield | Christchurch | 2.01 |
| Lichfield | Dovehouse Fields | 0.11 |
| Lichfield | Beacon Walk | 0.35 |
| Longdon | Borough Lane | 0.09 |
| Stonnall | Cartersfield Lane | 0.73 |
| Whittington | Whittington | 2.24 |

Lichfield City has around 245 plots on 6 sites (as shown in Map 11.2) totalling 5.67 ha throughout the city. Lichfield and District Allotment Society run 5 of these sites and operate 205 allotments, with a around 40 let privately at a site off Christchurch Lane. In order to reduce waiting times, some allotments run by the Lichfield and District Allotment Society have been split and currently there is a waiting list of 40 with a waiting time of 12-18 months. Assuming a plot size of 150 sq m an additional 0.6 ha of allotment space would be required to deliver a total of 285 plots. This would equate to around 1 plot per 41 households.

Although the standard plot size is around 150 sq m , a number of plots are split to cater for demand and for clients who only have time or capability to cultivate a smaller site.


Map 12.1 Lichfield District Cemetery and Churchyard Locations

### 11.3 Quality

There are currently no definitive local or national quality standards for the provision for allotments or community gardens. 'A Place to Grow' published by the LGA considers a variety of issues that relate to allotments including design and layout, and managing waiting lists. Almost all the allotments within the District appear to be well used and maintained. Lichfield District Allotment Society apply certain criteria to maintain the appearance of all plots, to
ensure that they are not neglected and that the amenity of adjacent users is not adversely affected.

It is important that existing and new sites are managed and maintained and strict control is maintained to ensure that the erection of small buildings and sheds which are often contrary to development policies including Green Belt do not occur within allotment sites.

### 11.4 Accessibility

In terms of distribution, Lichfield City has the most sites followed by Burntwood and Armitage. As Map 11.1 shows there is not an even spread of allotments, with the majority being in the northern half of the District. Allotments are a demand led facility and there is little value in applying a district wide standard which could provide allotments in an area where there is little or no demand. New sites will be supported throughout the District particularly in area poorly served and where there is a demand. Where possible allotments should aim to be accessible to wheelchair users.

Due to the nature of allotments, journeys are generally made by car (carrying tools, supplies etc). Ideally new sites should be well located to existing settlements to provide opportunities for shorter car journeys or access by foot, however it is accepted this is not always possible.

### 11.5 New Sites

The provision of new sites is covered by specific Allotment Acts as well as planning law, whilst the change of use of agricultural land to allotment use will not necessarily require planning permission, car parking, access arrangements and other physical structures such as sheds or fencing may require permission where they constitute development. Being demand led and thus subject to potential fluctuations makes setting rigid district wide standards challenging. It is considered therefore that it is important to balance the need to set standards as well as being sufficiently flexible that they may be reviewed as circumstances change.

It is also important that waiting lists are reviewed regularly to gauge demand.

### 11.6 Standards

The District Council is supportive of additional allotment provision and considers that a demand led approach is generally the most appropriate way forward in delivering additional plots where they are needed. It is acknowledged that there is an identified demand which exceeds supply within Lichfield City and it is considered appropriate to address this matter through the establishment of new allotment standard to serve Lichfield City. In addition where new strategic development is proposed within Lichfield City, the provision of new allotments should be provided as proven need exists and thus land should be identified.

## 12.Cemeteries and Churchyards

### 12.1 Introduction

Cemeteries and churchyards have an amenity value as people will use them to walk through as well as the peaceful nature and minimal disruption not only benefits people but also wildlife. Often flora and fauna can flourish in these conditions as they are relatively undisturbed compared to more intensively used environments.


Map 12.1 Lichfield District Cemetery and Churchyard Locations

### 12.2 Quantity

There are 40 recorded churchyards within Lichfield District ranging in size from 0.07 ha to 3.83 ha and in total 38.5 ha. There are no crematoria recorded within the District.

The need for burial grounds and new burial spaces is dependent on site capacity and the gradual need for more space when the capacity of remaining sites becomes exhausted. The need to monitor population estimates is necessary as this could give an indication of demand depending on whether an area has an ageing population. In the case of Lichfield District population forecasts show there is likely to be a significant rise in the number of older people over the next 20 years.

### 12.3 Quality

There are currently no national or local standards for the provision of cemeteries and churchyards. Aside from their main purpose it is also important to note that cemeteries and churchyards bring wider benefits to local areas including cultural and landscape value as greenspaces as well as ecological diversity.

### 12.4 Accessibility

There are no definitive local or national standards for accessibility.

### 12.5 Summary

There are no specific plans to identify additional churchyards and cemeteries within the District and a demand led approach will be followed. The District Council should continue to support acceptable proposals in suitable locations where demand is identified.

## 13. Water Based Recreation

### 13.1 Introduction

Alongside traditional open spaces, areas of water such as rivers, canals, lakes and reservoirs offer important opportunities for sport and recreation can also act as a visual amenity.

There are a number of key water spaces located within the District and include:

- Rivers: Tame, Trent and Mease;
- Canals: Trent and Mersey, Coventry and Birmingham and Fazeley;
- Lakes at Kings Bromley, Hamstall Ridware, Fisherwick/Elford, east of Alrewas;
- Reservoirs: Chasewater; and
- Smaller Water Areas such as Stowe and Minster Pols, and several pools and brook throughout the District.

Some of these water spaces and the land around them are also considered under the open space categories such as green corridors. They are considered separately here in relation to how the water areas themselves are used and valued whether for sport, recreation/leisure, biodiversity or a combination of these.

### 13.2 Rivers

In terms of rivers areas of public accessibility varies and in some cases formal arrangements exist for fishing. The River Mease has been designated as both a Site of Special Scientific Interest and a Special Area of Conservation for 2 fish species, namely Bullhead and Spined Loach along with Water Crowfoot. However the two dominant rivers within the District that have the most significant landscape impact are the Rivers Trent and Tame.

Within the corridors of the Tame and Trent several water bodies have been created following extraction of sand and gravel such as at Kings Bromley Lake which is used for sailing and fishing, and other lakes within the Tame valley such as those at Alrewas, Elford and Whittington/Fisherwick. With the exception of Kings Bromley, there lakes all fall within the Central Rivers Initiative (CRI) area (Map 7.2) which follows the Tame through Lichfield District from East Staffordshire and into Tamworth Borough. Lichfield District Council is a partner in this rural regeneration initiative.

Some lakes within the CRI are formally used for fishing and through the CRI the aspirations of landowners for the use of other lakes for water based recreation and leisure are emerging.

It is envisaged that the number of residents living within relatively easy access of the CRA area will increase over the coming years along with forecast growth in the need for and use of land and water for recreation and leisure. The CRI is seen as a key project area with potential to deliver leisure and recreational facilities within the District and could also relieve some of the potential pressure on existing more sensitive landscapes.

### 13.3 Chasewater Country Park

Chasewater is a key water feature which is of sub regional significance set within a developing country park run by Staffordshire County Council. As well as providing for passive recreational and leisure pursuits it also provides:

- The Midlands largest water ski lake at just over 200 acres of water and caters for 14 ft sports boats and tournament ski boats. Facilities include 2 slipways and jetty mooring for $30+$ crafts as well as a full slalom course and ski jump. Whilst no standard is set in relation to this activity its importance as a water ski venue is recognised.
- Chasewater sailing club caters for sailboards and all classes of sailing boats.
- Staffordshire County Council outdoor education facility: provides a wide range of activities including dinghy sailing, all terrain cycling, climbing, canoeing and archery which compliments an extensive choice of cross curricular environmental studies.
- Sub aqua facility
- Fishing


### 13.4 Other Pools and Lakes

Kings Bromley Lake: comprises 2 pools one used by Manor Park Sailing Club and the other by a local angling club for fishing.

Stowe and Minster Pools: both these city centre pools are of significant local and historic value providing important water features within the heart of Lichfield City. Stowe Pool is used for fishing and whilst sailing is no longer permitted on Stowe Pool its reintroduction is under consideration. Stowe pool is a SSSI and as such any future use must be compatible with this designation.

### 13.5 Canals

Canals are also considered within the Green Corridors and Urban Fridge chapter. Lichfield District is crossed by 3 canals, namely the Coventy, Trent and Mersey and Birmingham and Fazeley Canals. Work is also underway to restore the Lichfield Canal. As well as providing towpaths alongside the canals, the canals themselves are also used for fishing and narrow boating. Use of canals is increasing both water and land based uses. The Canal and Rivers Trust aim to have enough moorings with ample 'breathing spaces' between groups of moored boats to protect the intrinsic value of waterways as tranquil places for enjoyment. This has led to the increased development of inland marinas. Within the District there are marinas at Fazeley, King Bromley and one with permission at Alrewas.

In addition to the 3 existing operational canals the restoration of the Lichfield Canal is underway along certain sections, being carried out by the Lichfield and Hatherton Canal Trust. The canal will eventually cover a 7 mile stretch from Huddlesford passing to the south of Lichfield City and Burntwood following its original route for the most part. This is a long term project which is recognised will benefit those living and visiting the District in the future, however there are many issues to be resolved before the restoration can be secured in full.


