Havering Green Spaces, Sport and Recreation Study

Volume 1: Assessment of Greenspace Needs (Final)

October 2005
CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 9
  Assessment of Local Open Space Needs 9
  Approach and Methodology 10
  Local Standards 11
  Existing Open Space Provision 11
  Quality Assessment 12
  Allotments 14
  Value 14
  Playing Pitch and Sports Facilities Assessment 15
  Policy Recommendations 16
  Areas with provision above minimum standards 17
  Next Stage 17

1. INTRODUCTION 19
  Scope of the study 20
  Structure of this Report 21

2. NATIONAL, REGIONAL AND LOCAL FRAMEWORK 23
  National Policy 23
  Regional Policy 29
  Sub Regional Initiatives 30
  Local Policy 33
  Cross-Cutting Benefits 37
  Conclusions and Recommendations 38

3. LOCAL OPEN SPACE NEEDS AND PRIORITIES 41
  Introduction 41
  Perceptions of Open Space Need 41
  Assessment of Local Open Space Needs 44
  Open Space Need Indicators 47
  A Vision to Address Open Space Needs 51

4. APPROACH TO PLANNING AND OPEN SPACE PROVISION 53
  Introduction 53
  Approaches to Planning Open Space Provision 53
10. MEETING OPEN SPACE NEEDS

Introduction 159
Scope for Change and Improvement 159
Establishing A Green Network 162
Enhancing the Green Network to Meet the Needs of Sub-areas 170
Meeting Deficiencies in Quality 184
Maintaining an Adequate Supply of Open Space 185
Areas with Provision Above Minimum Open Space Standards 187

11. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Policy Framework 196
Open Space Needs and Priorities 197
Approach to Planning Open Space Provision 198
Assessment of Supply 198
Quality of Supply 199
Value of Open Space 200
Assessing Allotment Needs 201
Playing Pitch Assessment 202
Policy Recommendations 203
Areas with Provision Above Minimum Standards 204
Next Stage 204

List of Tables

Table 2.1 - Relationship of Open Space Strategy to other Initiatives 39
Table 3.1 - Demographic Profile 45
Table 3.2 - Ethnic Group Populations 46
Table 3.3 - In the last 12 months have you visited a park? 47
Table 4.1 - GLA Public Park hierarchy 58
Table 4.2 - Differences between existing UDP public park hierarchy and the GLA London Plan public park hierarchy 59
Table 4.3 - Number of parks classified under each park type when using the current UDP hierarchy and the GLA hierarchy 60
Table 4.4 - Park Facilities 61
Table 4.6 - Other Open Space Provision 62
Table 5.1 – Open Space Provision by Type 66
Table 5.2 – Open Space by Ward 67
Table 5.3 - Public Park Provision by Sub Area 68
Table 5.4 - Indicative Park Population Thresholds 70

Havering Volume 1 (Final Oct 05).doc
Table 5.5 – Comparison of public park provision and indicative park population thresholds
Table 5.6 – Formal Children’s Play Provision
Table 5.7 – Condition of Children’s Play Provision
Table 6.1 – Quality Assessment by Space Type (Overall Average Scores)
Table 6.2 Quality Assessment: Average Scores for Each Space Type According to Different ‘Green Flag’ Categories
Table 7.1 – Recreational Role of Open Spaces
Table 7.2 - Indications of Informal Use
Table 7.3 - Structural Role of Open Spaces
Table 7.4 - Amenity Value of Open Space
Table 7.5 - Educational Role of Open Spaces
Table 7.6 – Cultural Roles Performed by Open Spaces
Table 7.7 – Areas of Ecological Value in Havering*
Table 7.8 - Total Areas Subject to Ecological Designations
Table 7.9 – Natural Greenspace Provision (Within open space)
Table 7.10 – Areas of Natural Greenspace (by size)
Table 7.11 - Composite Value Scores
Table 7.12 - Relationship Between Quality and Value
Table 8.1 - Principal Allotments Legislation
Table 8.2 - Allotment Supply and Capacity
Table 8.3 - Allotment supply and capacity by ward
Table 8.4 – Estimated Allotment Needs Arising from Households Lying outside Allotment Catchments
Table 8.5 - Estimated Allotment Needs Arising from Demographic Change to 2016
Table 8.6 – Proposed Standard based on Total Land Need to 2016
Table 9.1 – Summary of Local Open Space Standards (to meet needs up to 2016)
Table 10.1 - Scope for Change / Improvement
Table 10.2 – Open space needs by sub area
Table 10.3 – Provision of open space by ward above open space standard
Table 10.4 – Using the following scale, How satisfied are you with levels of open space provision in your area?
Table 10.5 – How much do you feel that the open spaces in your neighbourhood affect your quality of life?