Map 13.1 Lichfield District Rivers, Canals, Lakes and Rivers

### 13.6 Conclusions

The District Council will continue to support current and future initiatives to improve existing and creation of new water bodies which seek to provide for a wide variety of uses for open space. However no standards are to be set for water sports and water based recreation due to the diversity of types, location and uses of existing sites. Proposals for new water sports
and recreational uses will be supported having regard to the particular circumstances of each individual proposal.
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## 1. Amenity Greenspace and Equipped Play Qualitative Scoring approach

### 1.1 Physical Quality Score

The following assessment score sheet is derived from 'Assessing Needs and Opportunities'. This scoring system has been used on previous versions of the Open Space Assessment, and is used again to provide continuity between the old and current Assessments. As was described within the main document each site is assessed against its maximum potential with a final score given as a percentage. This has made all sites comparable with sites not scoring poorly where certain elements of the scoring may not have been applicable.

| Element |  | Score |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Main entrance |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Boundary condition |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Roads, paths \& access |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Planted areas |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grassed areas |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Facilities |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bins |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Seats |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Toilets |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Parking |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Lighting |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Information |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cleanliness |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Events Programme |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Score (out of 62) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Maximum Potential Score (site by site basis) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total score \% |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 1.1 Physical Quality Score

| Attributes | Description | Scores |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Main entrance | Easy to find, with a welcome/ advisory sign <br> appropriate size, clear, clean, tidy, well maintained <br> and inviting | 4 |
|  | Appropriate size, clear, clean, tidy, well maintained <br> and inviting | 3 |
|  | Obvious, open inviting and clean | 2 |
|  | Apparent as an entrance and 1 <br> clean | 1 |
|  | All clearly defined and well maintained | 3 |
|  | All clearly defined - maintenance 'patchy' | 2 |
|  | All clearly defined - maintenance needed | 1 |


| Roads, Paths, cycle-ways and accesses | Suitable materials, level for safe use, edges well defined, surfaces clean and debris and weed free, good disabled access throughout | 5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Suitable materials, level for safe use, edges well defined, disabled access in most areas | 4 |
|  | Suitable materials, level for safe use, some disabled access | 3 |
|  | Suitable materials but with some faults, disabled access poor | 2 |
|  | Road/paths in correct place, but in need of obvious repair, disabled access poor and very restricted | 1 |
| Planted Areas (trees, shrubs, floral areas etc) | Numerous planting, with appropriate mix of plants, installed and maintained to a very high standard | 5 |
|  | Numerous plants, with an appropriate mix of plants, installed and maintained to a reasonable standard | 4 |
|  | Numerous plants, with an appropriate mix of plants and <br> 'patchy' maintenance | 3 |
|  | Limited range of plants, maintenance acceptable | 2 |
|  | Limited planting with limited maintenance | 1 |
| Grass areas | Full grass cover throughout, dense sward, good colour and cleanly cut | 5 |
|  | Full grass cover throughout, dense sward, good colour and cleanly cut, few weeds, grass cut frequently to keep length short | 4 |
|  | Full grass cover throughout main area but some 'thin' patches evident; some bald areas discreet; grass cut frequently but length excessive between cuts, cut quality good (no tearing) | 3 |
|  | General grass cover average and patchy with some bald patches, cut infrequently or at poor frequency, clippings obvious or cut quality poor | 2 |
|  | General grass cover poor, wear has led to patchy and 1 poor cover with little or no serious attempts to correct the problem, clippings obvious and cut quality poor | 1 |
| Facilities: Bins | Numerous and in good condition | 5 |
|  | Numerous and in average condition | 4 |
|  | Adequate number in good/average condition | 3 |
|  | Insufficient number but in good condition | 2 |
|  | Insufficient number in poor condition | 1 |
| Seats | Numerous for the size of the site and in good condition | 5 |
|  | Numerous for the size of the site and in average condition | 4 |
|  | Adequate number in good/average condition | 3 |
|  | Insufficient seats but in good condition | 2 |
|  | Insufficient seats in poor condition | 1 |


| Toilets | Provided within the park, easy to access, signed and well maintained | 5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Provided within or adjacent to the park, difficult to find, maintenance/condition is average | 4 |
|  | Provided within the park or adjacent to it and visible, but not well cared for and generally uninviting | 3 |
|  | Provided within the park or adjacent to it, but in very poor condition and generally avoided by park users | 2 |
|  | Temporary toilet provision for events only | 1 |
| Parking | Parking provided integral to, or adjacent to the park, adequate spaces, site clean, tidy, in good condition and well signed | 5 |
|  | Parking provided integral to, or adjacent to the park, adequate spaces but maintenance could be better | 4 |
|  | Parking provided integral to, or adjacent to the park, limited spaces, maintenance good or reasonable | 3 |
|  | Parking provided integral to, or adjacent to the park, limited space, maintenance poor | 2 |
|  | Parking provision very limited | 1 |
| Lighting | Good lighting scheme installed and well maintained | 3 |
|  | Reasonable lighting scheme installed | 2 |
|  | Poor lighting scheme | 1 |
| Information | Information available for locals and visitors (could be on boards or leaflet form) in some detail | 2 |
|  | Limited information about the park made available | 1 |
| Cleanliness | No evidence of litter, dog fouling or graffiti | 5 |
|  | Very limited evidence of litter, dog fouling or graffiti | 4 |
|  | Litter, dog fouling no worse than Grade B | 3 |
|  | Litter, dog fouling no worse than Grade C | 2 |
|  | Litter, dog fouling no worse than Grade D | 1 |
| Events programme | Full events programme with supporting leaflets | 5 |
|  | Full events programme | 4 |
|  | Events programme is in place which delivers at least one major event each year with some minor events | 3 |
|  | Some events | 2 |
|  | An event | 1 |

Table 1.2 Scoring System

### 1.2 Play Value Score

The methodology for assessing the 'play value' of areas of equipped play is included within the Children \& Young People's chapter of the main document. This element of quality scoring uses a series of criteria devised from the consultation for the play strategy and is designed to consider the quality of play at each site. In a similar manner to the physical quality scoring each site has been scored and given a potential maximum score to which the site should aspire. Each Criteria can score up to $100 \%$, however where a certain criteria may not be $100 \%$ applicable to a particular site.

| Degree to which play area is overlooked | Degree to which site is inclusive | Proximity to other services/ facilities | Does it have highest catchment coverage (within $480 \mathrm{~m} / 10 \mathrm{~min}$ walk time) | Accessibility barriers |  | Play value Children's criteria | Equipment quality | Overall comment s/Final score |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - Visible from properties fronting onto the site <br> - Visible by traffic (moderate residential volume and speed) <br> - Visible from footpaths | - Open during daylight <br> - Level, even surfaces for pushchairs/ wheelchairs <br> - Seating opportunities (both formal and informal) | - Opportunities to travel to play on route to other events/ facilities <br> - Proximity to shops, community buildings and schools | - Residential areas within the 480m/10minute walk time buffer. | Physical Barriers Railways lines, busy roads, canals, poor footpaths | Social <br> Barriers - <br> Local youth disputes, negative attitudes of residents to children | 1. Opportunities to run/walk <br> 2. Hard surface to cycle, rollerskate, basketball, skateboard <br> 3. Ability to play ball games <br> 4. Opportunities to sit/hang out. <br> 5. Risky play climbing, jumping, swinging <br> 6. Natural play hills, trees. <br> 7. Well maintained - bins, rubbish | Quality of equipment, presence of any broken equipment or equipment in need of repair | Current <br> Score <br> = sum of all current scores <br> Maximum <br> Score $=$ <br> sum <br> of all <br> maximum <br> scores |
| $100 \%=$ <br> overlooked | $100 \%=$ <br> inclusive | $100 \% \text { = close }$ <br> to multiple facilities | $100 \% \text { = full }$ <br> residential coverage | $100 \%=n$ | barriers | $\begin{aligned} & 100 \%=5+\text { out } \\ & \text { of } 7 \end{aligned}$ | $100 \%=$ <br> excellent condition |  |
| $0 \%=\text { not }$ <br> overlooked | $0 \%=\text { not }$ <br> inclusive | $0 \%=\text { no }$ <br> facilities in close proximity | $0 \%$ = no residential coverage | 0\% = barr | s present | $0 \%=0$ out of 7 | $0 \%=\text { poor }$ condition |  |

## 2. Amenity Greenspace Physical Quality Scoring

| Name | Location | Area (m2) | Main Entrance | Boundary Condition | Road/Path | Planted Areas | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Grass } \\ & \text { Area } \end{aligned}$ | Bin | Seats | Toilets | Parking | Lighting | Information | Cleanliness | Event Programme | Total | Max Score Possible | \% score |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Max Score per attribute |  |  | 4 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 5 |  | 57 |  |
| Somerville Road - Corner | Alrewas | 242 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  | 4 |  | 11 | 38 | 29\% |
| Somerville Road | Alrewas | 403 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 16 | 43 | 37\% |
| Church Road | Alrewas | 573 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 24 | 42 | 57\% |
| Fox Lane | Alrewas | 713 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 16 | 43 | 37\% |
| Somerville Road/ Fox Lane | Alrewas | 722 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 16 | 43 | 37\% |
| Kings Bromley Road/ Manor Fields | Alrewas | 1237 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 15 | 47 | 32\% |
| Oakfield Road | Alrewas | 1382 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 17 | 42 | 40\% |
| Deepmore Close | Alrewas | 1539 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 21 | 47 | 45\% |
| Foxton Close | Alrewas | 4535 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 18 | 47 | 38\% |
| Landscape Buffer, Alrewas (approx 3000) | Alrewas | 6050 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 14 | 32 | 44\% |
| Chaseview Road | Alrewas | 21250 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 18 | 52 | 35\% |
| Land to north of Church Road, Alrewas | Alrewas | 35863 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 9 | 32 | 28\% |
| Hill Top View | Armitage with Handsacre | 210 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 14 | 37 | 38\% |
| Hill Top View | Armitage with Handsacre | 235 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 14 | 62 | 23\% |
| Harvey Road | Armitage with Handsacre | 256 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 15 | 42 | 36\% |
| Harvey Road | Armitage with Handsacre | 291 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 15 | 42 | 36\% |
| Hill Top View | Armitage with Handsacre | 570 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 16 | 47 | 34\% |
| Millmoor Avenue | Armitage with Handsacre | 759 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 18 | 47 | 38\% |
| Hazel Close | Armitage with Handsacre | 771 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 21 | 47 | 45\% |
| Shropshire Brook Road/ Chase View | Armitage with Handsacre | 1069 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 22 | 47 | 47\% |
| Warren Close | Armitage with Handsacre | 1112 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 25 | 47 | 53\% |
| Wordsworth | Armitage with Handsacre | 1128 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 17 | 47 | 36\% |
| Peak Close | Armitage with Handsacre | 1535 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 22 | 47 | 47\% |
| Chesnut Close | Armitage with Handsacre | 1886 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 25 | 47 | 53\% |
| Pinfold Drive | Armitage with Handsacre | 2467 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 25 | 52 | 48\% |
| St Barbara's Road | Armitage with Handsacre | 2853 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 22 | 47 | 47\% |
| Shropshire Brook Road | Armitage with Handsacre | 3024 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 23 | 47 | 49\% |
| Foxleigh Meadows | Armitage with Handsacre | 4498 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 20 | 47 | 43\% |
| New Road/ Old Road/ The Green | Armitage with Handsacre | 6225 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 25 | 52 | 48\% |
| Shropshire Brook Road/ Manor Court Drive | Armitage with Handsacre | 8519 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 17 | 47 | 36\% |
| Shropshire Brook/ Yeoman Way | Armitage with Handsacre | 9849 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 28 | 52 | 54\% |
| Hawksyard central green space | Armitage with Handsacre | 11335 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 35 | 52 | 67\% |
| Hawksyard Swale/lake | Armitage with Handsacre | 17276 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 19 | 37 | 51\% |
| Shropshire Brook Road | Armitage with Handsacre | 22244 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 29 | 52 | 56\% |
| Shropshire Brook Road | Armitage with Handsacre | 24326 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 36 | 62 | 58\% |
| Sycamore Road/ Lilac Grove | Burntwood | 522 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 28 | 47 | 60\% |
| Sycamore Road/ Lilac grove | Burntwood | 544 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 27 | 47 | 57\% |
| Rugeley Road/ Duke Road | Burntwood | 645 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 24 | 47 | 51\% |
| Cedar Road | Burntwood | 656 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 14 | 42 | 33\% |
| Birch Avenue/ Oakdene Road | Burntwood | 780 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 20 | 47 | 43\% |
| Scholars Gate | Burntwood | 828 | Fenced Off | , | 0 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 19 | 38 | 50\% |
| Burntwood SDA (west of entrance) | Burntwood | 952 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 27 | 59\% |
| Scholars Gate | Burntwood | 1169 | Fenced Off | 2 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 15 | 38 | 39\% |
| Spinney Lane | Burntwood | 1197 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 18 | 47 | 38\% |
| Fair Lady Drive | Burntwood | 1305 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |  | 5 | 0 | 24 | 47 | 51\% |
| Chasetown Football Club | Burntwood | 1486 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 37 | 62 | 60\% |
| Fair Lady Drive | Burntwood | 1503 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 21 | 47 | 45\% |
| Baker Street | Burntwood | 1514 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 12 | 42 | 29\% |
| Robinson Road | Burntwood | 1568 |  | 3 | 1 |  | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 22 | 47 | 47\% |
| Fair Lady Drive | Burntwood | 1591 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 17 | 47 | 36\% |
| Hawthorne Crescent | Burntwood | 1805 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 18 | 47 | 38\% |
| Hawthorne Crescent | Burntwood | 2002 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 16 | 47 | 34\% |


| Name | Location | Area (m2) | Main Entrance | Boundary Condition | Road/Path | Planted Areas | Grass Area | Bin | Seats | Toilets | Parking | Lighting | Information | Cleanliness | Event Programme | Total | Max Score Possible | \% score |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Max Score per attribute |  |  | 4 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 5 |  | 57 |  |
| Rugeley Road/ Duke Road | Burntwood | 2030 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 23 | 47 | 49\% |
| Balmoral Way | Burntwood | 2160 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 18 | 47 | 38\% |
| School Lane | Burntwood | 2236 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 28 | 57 | 49\% |
| Viscount Road | Burntwood | 2294 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 18 | 47 | 38\% |
| Birch Avenue | Burntwood | 2305 | 2 |  | 3 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 4 |  | 20 | 47 | 43\% |
| Common View | Burntwood | 2539 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 21 | 62 | 34\% |
| Stour Close | Burntwood | 3092 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 21 | 47 | 45\% |
| Nightingale Walk | Burntwood | 3634 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 20 | 47 | 43\% |
| Derwent Grove/ Dove Close | Burntwood | 3900 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 19 | 48 | 40\% |
| Hilton Road | Burntwood | 3940 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 12 | 37 | 32\% |
| Chasetown Football Club | Burntwood | 3987 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 37 | 62 | 60\% |
| New Road | Burntwood | 4123 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 9 | 47 | 19\% |
| St Matthews Rd/ Glasscroft Cott | Burntwood | 4256 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 11 | 32 | 34\% |
| Keble Close | Burntwood | 4456 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 20 | 47 | 43\% |
| Burntwood SDA (east of entrance) | Burntwood | 5116 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 19 | 37 | 51\% |
| Chasetown Memorial Park | Burntwood | 5523 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 34 | 57 | 60\% |
| Adjacent to Ridgeway Primary School | Burntwood | 5599 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 23 | 47 | 49\% |
| Gorstey Ley | Burntwood | 6568 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 24 | 52 | 46\% |
| Ironstone Road | Burntwood | 6628 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 26 | 47 | 55\% |
| Coulson Close | Burntwood | 7569 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 20 | 47 | 43\% |
| Kingsdown Road | Burntwood | 7890 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 10 | 47 | 21\% |
| Chasewater Open Space | Burntwood | 8881 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 4 |  | 2 | 3 | 4 | 31 | 57 | 54\% |
| Hunslet Road/ Boulton Close | Burntwood | 10351 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 19 | 47 | 40\% |
| Hunslet Road | Burntwood | 11025 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 23 | 47 | 49\% |
| Adj Ridgeway Primary School | Burntwood | 13187 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 24 | 47 | 51\% |
| Chase Terrace Park | Burntwood | 14101 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 37 | 57 | 65\% |
| Chase View Park, Rochester Avenue | Burntwood | 14437 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 28 | 52 | 54\% |
| Chasewater Open Space | Burntwood | 17026 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 31 | 57 | 54\% |
| Church Lane | Burntwood | 18898 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 32 | 62 | 52\% |
| Cannock Road | Burntwood | 22860 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 19 | 47 | 40\% |
| Burntwood Park | Burntwood | 26467 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 33 | 62 | 53\% |
| Redwood Park | Burntwood | 36646 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 28 | 62 | 45\% |
| Chestnut Lane | Clifton Campville | 417 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 19 | 43 | 44\% |
| Main Street | Clifton Campville | 634 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 13 | 28 | 46\% |
| Clifton Campville to west of Church | Clifton Campville | 19661 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 10 | 32 | 31\% |
| Clifton Campville | Clifton Campville | 33759 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 31 | 44 | 70\% |
| Clifton Campville to South of Church | Clifton Campville | 42287 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 10 | 32 | 31\% |
| Pedley's Croft, Bellamour Way | Colton | 3809 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 30 | 57 | 53\% |
| Village Hall, Bellamour Way | Colton | 7869 | 4 | 2 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 42 | 62 | 68\% |
| Land to east of Moreton Brook | Colton | 12980 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 8 | 32 | 25\% |
| Comberford, Millenium Green | Comberford | 1319 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 29 | 44 | 66\% |
| Salts Lane | Drayton Bassett | 259 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 24 | 47 | 51\% |
| Old Manor Close | Drayton Bassett | 644 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 25 | 52 | 48\% |
| Rectory drive (2000sqm) | Drayton Bassett | 1470 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 19 | 47 | 40\% |
| Rectory drive (2000) | Drayton Bassett | 2745 | 1 |  | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 |  | 19 | 47 | 40\% |
| School Lane/ Main Road | Edingale | 318 | 3 | 2 | 5 |  | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 22 | 47 | 47\% |
| Woodyards Drive | Edingale | 398 | 3 | 3 | 3 |  | 4 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 28 | 42 | 67\% |
| Blakeways Close (South) | Edingale | 536 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 4 | 0 | 19 | 43 | 44\% |
| Main Road Opposite Blakeways Close | Edingale | 583 | 3 | 3 | 2 |  | 3 | 2 | , | 0 | , | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 22 | 47 | 47\% |
| Land between Main Road and Croxall Road | Edingale | 1083 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 24 | 42 | 57\% |
| Blakeways Close (North) | Edingale | 1195 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 22 | 47 | 47\% |
| Land between Main Road and Croxall Road | Edingale | 1418 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 24 | 42 | 57\% |


| Name | Location | Area (m2) | Main Entrance | Boundary Condition | Road/Path | Planted Areas | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Grass } \\ & \text { Area } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Bin | Seats | Toilets | Parking | Lighting | Information | Cleanliness | Event <br> Programme | Total | Max Score Possible | \% score |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Max Score per attribute |  |  | 4 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 5 |  | 57 |  |
| Moores Croft | Edingale | 13277 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 33 | 57 | 58\% |
| North of Edingale 3869(sqm) | Edinglae | 4455 | 4 | 3 |  | 5 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 47 | 49\% |
| The Shrubbery/ A513 (Classification N/A) | Elford | 3295 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 26 | 42 | 62\% |
| The Shrubbery/ The Hill | Elford | 4531 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 26 | 42 | 62\% |
| Land to from of Church, Elford | Elford | 9848 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 26 | 37 | 70\% |
| Land to south of Webbs Farm | Elford | 36629 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 8 | 32 | 25\% |
| Buxton Avenue | Fazeley | 405 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 17 | 42 | 40\% |
| Fallow Road | Fazeley | 688 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 18 | 47 | 38\% |
| Buxton Avenue | Fazeley | 1025 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 16 | 42 | 38\% |
| Oak Drive/ Heathcote Drive | Fazeley | 1160 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 17 | 47 | 36\% |
| Manor Road | Fazeley | 1213 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 17 | 47 | 36\% |
| Brook End | Fazeley | 1489 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 11 | 47 | 23\% |
| Gainsborough | Fazeley | 2037 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 18 | 47 | 38\% |
| Mayfair Drive | Fazeley | 3764 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 12 | 47 | 26\% |
| Laurel House | Fazeley | 4017 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 27 | 37 | 73\% |
| Drayton Manor Drive | Fazeley | 4297 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 14 | 47 | 30\% |
| Victory Terrace (Tam Road) | Fazeley | 7343 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 20 | 47 | 43\% |
| Williams Avenue | Fradley | 1259 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 21 | 47 | 45\% |
| Statfold Lane | Fradley | 1782 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 19 | 47 | 40\% |
| The Moor | Fradley | 2252 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 10 | 37 | 27\% |
| Hay End Lane | Fradley | 5954 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 33 | 47 | 70\% |
| Statfold Lane | Fradley | 8420 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 24 | 52 | 46\% |
| Hay End Lane | Fradley | 15305 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 18 | 57 | 32\% |
| Ashmall | Hammerwich | 1340 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 21 | 47 | 45\% |
| Mansion Drive, Hammerwich (4089 sqm) | Hammerwich | 2345 | 1 | 3 |  | 3 | 5 | 5 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 23 | 47 | 49\% |
| Harlaston Play Area | Harlaston | 911 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 32 | 52 | 62\% |
| Churchside | Harlaston | 1431 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 23 | 47 | 49\% |
| Chadwick Crescent | Hill Ridware | 616 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 23 | 47 | 49\% |
| Hawkhurst Drive | Hill Ridware | 1411 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 20 | 47 | 43\% |
| Village Hall | Hill Ridware | 2363 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 32 | 62 | 52\% |
| Village Hall/ Rookery Lane | Hints | 1198 | 4 | 2 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 39 | 62 | 63\% |
| Rookery Lane | Hints | 3826 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 15 | 47 | 32\% |
| Church Drive | Hopwas | 3637 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 16 | 47 | 34\% |
| Nursery Lane | Hopwas | 4291 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 2 | 26 | 57 | 46\% |
| Lanes Close | Kings Bromley | 1035 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 30 | 47 | 64\% |
| Leofric Close | Kings Bromley | 1053 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 22 | 47 | 47\% |
| Kings Bromley | Kings Bromley | 1240 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 29 | 49 | 59\% |
| Football field | Kings Bromley | 14826 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 25 | 42 | 60\% |
| Yoxall Road | Kngs Bromley | 898 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 19 | 42 | 45\% |
| Greenhill | Lichfield | 182 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 29 | 37 | 78\% |
| Chatterton Avenue/ Alesmore Meadow | Lichfield | 207 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 19 | 28 | 68\% |
| Burwaye Close | Lichfield | 565 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 18 | 43 | 42\% |
| Irving Close | Lichfield | 636 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 27 | 47 | 57\% |
| Thomas Greenway | Lichfield | 674 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 23 | 47 | 49\% |
| Friary Road, Lichfield Library | Lichfield | 727 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 18 | 47 | 38\% |
| Allington Avenue | Lichfield | 948 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 25 | 47 | 53\% |
| Mallicot Close | Lichfield | 1115 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 16 | 42 | 38\% |
| Furnival Crescent | Lichfield | 1124 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 4 | 0 | 13 | 38 | 34\% |
| St Catherines Road | Lichfield | 1127 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 16 | 47 | 34\% |
| Greencroft/ Collins Hill | Lichfield | 1196 | 2 |  | 4 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 21 | 47 | 45\% |
| Maxtock Avenue | Lichfield | 1258 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |  | 5 | 0 | 26 | 47 | 55\% |
| Windmill Lane | Lichfield | 1480 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 12 | 42 | 29\% |