List of Figures
Figure 1.1 – Open Space Locations
Figure 1.2 - Open Space Ownership
Figure 1.3 - Ward Boundaries
Figure 3.1 - Population Density by Output Area (Dwellings per Hectare)
Figure 3.2 - % Dwellings Terraced, Flats or Apartments
Figure 3.3 - Child Densities by Ward (% Population aged 0-15)
Figure 3.4 - % Population in Good Health
Figure 3.5 - Deprivation Index Scores
Figure 3.6 – Composite Needs Assessment
Figure 4.1 - Open Space by Type
Figure 5.1 - Pedestrian Accessibility to Small Local Parks & Pocket Parks
Figure 5.2 - Pedestrian Accessibility to Local Parks
Figure 5.3 – Pedestrian Accessibility to District Parks
Figure 5.4 – Accessibility to Metropolitan Parks
Figure 5.5 - Areas Deficient in Access to Public Parks
Figure 5.6 - Provision of Other Open Spaces within Deficiency Areas
Figure 5.7 - Children’s Play Provision
Figure 6.1 - Quality of Open Space
Figure 7.1 - Structural and Amenity Role
Figure 7.2 - Landscape Designations
Figure 7.3 - Heritage Value
Figure 7.4 - Ecological Designations
Figure 7.5 - Natural Green Space Provision
Figure 7.6 - Distribution of Natural/Semi-Natural Green Space
Figure 7.7 - Deficiencies in Natural / Semi-Natural Green Space
Figure 7.8 - Open Space Value
Figure 7.9 – Relationship between Quality and Value
Figure 7.10 - Site Value Weightings
Figure 7.11 - Combining Quality and Value
Figure 8.1 – Allotment Distribution
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Atkins was commissioned by the London Borough of Havering in May 2004 to undertake an assessment of open space and sports facilities within the Borough. The study has provided a qualitative and quantitative audit and analysis of the supply of, and demand for, open space, indoor and outdoor sports provision in the Borough to inform the next stages of an Open Space Strategy.

This study has been prompted by the emergence of recent reports and guidance emphasising the value of assessing recreational and open space requirements, most notably Planning Policy Guidance 17 (PPG17, 2002) which encourages local authorities to adopt a methodology which assesses the wider recreational needs of the local community and make appropriate provision for sport and open space facilities in light of those assessments.

Volume 1 of the study includes an assessment of the quantity, quality and value of parks and open spaces in Havering and identifies whether provision is meeting local needs. It develops local standards and measures to address deficiencies in open space provision.

Demand assessments for playing pitches and indoor sports facilities in the Borough have also been an element of this study. These include all outdoor sports concentrating on those which depend on playing fields (football, rugby, cricket and hockey), as well as sports and leisure centres in the Borough.

National, regional and local strategies and initiatives provide a framework to influence the development of an Open Space Study. Sport, open spaces and recreation all contribute to people’s quality of life and consequently cross a number of national and local government competences including; planning, leisure and recreation, health, education and crime. The implications of the relevant strategies relating to the Borough have been considered.

ASSESSMENT OF LOCAL OPEN SPACE NEEDS

Differential levels of need within the Borough were considered based upon a number of objective demographic and socio-economic indicators which influence the open space needs of individual localities. Output areas which have high population and housing densities and high levels of deprivation were identified as the areas of greatest public open space need.
which may require a special approach to the development of standards or additional provision.

It is recommended that open space enhancement is prioritised in these areas due to the lack of access to private gardens and the overall density of development which means that there tend to be fewer amenity spaces, natural and semi-natural areas including urban trees particularly within the areas of highest density.

Perceptions of Open Space and Sports Need

A telephone survey of 1000 residents was undertaken to inform usage patterns and explore attitudes towards and perceptions of open space and sports facilities. The findings of this survey are being incorporated into the report and will inform the recommendations.