| Name | Location | Area (m2) | Main Entrance | Boundary Condition | Road/Path | Planted Areas | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Grass } \\ & \text { Area } \end{aligned}$ | Bin | Seats | Toilets | Parking | Lighting | Information | Cleanliness | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Event } \\ \text { Programme } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Total | Max Score Possible | \% score |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Max Score per attribute |  |  | 4 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 5 |  | 57 |  |
| Furnival Crescent (Square) | Lichfield | 1545 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 13 | 38 | 34\% |
| Bains Drive/ Parnell Avenue | Lichfield | 1546 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |  | 0 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 37 | 52 | 71\% |
| Francis Road | Lichfield | 1655 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 13 | 47 | 28\% |
| The Friary | Lichfield | 1714 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 9 | 47 | 19\% |
| Balmoral Close | Lichfield | 1792 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 23 | 47 | 49\% |
| Longstaff Croft | Lichfield | 1937 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 10 | 47 | 21\% |
| Kean Close | Lichfield | 2473 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 23 | 47 | 49\% |
| Havefield Avenue | Lichfield | 2577 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 16 | 47 | 34\% |
| Staffordshire University | Lichfield | 2587 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 29 | 47 | 62\% |
| Broad Lane | Lichfield | 2637 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 17 | 47 | 36\% |
| Gable Croft | Lichfield | 2830 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 17 | 47 | 36\% |
| Ash Grove | Lichfield | 3056 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 21 | 47 | 45\% |
| North of Haymoor | Lichfield | 3351 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | , | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 19 | 47 | 40\% |
| Dimbles Hill/ Leyfields | Lichfield | 3373 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 9 | 47 | 19\% |
| Warren Close | Lichfield | 3559 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | , | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 16 | 47 | 34\% |
| Eastern Avenue/ Dimbles Lane | Lichfield | 3685 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 11 | 47 | 23\% |
| Lincoln Close | Lichfield | 3792 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 19 | 42 | 45\% |
| The Mill Pond | Lichfield | 3845 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 15 | 47 | 32\% |
| Wissage Lane | Lichfield | 4119 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 19 | 52 | 37\% |
| Eastern Avenue/ Judes Walk | Lichfield | 4353 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 18 | 47 | 38\% |
| Roman Way opposite co-op | Lichfield | 4370 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 18 | 47 | 38\% |
| Beech Gardens | Lichfield | 4553 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 16 | 47 | 34\% |
| Mesnes Green | Lichfield | 4579 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 15 | 43 | 35\% |
| Harrington Walk | Lichfield | 4693 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 22 | 47 | 47\% |
| Eastern Avenue/ Cricket Pitch | Lichfield | 4749 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 9 | 42 | 21\% |
| St Michaels Road | Lichfield | 4756 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 12 | 47 | 26\% |
| Sandfield Meadow | Lichfield | 4768 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 27 | 52 | 52\% |
| Broad Lane/ Roman Way | Lichfield | 4830 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 18 | 47 | 38\% |
| Truro Close | Lichfield | 5258 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 20 | 42 | 48\% |
| Roman Way | Lichfield | 5672 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 20 | 47 | 43\% |
| North of Hillside | Lichfield | 5683 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 21 | 47 | 45\% |
| Eastern Avenue/ Health Centre | Lichfield | 6104 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 19 | 47 | 40\% |
| David Garrick Gardens | Lichfield | 6264 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 30 | 47 | 64\% |
| Friary Gardens | Lichfield | 7862 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 37 | 47 | 79\% |
| Tamworth Rd | Lichfield | 7984 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 20 | 47 | 43\% |
| Beacon Park (Scout hut) | Lichfield | 8234 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 21 | 52 | 40\% |
| Museum Grounds, Beacon Park | Lichfield | 8251 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 47 | 62 | 76\% |
| Museum Grounds, Beacon Park | Lichfield | 10555 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 47 | 62 | 76\% |
| Old Cricket Ground | Lichfield | 10658 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 27 | 47 | 57\% |
| Beacon Park (Christchurch) | Lichfield | 11340 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 26 | 52 | 50\% |
| Brownsfield Park (Enots) | Lichfield | 12458 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | , | 4 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 18 | 57 | 32\% |
| Boley Lane | Lichfield | 12514 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 14 | 37 | 38\% |
| Beacon Park | Lichfield | 13587 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 36 | 57 | 63\% |
| Wordsworth Close | Lichfield | 13791 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 21 | 47 | 45\% |
| Beacon Park | Lichfield | 15292 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 37 | 57 | 65\% |
| Netherstowe | Lichfield | 17343 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 30 | 47 | 64\% |
| Christchurch | Lichfield | 17646 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 19 | 47 | 40\% |
| Beacon Park | Lichfield | 18615 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 1 |  | 4 | 4 | 36 | 57 | 63\% |
| Western Bypass, Beacon Park | Lichfield | 18676 |  |  | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 36 | 57 | 63\% |
| Eastern Avenue/ Grange Lane | Lichfield | 21116 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 17 | 42 | 40\% |
| Friary Gardens | Lichfield | 21830 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 31 | 47 | 66\% |
| Cathedral Walk | Lichfield | 23670 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 27 | 52 | 52\% |


| Name | Location | Area (m2) | Main Entrance | Boundary Condition | Road/Path | Planted Areas | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Grass } \\ & \text { Area } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Bin | Seats | Toilets | Parking | Lighting | Information | Cleanliness | Event <br> Programme | Total | Max Score Possible | \% score |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Max Score per attribute |  |  | 4 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 5 |  | 57 |  |
| Saddlers Wood Park | Lichfield | 28107 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 19 | 40 | 48\% |
| Estern Avenue,Christian Fields | Lichfield | 32978 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 17 | 47 | 36\% |
| Shortbutts Lane | Lichfield | 34789 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 57 | 7\% |
| Eastern Avenue, Stychbrook Park | Lichfield | 35450 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 23 | 62 | 37\% |
| Trunkfield Brook | Lichfield | 43515 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 24 | 52 | 46\% |
| Stowe Fields | Lichfield | 49387 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 34 | 47 | 72\% |
| Darnford Park? | Lichfield | 65925 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 35 | 57 | 61\% |
| Darnford Park | Lichfield | 110202 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 33 | 47 | 70\% |
| Willow Tree Close | LIchfield | 279 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 17 | 37 | 46\% |
| Hewitt Close | LIchfield | 290 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 18 | 37 | 49\% |
| Needwood Hill | Llchfield | 302 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 15 | 37 | 41\% |
| Collins Hill corner | LIchfield | 377 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 15 | 37 | 41\% |
| Bloomfield Cresecent | Llchfield | 521 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 19 | 37 | 51\% |
| James Greenway Mews | LIchfield | 542 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 12 | 37 | 32\% |
| Oakenfield | Llchfield | 867 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 15 | 37 | 41\% |
| Agincourt Rd | LIchfield | 1577 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 25 | 37 | 68\% |
| Beside railway, Chesterfield Rd | Llchfield | 10941 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 20 | 37 | 54\% |
| Bottom of Brook End/ A51 | Longdon | 589 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 22 | 47 | 47\% |
| St James Close/ Brook End | Longdon | 1135 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 20 | 47 | 43\% |
| Berkeley Way/ Beech Walk | Longdon | 1826 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 23 | 47 | 49\% |
| A51/ Top of Brookend Lane | Longdon | 1922 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 25 | 47 | 53\% |
| A51 | Longdon | 2381 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 |  | 0 | 4 | 0 | 21 | 47 | 45\% |
| Back of Club | Longdon | 3639 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 15 | 47 | 32\% |
| Greysbrooke | Shenstone | 808 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 20 | 48 | 42\% |
| Birmingham Road | Shenstone | 2576 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 15 | 38 | 39\% |
| Shenstone Recreation Ground | Shenstone | 5931 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 33 | 57 | 58\% |
| Lamas Land 35822sam | Shenstone | 56043 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 37 | 57 | 65\% |
| Glenwood Rise | Stonnall | 210 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 14 | 33 | 42\% |
| Main St/ Cartesfield Lane | Stonnall | 325 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 16 | 38 | 42\% |
| Land around pitch | Stonnall | 6774 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 24 | 47 | 51\% |
| Bexmore Drive | Streethay | 1483 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 20 | 47 | 43\% |
| Burton Road | Streethay | 3596 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 23 | 47 | 49\% |
| Shavers Lane | Upper Longdon | 237 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 21 | 43 | 49\% |
| The Green | Whittington | 607 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 22 | 47 | 47\% |
| Langton Crescent | Whittington | 754 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 23 | 47 | 49\% |
| Langton Crescent/ Main Street | Whittington | 846 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  | 0 | 24 | 52 | 46\% |
| Bramley Way | Whittington | 2299 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 26 | 47 | 55\% |
| Peregrine Close | Whittington | 8867 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 20 | 47 | 43\% |
| Merlin Way | Whttington | 5460 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 20 | 47 | 43\% |

## 3. Equipped Play Physical Quality and Play Value Scoring

Physical Quality Criteria ( $0=$ not present on site)

|  | Main <br> Entrance | Boundaries | Roads etc | Planted areas | Grass areas | Facilities: Bins | Facilities: <br> Seats | Facilities: Toilets | Facilities: <br> Parking | Facilities: Lighting | Facilities: Information | Cleanliness | Events Programme |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| David Garrick <br> Gardens, <br> Curborough | 2 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 0 |
| Stowe Croft Netherstowe | 1 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 0 |
| Oakenfield/ James Greenway | 2 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Scotch Orchard | 1 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 |
| Streethay | 3 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 0 |
| Saddlers <br> Wood | 1 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 0 |
| Darnford Park | 3 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| Shortbutts <br> Park | 3 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 0 |
| Sainte Foy | 4 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 0 |
| Darwin Park | 2 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 0 |
| Burntwood Park | 3 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 0 |
| Redwood Park | 2 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| Chase Terrace | 3 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 0 |
| Harlaston | 4 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 0 |
| Edingale | 3 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 0 |
| Clifton | 4 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 0 |
| Comberford | 4 | 3 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 0 |
| Hay End Lane | 3 | 3 | 5 | 2 | 5 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 0 |
| Alrewas | 3 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 |
| Kings Bromley | 3 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 0 |


|  | Main Entrance | Boundaries | Roads etc | Planted areas | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Grass } \\ & \text { areas } \end{aligned}$ | Facilities: Bins | Facilities: Seats | Facilities: Toilets | Facilities: Parking | Facilities: Lighting | Facilities: Information | Cleanliness | Events Programme |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Hawksyard | 2 | 2 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| Armitage, <br> Millmoor <br> Avenue | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| Armitage, Shropshire Brook | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 0 |
| Armitage, St <br> Barbara's <br> Road | 2 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| Hill Ridware | 4 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 0 |
| Colton | 4 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 0 |
| Stychbrook <br> Park | 4 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 0 |
| Stowe Fields | 1 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 0 |
| Beech Gardens | 1 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| Hammerwich, Hospital Road | 4 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| Hammerwich, Mansion Drive | 2 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 0 |
| Stonnall | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 0 |
| Little Aston | 4 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 3 |
| Shenstone | 3 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 0 | ? | 2 | 2 | 3 | ? |
| Whittington, Swan Road | 4 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 5 | ? |
| Hopwas | 4 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 5 | ? |
| Drayton Bassett | 4 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 5 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 5 | ? |









Degree to which play area is overlooked perception of safety -

- Visible from properties
fronting onto
site,
- Visible by traffic - moderate residential volume and speed
- Visible from footpaths 100\% overlooked 0\% not overlooked


## Degree to which site

## is 'inclusive'

- Open during daylight
- Level even surfaces for pushchairs \& wheelchairs
- Seating opportunities both formal and informal


## $100 \%$ inclusive - $0 \%$

 not inclusiveProximity to other services \& facilities Opportunities to travel to play on route to other events

- Shops, community buildings, school


## 100\% multi

 facilities -0\% no facilities| Does it have highest <br> catchment coverage | Accessibility barriers <br> Physical |
| :--- | :--- |

- Railway lines,
busy roads, canals, poor footpath links etc.


## Social

- Local youth disputes, negative attitudes of residents to children
$100 \%$ no barriers $-0 \%$
barriers

Play value - Children's criteria
(must have at least 5 out of 7)

- Opportunities to run/walk
- Hard surface to cycle, basketball, roller stake, skateboard
- Ability to play bal
games
- Opportunities to
sit/hang out
- Risky play - climbing, jumping, swinging
- Natural play - hills, tress
- Well maintained - bins, litter
100\% 5 out of $7-0 \% 0$ out of
100
7

Equipment quality Broken equipment or in need of repair

100\% excellent condition-0\% poor condition

Overall comments
This site is well maintained and well used.

This site has the potential to be improved in terms of type and number of equipment provided given the size and location of the site.

There is no provision in terms of equipment for older children/
teenagers at this site
This is a potential
mprovement that could be made, for example a MUGA or skate ramp.

There is an opportunity to add natural play.




| Degree to which play area is overlooked, perception of safety <br> - Visible from properties fronting onto site, <br> - Visible by traffic moderate residential volume and speed <br> - Visible from footpaths 100\% overlooked 0\% not overlooked | Degree to which site is 'inclusive' <br> - Open during daylight <br> - Level even surfaces for pushchairs \& wheelchairs <br> - Seating opportunities both formal and informal <br> 100\% inclusive - 0\% not inclusive | Proximity to other services \& facilities Opportunities to travel to play on route to other events <br> - Shops, community buildings, school <br> 100\% multi facilities $0 \%$ no facilities | Does it have highest catchment coverage Within $480 \mathrm{~m} / 10 \mathrm{~min}$ walk time coverage | Accessibility barriers Physical <br> - Railway lines, busy roads, canals, poor footpath links etc. <br> Social <br> - Local youth disputes, negative attitudes of residents to children | Play value - Children's criteria <br> (must have at least 5 out of <br> 7) <br> Opportunities to run/walk <br> - Hard surface to cycle, basketball, roller stake, skateboard <br> - Ability to play ball games <br> - Opportunities to sit/hang out <br> - Risky play - climbing, jumping, swinging <br> - Natural play - hills, tress <br> - Well maintained bins, litter <br> $100 \% 5$ out of $7-0 \% 0$ out of 7 | Equipment quality Broken equipment or in need of repair <br> 100\% excellent condition - 0\% poor condition | Overall comments <br> Excellent site for younger children. <br> Potential to include equipment for older children. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Score |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 90\% Physical, 100\% Social | 100\% | 100\% |  |
| Comments |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Located within a wider green area which is surrounded by housing, has a number of well used footpaths through site. <br> Visible from Blakeman Way. | The site is highly accessible due to a number of footpaths which cross the wider green space and link the equipped play areas together. Plenty of seating available. | Play area is located within walking distance of Waitrose and the community hall. | The site has a wide catchment consisting of mainly residential properties. | Physical: <br> Blakeman Way adjacent, though slow traffic speeds and informal crossings. <br> Social: <br> None | Opportunities to run/walk, Ability to play ball games, Opportunities to sit hang out, Risky Play, Natural Play, Well maintained. | Site is good for young children. Equipment is in good condition. |  |
| Suggested Improvements |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| None | None | None | None | Potential to add a formal crossing on Blakeman Way | While the footpaths provide hard surfacing for skateboarding etc, there is no designated hard surface area. | Potential to include equipment for older children/ teenagers. | Total Score: <br> 790 / 800 |
| Max score |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% / 100\% | 100\% | 100\% |  |



| This site has a fenced play area for young children, a basketball court and football posts. | Degree to which play area is overlooked, perception of safety - <br> - Visible from properties fronting onto site, <br> - Visible by traffic - moderate residential volume and speed <br> - Visible from footpaths 100\% overlooked -0\% not overlooked | Degree to which site is 'inclusive' <br> - Open during daylight <br> - Level even surfaces for pushchairs \& wheelchairs <br> - Seating opportunities both formal and informal <br> 100\% inclusive - 0\% not inclusive | Proximity to other services \& facilities Opportunities to travel to play on route to other events <br> - Shops, community buildings, school | Does it have highest catchment coverage Within $480 \mathrm{~m} / 10 \mathrm{~min}$ walk time <br> $100 \%$ full residential coverage - 0\% no coverage | Accessibility barriers Physical <br> - Railway lines, busy roads, canals, poor footpath links etc. <br> Social <br> - Local youth disputes, negative attitudes of residents to children | Play value - Children's criteria (must have at least 5 out of 7) <br> - Opportunities to run/walk <br> - Hard surface to cycle, basketball, roller stake, skateboard <br> - Ability to play ball games <br> - Opportunities to sit/hang out <br> - Risky play - climbing, jumping, swinging <br> - Natural play - hills, tress <br> - Well maintained - bins, litter <br> $100 \% 5$ out of $7-0 \% 0$ out of 7 | Equipment quality Broken equipment or in need of repair <br> 100\% excellent condition - 0\% poor condition | Overall comments <br> This site has an overall natural appearance given the landscape and planting. <br> Footpaths could be improved throughout the site, to improve comfort to wheeled users. <br> There is a lack of seating and bins around the MUGA and goal posts, potential for improvement. <br> A crossing over Roman |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Score | 50\% | 100\% | 100\% | 50\% Physical, 100\% Social | 100\% | 100\% | Way would improve the accessibility. |
|  | Comments |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Despite being surrounded by housing most properties don't overlook the site. Create sight lines into site from Roman Way through management of planting. No crossing point across Roman Way. | Informal paths across site. <br> Seating around children's play equipment but limited seating elsewhere. | Site is located near Coop and community hall. | Site has full residential catchment. | Physical: <br> Railway adjacent, Roman Way has fast traffic and no crossing. <br> Social: <br> None | Opportunities to run/walk, Hard surface, <br> Ability to play ball games, Opportunities to sit/hang out, Risky play, Natural Play, Well maintained | Equipment is in good condition. <br> Goal posts \& MUGA are in good condition. |  |
|  | Suggested Improvements |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Consider potential benefits of installing a crossing over Roman Way. <br> Reduce the height of planting on Roman Way to increase visibility. | Increase the amount of seating. | A crossing over Roman Way would increase the accessibility from these services \& facilities to the site. | None | Consider formal pedestrian crossing over Roman Way. | There is a lack of seating around the MUGA and goal posts, the only seating available is the grassed area. Consider increasing formal/informal seating in this part of the site. |  |  |
|  | Max score |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 60\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 50\% / 100\% | 100\% | 100\% |  |