A postal survey of all clubs and facility providers has also been undertaken to inform the demand and supply assessment of playing pitches and sports facilities.

APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY

This study reviews the existing open space typology and public park hierarchy in line with recent guidance to provide a comprehensive basis for assessing the quantity, quality and accessibility of open spaces in Havering. The assessment is informed by an up to date audit of open spaces within the Borough.

Revised Open Space Typology

The open space typology used within the Borough has been reviewed, in the light of advice within PPG17, to consider the importance of all types of open space. During the site assessments each open space was classified with reference to the typology of open space types included within the Annex to PPG17. The identification of the open space type was based upon consideration of the primary role and function of individual spaces.

The existing parks hierarchy concept outlined in the adopted UDP is used as a basis for the consideration of the provision for and access to larger public open spaces. However, a revised hierarchy is proposed which redefines the classification and includes a description of the role, function and quality of each park type as these factors influence the likely recreational value of the park to its catchment community.

Other Types of Urban Greenspace

There are a number of other forms of urban greenspace provision within the Borough in addition to public parks. These have been categorised according to nine different types of
urban greenspace: Provision for children and teenagers; Amenity Green Space; Outdoor Sports Facilities / Playing Fields; Allotments / Community Gardens / Urban Farms; Cemeteries and Churchyards; Natural or Semi-Natural Urban Greenspaces; Civic spaces / pedestrianised areas; Green Spaces within Grounds of Institution; and Other.

Standards of provision have been developed for the following categories of other open space where it is important that local needs are provided for locally on a consistent basis:

- Provision for children and teenagers;
- Outdoor sports fields and playing field needs;
- Natural or semi-natural greenspace;
- Allotment provision.

Within certain areas of the Borough amenity greenspace and other types of open space form an integral part of the urban fabric and contribute towards local character and distinctiveness. For this reason it is not appropriate to define consistent quantity or access standards relating to such provision. Within areas of deficiency other forms of urban greenspace provision such other open spaces can be of particular value and represent possible opportunities for meeting local deficiencies.

LOCAL STANDARDS

A series of locally based open space standards will be recommended based upon the findings of the assessment of local open space needs. The open space study has considered the supply, quality and value of all types of open space provision within Havering and levels of demand for playing pitches, indoor sports facilities and allotment provision. The analysis of local needs has also informed an open space hierarchy for public park and natural and semi-natural greenspace provision within the Borough.

Assessing Needs and Opportunities, the companion guide to PPG17, recommends that local authorities set local provision standards which incorporate a quantitative, qualitative and accessibility component.

The standards relating to each type of open space provision which are required to meet the needs of the Borough up to 2016 are identified below and summarised in a table at the end of Chapter 9.

EXISTING OPEN SPACE PROVISION

Within Havering a total of 316 open spaces were identified following a comprehensive survey in Autumn 2004 of all open spaces, public and private, greater than 0.25 ha in size. Together these spaces comprise a total of some 1747 ha. Privately owned outdoor sports
facilities, including golf courses, represent the largest proportion of open space in terms of area (20% of total open space area) and Metropolitan Parks the second largest open space type area in the Borough (18%).

83 public parks were identified from the 316 open spaces surveyed. These have been classified according to the typologies indicated in the revised parks hierarchy. Overall public park provision comprises a total of 43% of all open space within the Borough.

**Distribution and Access to Public Parks**

Distribution and access to public parks has been considered using three indicators: consideration of the distribution of parks by ward/population; consideration of indicative threshold populations for different parks within the typology; and application of park catchments to the current distribution of public parks within the Borough.

The study identifies areas deficient in access to all public parks as classified by the parks hierarchy. Parks deficiency areas have been derived by considering pedestrian access to any form of public park. Those areas of the Borough which are deficient in public parks are defined as those which are further than 800m from any public park. This assessment takes account of areas which are served by public parks located beyond the Borough boundary.

**QUALITY ASSESSMENT**

The range and condition of facilities within each open space was assessed using a scoring criteria method derived from the Green Flag assessment system, where 0 is considered to be very poor and 10 is considered to be excellent.