HFIELD
Degree to which
play area is
overlooked,
perception of
safety -
safety -

- Visible from
properties
fronting
onto site,
- Visible by
traffic -
moderate residential volume and speed
- Visible from
footpaths 100\% overlooked -0\% not ov Score

| Score | $30 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $60 \%$ Physical, <br> $100 \%$ Social |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $40 \%$ |  |  |  |  |
| Comments |  |  |  |  |
| Due to the <br> location of this <br> site glimpses are <br> only possible <br> from the road. <br> Visibility is from <br> within the wider <br> green area. It is <br> frequently used <br> by dog walkers. | The play is in 3 areas, <br> and mostly set within <br> grass. The toddler <br> area is on bark and <br> surrounded by a fence <br> with bins and <br> benches. Pay and <br> display cark park <br> adjacent. | Shops, primary and <br> secondary schools. | Site is located in the <br> centre of Lichfield. | Physical: <br> Busy road and car park <br> access on two sides of <br> the play area. |

## Degree to which site

## is 'inclusive'

- Open during
daylight
- Level even
surfaces for surfaces for wheelchairs
- Seating opportunities both formal and informal
$100 \%$ inclusive - 0\% not inclusive


## Proximity to other services \& facilities Opportunities to

 travel to play on route to other events- Shops,
community
buildings
school
$100 \%$ multi facilities - 0\% no facilities


## Does it have highest

 catchment coverage Within $480 \mathrm{~m} / 10 \mathrm{~min}$ walk timeAcces
Physi

- Railway lines, busy roads, canals, poor footpath links etc.


## Social

- Local youth disputes, negative attitudes of residents to children

100\% full residential coverage-0\% no coverage

100\% no barriers - 0\% barriers

Play value - Children's criteria (must have at least 5 out of 7)

## run/walk

- Hard surface to cycle basketball, roller stake, basketball,
- Ability to play ball games - Opportunities to sit/hang out
- Risky play - climbing, jumping, swinging
- Natural play - hills, tress

Well maintained - bins, litter
$100 \% 5$ out of $7-0 \% 0$ out of 7

## Equipment

 quality Broken equipment or in need of repair100\% excellent condition-0\% poor condition

Overall comments
Equipment old and in need of replacement.

Footpaths to and within the site may improve access.

Potential to increase further play opportunities within the wider green space.









| Play Location <br> Armitage, Millmoor Avenue <br> Play equipment for a range of ages. | Degree to which play area is overlooked, perception of safety - <br> - Visible from properties fronting onto site, <br> - Visible by traffic moderate residential volume and speed <br> - Visible from footpaths 100\% overlooked -0\% not overlooked | Degree to which site is 'inclusive' <br> - Open during daylight <br> - Level even surfaces for pushchairs \& wheelchairs <br> - Seating opportunities both formal and informal <br> 100\% inclusive - 0\% not inclusive | Proximity to other services \& facilities Opportunities to travel to play on route to other events <br> - Shops, community buildings, school <br> 100\% multi facilities <br> $-0 \%$ no facilities | Does it have highest catchment coverage Within $480 \mathrm{~m} / 10 \mathrm{~min}$ walk time <br> 100\% full residential coverage-0\% no coverage | Accessibility barriers <br> Physical <br> - Railway lines, busy roads, canals, poor footpath links etc. <br> Social <br> - Local youth disputes, negative attitudes of residents to children | Play value - Children's criteria <br> (must have at least 5 out of 7) <br> - Opportunities to run/walk <br> - Hard surface to cycle, basketball, roller stake, skateboard <br> - Ability to play ball games <br> - Opportunities to sit/hang out <br> - Risky play - climbing, jumping, swinging <br> - Natural play - hills, tress <br> - Well maintained - bins, litter <br> $100 \% 5$ out of $7-0 \% 0$ out of 7 | Equipment quality Broken equipment or in need of repair <br> 100\% excellent condition-0\% poor condition | Overall comments <br> Equipment is all in good condition offering good play value. <br> Site is on a slope with no footpaths or hard surfaces around equipment. This could make access for wheeled users difficult. Potential to improve this with footpaths and hard surfaces. <br> Due to the location within a large green space there is potential to increase the size of this play area. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Score |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 20\% | 50\% | 70\% | 100\% | 100\% Physical, 100\% Social | 100\% | 100\% |  |
|  | Comments |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Limited visibility from rear of | Site is not flat, no hard surfaces around | Local shops are a short walk away, | Site is located within a residential area to | Physical: None | Opportunities to run/walk, Ability to play ball games, | Equipment is in good condition. |  |
|  | properties to one side. Adjacent to garage court and parking area. Adjacent to hall. | equipment. Plenty of informal seating but no formal seating. | other services <br> located to the north of the site. | the west of the settlement. | Social: <br> None | Opportunities to sit/hang out, <br> Risky play, <br> Natural play, <br> Well maintained. <br> Limited natural play elements. | Grass under <br> equipment is becoming worn. <br> One fence panel broken at time of visit. |  |
|  | Suggested Improvements |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | No potential to increase this score. | Explore opportunities for formal seating and improved surfacing. | None | None | None | Potential to improve natural play and add hard surface. Site is located within a large green space, potential to increase the size of play area. | Potential to improve surface under equipment to reduce grass wearing. Repair or replace fencing. | $\frac{\text { Total Score: }}{640 / 720}$ |
|  | Max score |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 20\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\%/100\% | 100\% | 100\% |  |





Degree to which
play area is
overlooked,
perception of
perception of
safety -

- Visible from properties fronting onto site,
- Visible by traffic moderate residential volume and speed
- Visible from footpaths
100\% overlooked
0\% not
overlooked
Score

| Score |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 20\% | 50\% | 20\% | 100\% | 100\% Physical, 100\% Social | 100\% | 90\% |
| Comments |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Overlooked from footpaths through the green space, but no houses or roads overlook the site. | Footpaths in good condition with plenty of formal and informal seating throughout the site. | Located a distance from facilities but within the wider facilities of the Millennium Green. | Although this site is located outside the settlement the catchment covers the whole village, and the site is accessible by a number of footpaths and entrances. | Physical: <br> None <br> Social: <br> None | Opportunities to run/walk, Ability to play ball games, Opportunities to sit/hang out, Risky play, Natural play, Well maintained. <br> Introducing hard surfaces to this site wouldn't be appropriate due to its natural setting. | Equipment is in good condition. At time of visit part of the climbing frame was unusable and section off, unsure as to the reason. |
| Suggested Improvements |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No potential to improve this score. | None | No potential to improve this score. | None | None | Explore opportunities for additional equipment within the wider green space. | Repair climbing frame. |
| Max score |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 20\% | 100\% | 20\% | 100\% | 100\%/100\% | 100\% | 100\% |


| Degree to which site is 'inclusive' <br> - Open during daylight <br> - Level even surfaces for pushchairs \& wheelchairs <br> - Seating opportunities both formal and informal | Proximity to other services \& facilities Opportunities to travel to play on route to other events <br> - Shops, community buildings, school | Does it have highest catchment coverage Within $480 \mathrm{~m} / 10$ min walk time | Accessibility barriers <br> Physical <br> - Railway lines, busy roads, canals, poor footpath links etc. <br> Social <br> - Local youth disputes, negative attitudes of residents to children |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $100 \%$ inclusive - 0\% not inclusive | 100\% multi facilities <br> - 0\% no facilities | 100\% full <br> residential <br> coverage - 0\% no <br> coverage | 100\% no barriers - 0\% barriers |

value - Children's criteria (must have at least 5 out of 7)

- Opportunities to
run/walk
- Hard surface to cycle, basketball, roller stake skateboard
- Ability to play ball games Opportunities to sit/hang out
- Risky play - climbing, jumping, swinging
- Natural play - hills, tress
- Well maintained - bins, litter
$100 \% 5$ out of $7-0 \% 0$ out of 7

Equipment quality Broken equipment or in need of repair

Good green space which is excellently maintained and offers a lot of accessible green space for the village However the equipped play element of the site is limited to a small area.

Potential to explore opportunities to improve this through additional play equipment and natural play.

Total Score: 580/ 640

| Play Location <br> Colton, Bellamour Way <br> This site hosts play equipment for young children, swings and football posts. | Degree to which play area is overlooked, perception of safety - <br> - Visible from properties fronting onto site, <br> - Visible by traffic moderate residential volume and speed <br> - Visible from footpaths 100\% overlooked -0\% not overlooked | Degree to which site is 'inclusive' <br> - Open during daylight <br> - Level even surfaces for pushchairs \& wheelchairs <br> - Seating opportunities both formal and informal <br> 100\% inclusive - 0\% not inclusive | Proximity to other services \& facilities Opportunities to travel to play on route to other events <br> - Shops, community buildings, school | Does it have highest catchment coverage Within $480 \mathrm{~m} / 10 \mathrm{~min}$ walk time <br> $100 \%$ full residential coverage - 0\% no coverage | Accessibility barriers Physical <br> - Railway lines, busy roads, canals, poor footpath links etc. <br> Social <br> - Local youth disputes, negative attitudes of residents to children | Play value - Children's criteria (must have at least 5 out of 7) <br> - Opportunities to run/walk <br> - Hard surface to cycle, basketball, roller stake, skateboard <br> - Ability to play ball games <br> - Opportunities to sit/hang out <br> - Risky play - climbing, jumping, swinging <br> - Natural play - hills, tress <br> - Well maintained - bins, litter <br> $100 \% 5$ out of $7-0 \% 0$ out of 7 | Equipment quality Broken equipment or in need of repair <br> 100\% excellent condition - 0\% poor condition | Overall comments <br> Good site which offers a range of play opportunities within a well maintained wider green space. Caters mainly for younger children. <br> Potential to increase play value through natural play. Could add hard surfacing (eg: MUGA) or other equipment to cater for older children/teenagers. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Score |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 20\% | 100\% | 100\% | 50\% | 100\% Physical, 100\% Social | 100\% | 90\% |  |
|  | Comments |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Only overlooked by village hall. Not visible from footpaths or traffic. | Level surfaces throughout, all hard surfacing around equipment. Lots of formal seating. | Site is adjacent to the village hall. School is short distance along the street. | Majority of the village is within the catchment, although much of the catchment is countryside due to location on edge on settlement. | Physical: <br> None | Opportunities to run/walk, Ability to play ball games, Opportunities to sit/hang out, Risky play, Well maintained. | Most of equipment is in good condition. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Social: <br> None |  |  |  |
|  | Suggested Improvements |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | No potential to improve this score. | None | None | No potential to improve this score. | None | Potential to introduce natural play and hard surfaces within wider green space. | None |  |
|  | Max score |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\frac{\text { Total Score: }}{620 / 670}$ |
|  | 20\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\%/100\% | 100\% | 100\% |  |