The assessment identifies that, whilst larger public parks such as Bedford Park, Hornchurch Country Park and Havering Country Park tend to score consistently high at 7-8 (good-very good) in most categories, smaller parks which fall under the category of Local Parks or Small Local Parks tend to score lower at around 5-6 (fair). An important aspect to a qualitative assessment is the need to integrate decision-making on park improvements with the assessment of quantity and accessibility of provision. In areas deficient in public open space and where there are limited opportunities to increase supply, either by the creation of new spaces, or by increasing access to private spaces, the only way of addressing deficiency will be to ensure that the potential of existing spaces is fully realised where appropriate and there is improved access to them where possible.
Proposed Standards for Public Park Provision

Quantitative component

At present there is public park provision within the Borough of 3.32 ha per 1,000 population. All parts of the Borough are within the catchment area of a Metropolitan Park. It is recommended that existing levels of provision are maintained. At 2016, provision of Metropolitan Parks will equate to 1.34 ha/1000.

For other types of public park provision a public parks standard of 1.84 ha per 1,000 population is proposed for new development in the Borough based upon established levels of provision per 1,000 population and the additional provision required to address existing deficiencies in public park access.

The standard also takes into account the projected rise in the population of the Borough.

Accessibility Component

Following analysis of current park usage patterns obtained by Resident’s Survey, it is recommended that all residents should have access to public park provision of some form within 800m of home.

Qualitative Component

Public parks within the Borough should be of adequate quality and provide the range of facilities associated with their respective tier of the parks hierarchy. Those public parks which either under perform in terms of their value to the local community or their quality (as measured the Green Flag Assessment criteria) should be improved consistent with the guidelines identified.

Access to Children’s Play Provision

This study has identified the areas deficient in access to formally provided children’s play provision but also identifies other publicly accessible open spaces which may have the potential to incorporate dedicated children’s play facilities and help reduce the deficiencies. It is recommended that residents should have access to 0.8 ha per 1,000 population of children’s play provision consistent with the NPFA play area size standards. Provision could take the form of dedicated open space provision or form part of an other type of publicly accessible open space (e.g. public park, natural or semi-natural greenspace).
In addition, it is recommended that all residents within the Borough should have access to areas of formal and informal play provision for children and teenagers within 400m from home.

ALLOTMENTS

The role of allotments is in a period of transition and their value is undergoing reappraisal. More recently interest in allotments has increased due to public awareness of ‘green’ issues and concerns over links between food and health. Modern housing developments are also being developed with smaller garden sizes which may stimulate demand for community gardens and allotments. Demographic changes including a larger number of older, but relatively healthy individuals could also stimulate demand for allotment plots as allotment participation is highest amongst the over 50s.

The study has also looked at the supply and demand of allotments in the Borough. It is recommended that a standard of 0.18 ha of allotment land per 1,000 population is adopted to meet the needs of the Borough up to 2016. In order to meet this standard of 43.21 ha of allotment land (an additional 9.21 ha) would need to be brought forward up to 2016.

In addition, it is recommended that all households within the Borough should have access to an allotment garden within 800m of home.

Although the need for additional allotment provision is identified opportunities for bringing forward provision are likely to only exist in conjunction with new development and changes to the management of existing open spaces within the Borough. There is also a need for a redistribution of provision to better reflect the needs of the Borough.

VALUE

The benefits and value of open spaces to local communities extends beyond their active recreational role. Both public and private open spaces perform recreational and non-recreational roles contributing to community and quality of life. An assessment of the value of open spaces has been undertaken which considers the context within which the open space lies, the level and type of use associated with the space and the wider benefits it generates for people, biodiversity and the wider environment.

The following types of value have been examined by the study:

- The context of the open space including local open space needs, park deficiencies, site access arrangements and barriers of access to and within the open space;
- The recreational function performed by the open space;
The structural role of open space in separating and defining communities;

The amenity value of space;

Historical / Heritage value of spaces;

The ecological and environmental roles performed by spaces;

The existing and potential educational value of spaces to the community; and

The cultural roles spaces perform (e.g. community venues, performance spaces).

Natural/Semi-Natural Greenspace

The following access standards are recommended for adoption in line with standards published by English Nature within ‘A Space for Nature’ in 1996:

- All residents within the Borough should have access to a designated ecological site or natural or semi-natural greenspace of at least 2ha in size within 300m of home;

- All residents within the Borough should have access to a designated ecological site or natural or semi-natural greenspace of at least 20ha in size within 2km of home.

- All residents within the Borough should have access to a designated ecological site or natural or semi natural greenspace of at least 100ha within 5km of home.

Where it is not possible to achieve the above levels of provision the quality of sites <2ha should be improved or contributions should be directed to improving linkages to existing or planned accessible natural greenspaces within the Borough and surrounding urban fringe area.

PLAYING PITCH AND SPORTS FACILITIES ASSESSMENT

The supply of playing pitches and sports facilities within the Borough has been assessed following a comprehensive programme of audits.

The findings of the site appraisals have been compared and verified with supply and demand information provided by the Council and the findings of postal surveys of clubs and facility providers undertaken as part of this study.
To provide an in depth assessment of local playing pitch needs, an assessment following the stages of the Sport England Playing Pitch Model has been undertaken. This approach uses surveys of actual demand to assess the number of pitches required to meet local needs. Quantity and accessibility standards have been proposed on the basis of this assessment.

The sports facilities assessment is based on the Sport England Facilities Planning Model type adapted to reflect local circumstances and the findings of the club and residents surveys.

**Quantitative standard**

It is recommended that the Council adopt a minimum standard of **0.74 ha of pitch space per 1,000 population** which is the minimum required to meet the needs of the Borough up to 2016.

**Accessibility standard**

It is recommended that all residents within the Borough should have access to a site providing football pitch provision in secure community use within 1200km from home

The Council should prepare a playing pitch and sports facilities strategy and action plan in order to identify solutions to any quantitative and qualitative deficiencies identified within the assessment.

**POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS**

The Study provides comprehensive information on each open space surveyed to allow an informed assessment of the impact of development proposals on the value of individual open spaces. Planning decisions should have regard to the analysis undertaken on current levels of provision, the identified deficiencies and the quality and value of the open spaces within or surrounding a development site.

It is recommended that proposals for new housing development should be accompanied by proposals to improve open space provision. The nature of such improvements should reflect the additional open space needs generated as a result of the proposed development.

If the proposed development is located within an identified area of deficiency for public park, children’s play, playing pitch, natural greenspace or allotment provision, it should be necessary for additional land to be brought into the relevant open space use. The developer could be asked to make a contribution towards the provision of the open space. It may be appropriate for such provision to be incorporated within the curtilage of the development. Alternatively a contribution to off-site provision may be appropriate.
If the proposed development is not located within an area which is deficient in either quantity or access to open space provision, it is recommended that consideration should then be given to any deficiency in open space quality or value. The developer could be required to make a contribution towards the enhancement of the quality of open space provision including the range facilities and their condition.

**Green Network**

A “green network” approach for the Borough summarises existing provision, needs and local deficiencies and provide a diagnostic tool for identifying priorities for open space improvements on a spatial basis. The network can be used to inform and to develop an open space strategy for the Borough and assist the Council in realising its vision for parks and open spaces.

The identification of a green network also provides a basis to consolidate the existing green network within Havering and looks at ways of providing further linkages between presently remote sites. The Green Network Plan also identifies links between the Green Arc, Thames Gateway Green Grid and the Thames Chase Community Forest. The ultimate aim will be to provide links into the adjoining authorities and a London-wide green network.

**AREAS WITH PROVISION ABOVE MINIMUM STANDARDS**

The study considers provision within areas where the minimum standards of open space provision and evaluates whether the sites are likely to represent sites which are surplus to requirements.

**NEXT STAGE**

The open space standards proposed within the study should be used to formulate planning policies within the forthcoming Local Development Framework.

The results of this study and the open space consultation should inform the preparation of an Open Space Strategy and a Playing Pitch Strategy. These strategies will include action plans to identify timescales, relevant stakeholders and potential funding sources.
1. INTRODUCTION

BACKGROUND

1.1 Atkins was commissioned by the London Borough of Havering in May 2004 to undertake an assessment of Greenspaces, Sport and Recreation Facilities within the Borough. The purpose of the study has been to produce a qualitative and quantitative audit and analysis of the supply and demand for, open space, indoor and outdoor sports provision in the borough. It also includes the preparation of three interlinked strategies based upon the findings of the assessments.