## Play Location

Drayton Bassett, Rectory Close
Play equipment, MUGA, football posts




## Degree to which play area is

 overlooked, perception of safety -- Visible from properties fronting onto site,
- Visible by
traffic -
moderate residential volume and speed
- Visible from footpaths 100\% overlooked -0\% not overlooked

| Score |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 40\% | 100\% | 100\% | 30\% | 100\% Physical, 100\% Social | 100\% |
| Comments |  |  |  |  |  |
| Overlooked by some properties to one side. Not visible from roads or footpaths. Visible to other users of the wider green space. | Site is level with plenty of seating on offer. | Site is located within walking distance of local shop and school. | Site is well located, despite its edge of settlement location the whole village is within the catchment. | Physical: <br> None <br> Social: <br> None | Opportunities to run/walk, Hard surface, <br> Ability to play ball games, Opportunities to sit/hang out, Risky play, <br> Well maintained |


| Degree to which site is 'inclusive' <br> - Open during daylight <br> - Level even surfaces for | Proximity to other services \& facilities Opportunities to travel to play on route to other events | Does it have highest catchment coverage Within $480 \mathrm{~m} / 10 \mathrm{~min}$ walk time | Accessibility barriers Physical <br> - Railway lines, busy roads, canals, poor footpath links etc. <br> Social |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

Play value - Children's criteria (must have at least 5 out of 7)

- Opportunities to
run/walk
- Hard surface to cycle, basketball, roller stake, skateboard
- Local youth disputes, negative attitudes of residents to children
$100 \%$ full residential coverage-0\% no coverage

100\% inclusive - 0\% $\quad 100 \%$ multi facilities not inclusive

0\% no facilities
community
buildings,
school

Ability to play ball games

- Opportunities to sit/hang out
- Risky play - climbing, jumping, swinging
- Natural play - hills, tress
- Well maintained - bins, litter

$$
100 \% 5 \text { out of } 7-0 \% 0 \text { out of } 7
$$

$100 \%$ no barriers - 0\%
barriers

## Equipment

## quality

Broken
equipment or in need of repair

100\% excellent condition-0\% poor condition

## Overall comments

Good site which offers a good play value and is well located within the settlement.

The MUGA requires some maintenance and improvements and the equipment needs repainting.


| Play Location <br> Edingale, Off Moores Croft <br> There are three areas to this site: a fenced off area of play equipment for young children, an adventure park and a MUGA. | Degree to which play area is overlooked, perception of safety - <br> - Visible from properties fronting onto site, <br> - Visible by traffic moderate residential volume and speed <br> - Visible from footpaths 100\% overlooked -0\% not overlooked | Degree to which site is 'inclusive' <br> - Open during daylight <br> - Level even surfaces for pushchairs \& wheelchairs <br> - Seating opportunities both formal and informal <br> $100 \%$ inclusive - 0\% not inclusive | Proximity to other services \& facilities Opportunities to travel to play on route to other events <br> - Shops, community buildings, school | Does it have highest catchment coverage Within $480 \mathrm{~m} / 10$ min walk time <br> 100\% full residential coverage - 0\% no coverage | Accessibility barriers Physical <br> - Railway lines, busy roads, canals, poor footpath links etc. <br> Social <br> - Local youth disputes, negative attitudes of residents to children | Play value - Children's criteria (must have at least 5 out of 7) <br> - Opportunities to run/walk <br> - Hard surface to cycle, basketball, roller stake, skateboard <br> - Ability to play ball games <br> - Opportunities to sit/hang out <br> - Risky play - climbing, jumping, swinging <br> - Natural play - hills, tress <br> - Well maintained - bins, litter <br> $100 \% 5$ out of $7-0 \% 0$ out of 7 | Equipment quality Broken equipment or in need of repair <br> 100\% excellent condition - 0\% poor condition | Overall comments <br> Very well maintained site, offering play opportunities for a range of ages. <br> A footpath through the site would make it more accessible for wheeled users. <br> There is no formal seating by the adventure park but there is informal seating. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Score |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 60\% | 70\% | 100\% | 40\% | 100\% Physical, 100\% Social | 100\% | 80\% |  |
|  | Comments |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Overlooked on two sides by adjacent village | Access for wheeled users may be difficult in some parts of the site. | Close to school, adjacent to village hall. | Whilst located on the edge of the settlement the | Physical: None | Opportunities to run/walk, Hard surfaces, <br> Ability to play ball games, Opportunities to sit/hang out, Risky play, Natural play, Well maintained. | Adventure park and MUGA in excellent |  |
|  | hall and houses. <br> The adventure park is not particularly overlooked. | No formal footpath through site. Plenty of seating available. |  | whole village is within the catchment. | Social: <br> None |  | condition. <br> Fenced play area equipment in working order but would benefit from repainting. |  |
|  | Suggested Improvements |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Potential to reduce hedge height along road to improve visibility. | Footpath to improve accessibility through and within site. | None | None | None | None | Repaint fenced area equipment. | Total Score: 650 / 760 |
|  | Max score |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 60\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\%/100\% | 100\% | 100\% |  |




| Play Location <br> Fazeley, behind Victory Terrace <br> Young children's climbing frame | Degree to which play area is overlooked, perception of safety - <br> - Visible from <br> properties <br> fronting <br> onto site, <br> - Visible by <br> traffic - <br> moderate <br> residential <br> volume and <br> speed <br> - Visible from footpaths <br> 100\% overlooked <br> -0\% not <br> overlooked | Degree to which site is 'inclusive' <br> - Open during daylight <br> - Level even surfaces for pushchairs \& wheelchairs <br> - Seating opportunities both formal and informal <br> 100\% inclusive - 0\% not inclusive | Proximity to other services \& facilities Opportunities to travel to play on route to other events <br> - Shops, community buildings, school | Does it have highest catchment coverage Within $480 \mathrm{~m} / 10 \mathrm{~min}$ walk time | Accessibility barriers Physical <br> - Railway lines, busy roads, canals, poor footpath links etc. <br> Social <br> - Local youth disputes, negative attitudes of residents to children barriers | Play value - Children's criteria <br> (must have at least 5 out of 7) <br> - Opportunities to run/walk <br> - Hard surface to cycle, basketball, roller stake, skateboard <br> - Ability to play ball games <br> - Opportunities to sit/hang out <br> - Risky play - climbing, jumping, swinging <br> - Natural play - hills, tress <br> - Well maintained - bins, litter <br> $100 \% 5$ out of $7-0 \% 0$ out of 7 | Equipment quality Broken equipment or in need of repair <br> 100\% excellent condition-0\% poor condition | Very poor site which is in need of replacing. The equipment is limited and does not offer many play opportunities. <br> The site is underused and is located poorly, as it is hidden behind the adjacent flats and separated from the wider residential area. The play area is also fenced off within the wider green space in which it is located. <br> There is need to improve this site with new equipment and landscaping. However due to its location it may be worthwhile to relocate the play area to a preferable site within the residential area. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Score |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 50\% | 0\% | 80\% | 50\% | 50\% Physical, 100\% Social | 40\% | 20\% |  |
|  | Comments |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Site is overlooked by the adjacent properties. | There is no seating or level surfaces within this site. | Site is in close proximity to the local shops and community facilities in Fazeley. | Catchment covers residential area with the District and parts of Tamworth Borough. The catchment contains some industrial uses. | Physical: <br> Busy roads separate the site from much of its catchment and the whole site is surrounded by obtrusive fencing. | Opportunities to run/walk, Risky play. <br> Very poor site which offers little in play value. Site consists of one small climbing frame for young children. | Equipment is in poor condition and rusted. |  |
|  | Suggested Improv | ents |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | None | Opportunities to introduce seating and level surfaces. | None | Little opportunity to improve this score. | Improve access into the site and remove fencing which currently limits access. | Site requires significant improvement. The site is underutilised and has great potential to be remodelled. | Equipment needs replacing and whole site needs remodelling. |  |
|  | Max score |  |  |  |  |  |  | 390 / 7 |
|  | 100\% | 100\% | 80\% | 50\% | 80\% / 100\% | 100\% | 100\% |  |












| Play Location <br> Shenstone, Recreation Ground <br> Play equipment, MUGA, outdoor gym, skate equipment | Degree to which play area is overlooked, perception of safety - <br> - Visible from <br> properties <br> fronting <br> onto site, <br> - Visible by <br> traffic - <br> moderate <br> residential <br> volume and <br> speed <br> - Visible from footpaths <br> 100\% overlooked <br> -0\% not <br> overlooked | Degree to which site is 'inclusive' <br> - Open during daylight <br> - Level even surfaces for pushchairs \& wheelchairs <br> - Seating opportunities both formal and informal <br> 100\% inclusive - 0\% not inclusive | Proximity to other services \& facilities Opportunities to travel to play on route to other events <br> - Shops, community buildings, school | Does it have highest catchment coverage Within $480 \mathrm{~m} / 10 \mathrm{~min}$ walk time <br> 100\% full residential coverage-0\% no coverage | Accessibility barriers Physical <br> - Railway lines, busy roads, canals, poor footpath links etc. <br> Social <br> - Local youth disputes, negative attitudes of residents to children | Play value - Children's criteria <br> (must have at least 5 out of 7) <br> - Opportunities to run/walk <br> - Hard surface to cycle, basketball, roller stake, skateboard <br> - Ability to play ball games <br> - Opportunities to sit/hang out <br> - Risky play - climbing, jumping, swinging <br> - Natural play - hills, tress <br> - Well maintained - bins, litter <br> $100 \% 5$ out of $7-0 \% 0$ out of 7 | Equipment quality Broken equipment or in need of repair | Overall comments <br> Good site offering play opportunities for a range of ages. Potential to introduce natural play, also to expand play areas within the wider green space. <br> Explore potential for additional site located in the south of the settlement. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Score |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 40\% | 100\% | 100\% | 50\% | 100\% Physical, 100\% Social | 100\% | 80\% |  |
|  | Comments |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Not overlooked by properties or the road. Visible from users of the adjacent village hall and recreation ground. | There are a number of seats near the play equipment, a good footpath is adjacent to the play equipment. | Located close to the school, village hall and local shops. | Located in the north of the village which leaves the south of the settlement without provision. | Physical: <br> None <br> Social: <br> None | Opportunities to run/walk, Hard surface, <br> Ability to play ball games, Opportunities to sit/hang out, Risky play, <br> Well maintained | The majority of equipment is in good condition, some pieces of equipment ned refurbishing. |  |
|  | Suggested Improvements |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | No potential to improve this score. | None | None | No potential to improve this score. | None | Potential to introduce natural play into wider green space. | Refurbish the older pieces of equipment. | $\frac{\text { Total Score: }}{670 / 740}$ |
|  | Max score |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 40\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\%/100\% | 100\% | 100\% |  |





| Degree to which play area is overlooked, perception of safety - <br> - Visible from properties fronting onto site, <br> - Visible by traffic moderate residential volume and speed <br> - Visible from footpaths 100\% overlooked -0\% not overlooked | Degree to which site is 'inclusive' <br> - Open during daylight <br> - Level even surfaces for pushchairs \& wheelchairs <br> - Seating opportunities both formal and informal | Proximity to other services \& facilities Opportunities to travel to play on route to other events <br> - Shops, community buildings, school | Does it have highest catchment coverage Within $480 \mathrm{~m} / 10$ min walk time <br> 100\% full residential coverage - $0 \%$ no coverage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |


| Accessibility barriers |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Physical |  |
| - | Railway lines, busy <br> roads, canals, poor <br> footpath links etc. |
| Social <br> - <br> Local youth <br> disputes, negative <br> attitudes of <br> residents to <br> children |  |
| $100 \%$ no barriers - 0\% |  |
| barriers |  |

Play value - Children's criteria
(must have at least 5 out of 7)

- Opportunities to
run/walk
- Hard surface to cycle, basketball, roller stake skateboard
- Ability to play ball games
- Opportunities to sit/hang out
- Risky play - climbing,
jumping, swinging
- Natural play - hills, tress
- Well maintained - bins, litter
$100 \% 5$ out of $7-0 \% 0$ out of 7

Equipment quality Broken equipment or in need of repair

An excellent site, which offers a unique facility within the village, and the District. Beautifully maintained.
$100 \%$ excellent condition - 0\% poor condition
100\%

| Score | $80 \%$ | $20 \%$ |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $20 \%$ |  |  |  |  |
| Comments | Visibility is limited <br> due to location. <br> Site is visible from <br> the adjacent <br> cricket ground <br> and hospice. | There is a good footpath <br> through the site, though <br> the site is located on a <br> hill so may be difficult <br> for some wheeled users. <br> Numerous benches in <br> the site, located <br> adjacent to the path. | Site is located near <br> the cricket ground. | D |


| Suggested Improvements |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| No potential to <br> improve this <br> score. | None | Limited potential to <br> improve this score. | No potential to <br> improve this. | None | Due to the nature of this site <br> introducing hard surfaces <br> wouldn't be appropriate. |
| Max score |  |  | None <br> wore |  |  |




## 4. Summary of Consultations

The following section provides details of some of the consultations that have taken place and have informed this Open Space Assessment.

## Citizens Questionnaire August 2011

The Citizen's Questionnaire was completed by over 400 residents of the District and included a series of questions to gauge satisfaction with leisure facilities and open spaces across the District. $84 \%$ of respondents are very or fairly satisfied with parks and open space facilities within the District.

On the whole residents of Burntwood are less satisfied with the provision of open space in their area than Lichfield City and the wider rural areas. The survey found that the main use of parks and open spaces within the District is for 'fresh air' and 'walking'. The survey also found that $81 \%$ of residents had visited a park or open space within the District in the last 6 months, with those with children visiting parks more regularly.

Beacon Park in Lichfield is the most regularly used park and is used by residents from across the entire district.

All areas of the District expressed a need for an increase in allotment provision. Burntwood residents were less satisfied with the provision of parks and gardens, spaces for children and amenity green space that residents of Lichfield City or the wider rural areas.

## Lichfield District Play Strategy -'Who told us?'

The preparation of the Lichfield District Play Strategy involved gathering the views of children. The section below sets out the opinions gathered from this consultation.

The School Councils told us a lot about the difficulties children have whilst playing outdoors. For most children there were many barriers to outside play.

- Chase Terrace: The children said they like to play outside, but the play areas are too far away from where they live.
- Mile Oak: Children don't feel safe because there are too many teenagers hanging around who bully them, drive fast in cars, and hang around the community centre drinking and taking drugs. There are police about every night. If they play near home, neighbours complain about the noise and the balls going into their gardens. The play area by the community centre is damaged and boring. It only has one swing working.
- Handsacre: There is a good play area in Armitage, but it is too far away, across a busy road. The local play area is very run down. Teenagers drink there and break glass bottles, so it is not safe to play.
- Chasetown: The main park is across a busy main road, so the children can't go by themselves. The play area is boring and not looked after, so they don't like using it. Lots of the children did not live near a park. Some play on a traffic island.
- North Lichfield: Most of the children did not have a play area near their home. The roads are busy and this makes it difficult to walk to the play areas further away. Neighbours complain if they play in the street. They don't feel safe playing out.
- Queens Croft: Young people make friends at school and then have to go home on a bus and can't meet their friends outside school. Concerns were expressed about not feeling safe, having no-one to play with. They said they are often not allowed to go out to play by their parents.
- Nether Stowe High School: Some young people said they had no friends who lived nearby. If they meet their friends they get moved on from the local shop, even though they are not doing anything wrong. There is nowhere to go in town without going into cafes which cost too much and there is nowhere to hang about in their local area. Some of the young people didn't feel safe and had experienced bullying. Some experience transport difficulties because they live in villages. They felt that many of the play areas were full of rubbish and glass and that the benches in Beacon Park were scruffy and broken. Friary Grange Leisure Centre has too many rules and restrictions for the swimming pool, so they can't enjoy swimming, the changing areas are unhygienic. They said the refreshment area was dirty and always had used plastic cups on the tables and they were unable to get hot food, unlike at the café at Burntwood Leisure Centre.
- Chase Terrace: Children wanted more play areas near where they live. They wanted more things they like to do at the play areas, different equipment which was more fun.
- Mile Oak: They want their play area to have good equipment like in Beacon Park. They would like an all-weather surface. More litter bins to keep the play area clean and ,somebody to look after it properly. Somewhere for the teenagers to go and hang out. They want things for teenagers to do, so that they don't spoil their play area or bully them.
- Hayes Meadow: Someone to look after their play area and keep it clean and tidy. An allweather surface. A bike park so they can have somewhere just to ride bikes. Something for teenagers to do.
- Springhill: Play areas closer to home and better looked after equipment.
- North Lichfield: Children want us to keep the green spaces and they want more play areas. Water fountains in parks and playgrounds because they get hot and thirsty when they play. More litter bins to help keep the play areas clean and tidy. Playgrounds which aren't near main roads, so they are safe to get to.
- Queens Croft: The children wanted more playschemes and activities in holidays and more sports clubs that they can go to.
- Nether Stowe High School: They wanted somewhere to hang out, but not necessarily to take part in activities. Over half thought teen shelters were a good idea, or else a youth pod, which would be warmer and dryer. One council member had used a pod in Rugeley and it was very well used. They wanted more fields for sports and play areas to be looked after. The Enots play area was mentioned by a number of members, who wanted it improving. Just over half the members supported the idea of a skate park in Lichfield. Members who live in surrounding villages such as Armitage and Handsacre, mentioned transport difficulties and said they wanted a skate park as well. They want nhot food
facilities, like the ones offered at Burntwood Leisure Centre at Friary Grange Leisure Centre and cleaner changing rooms and café. They offered new ideas for the summer programme, including paintballing and weekend camps, they also suggested new ways to market the programme.

Results of the Summer Programme consultation. The children's favourite play activity was playing outdoors, including football and other sports.

- Nearly two out of ten children said they did not play outside their home, on their own, without an adult.
- However, $99 \%$ of children thought it was important to have somewhere safe to play outside. Over half thought it was very important.
- The most popular outdoor activity was football and riding bikes. The most popular, indoor activity was watching television and playing on the computer.
- Top of the poll for better play opportunities was better outdoor play areas and more sports facilities.


## Results of the Parent's Questionnaires

- We received 121 responses:
- $85 \%$ felt strongly that every community should have an outdoor play area
- $80 \%$ are happy with the summer playscheme opening times.

Parents were asked which age group has the greatest need for new play services and facilities. The results were:
$>0-4$ years $7 \%$
$>5-9$ years $36 \%$
> $10-13$ years $39 \%$
> 14-18 years $19 \%$

## Snap Place Survey 2008/2009

Introduced in 2008/9, this survey replaces the Best Value Satisfaction, Benefits and Libraries Survey and focuses more on the local area as opposed to the Local Authority and is designed to capture people's views. It showed that overall 47\% of respondents were very/fairly satisfied with sport/leisure facilities (57\% had used sport/leisure facilities in last year) and $70 \%$ were very/fairly satisfied with parks and open spaces with $89 \%$ having used parks and open spaces in last year.

In terms of community safety 43\% felt teenagers hanging around street were a very/fairly big problem and in terms of improvements to local areas activities for teenagers (55\% response) was identified as most in need of improvement. This also relates to another finding within the report which shows $43 \%$ of respondents felt that teenagers hanging around the streets was a very big problem.

In terms of overall satisfaction with the local area as a place to live, the response deceased by $1 \%$ from $2006 / 7$ to 2008 , from $82 \%$ to $81 \%$ but this still remains fairly high.


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ The maps contained within this assessment display the accessibility buffer around each type of open space. However the buffers shown do not take into account any barriers that may restrict access such as major roads and railways. It is important that such barriers are considered when applying any policies.

[^1]:    ${ }^{2}$ Space for People. Targeting action for woodland access. Woodland Trust 2010.
    ${ }^{3}$ Woodland Trust Policy Paper Space for People, Targeting action for woodland access. January 2015

[^2]:    ${ }^{4}$ Guidance for Outdoor Sport and Play: Beyond the Six Acre Standard - Fields in Trust October 2015
    ${ }^{5}$ ONS 2014 SNPP Projected Population, 2014-based Subnational Population Projections