1.2 This study has been prompted by the emergence of recent reports and guidance emphasising the value of assessing recreational and open space requirements. According to Planning Policy Guidance Note 17 (PPG17, 2002) on Sport, Open Space and Recreation, local authorities should adopt a methodology which assesses the wider recreational needs of the local community and make appropriate provision in the light of those assessments. The study is set in this national and regional framework and aims to support and inform the following local initiatives:

- To inform the development of the forthcoming Local Development Framework;
- To provide a strategy and action plan for enhancing provision;
- To inform management of the public open spaces.

1.3 The need for a study has also been highlighted through the pressures for the development on recreational space, such as landowners seeking to sell the land that accommodates sports pitches for development, sports clubs rationalising facilities, and increasing participation rates in sport and recreation activities.

1.4 The lack of coordinated and accessible information on the type and quality of facilities is preventing an informed assessment of these formal and informal recreation needs and opportunities.
1.5 The process was also informed by undertaking telephone interviews with 1000 residents which provided an insight into local perceptions and use of open spaces and sporting facilities within the Borough and consultation with sports clubs and facilities providers.

**SCOPE OF THE STUDY**

1.6 The aim of the Havering Open Space Study is to assess and analyse the quantity and quality of existing open spaces, the varied functions of open spaces and the needs of local people.

1.7 The results of this analysis will:

- Inform the review of the UDP;
- Provide the Council with adequate planning guidance and open space standards;
- Assist the Council in identifying needs for new open spaces and outdoor sports facilities;
- Inform the future management of open spaces and sports facilities including the identification of opportunities to enhance and reconfigure open space provision;
- Enable the Council to identify priorities for future investment and provide a rationale to secure external funding for the improvement and additional provision of facilities particularly via developer contributions.

1.8 Volume 1 of the study includes an assessment of the quantity, quality and value of parks and open spaces in Havering and identifies whether provision is meeting local needs. It develops local standards and measures to address deficiencies in open space provision. The findings from the Residents’ Survey are fed into this report, which also informs the Havering Open Space strategy documents.

1.9 A full list of all open spaces in Havering is illustrated in Figures 1.1. Sites are illustrated by ownership in Figure 1.2 and in relation to wards in Figure 1.3.

1.10 Demand assessments for playing pitches and other sport and recreation facilities in the Borough have also formed part of this study (Volume 2). These include all outdoor sports concentrating on those sports which depend on playing fields (football, rugby, cricket and hockey), as well as all sports and leisure centres in the Borough. These assessments will enable the Council to establish whether the Borough is meeting demand for these sports.
Volume 1: Open Space Assessment

1.11 This element of the Open Space study has been undertaken in four phases:

- Phase 1: The National, Regional and Local Framework
  A desk top study looking at the national, regional and local initiatives and an analysis of the local context.

- Phase 2: Assessment Of Supply
  Looking at the quantity and quality of the open spaces in the Borough and identifying opportunities for improvement and enhancement.

- Phase 3: Assessment Of Demand
  Identifying strategic, borough-wide concerns and assessing the demand for playing pitches.

- Phase 4: Recommendations to inform Strategy
  Analysis of strategic demand and supply resulting in recommendations for the protection and enhancement of existing spaces to inform the Open Space Strategy and guide policy development.

STRUCTURE OF THIS REPORT

1.12 This report follows the structure of the approach starting with a review of the current national, regional and local strategies, guidance and initiatives in Chapter 2, an assessment of local open spaces needs and priorities in Chapter 3. Chapter 4 outlines the approach to planning open space provision and Chapters 5 and 6 provide an assessment of the quantity and quality of the supply of open space in the Borough. Chapter 7 considers the different roles that open spaces play and Chapter 8 provides a demand assessment for allotments. Chapters 9 and 10 build on the results of the study to identify open space standards and the development of a Green Network. The report concludes with a summary of conclusions and recommendations in Chapter 11.
2. NATIONAL, REGIONAL AND LOCAL FRAMEWORK

INTRODUCTION

2.1 National, regional and local strategies and initiatives provide a framework to influence the development of an Open Space Strategy. Sport, open spaces and recreation all contribute to people’s quality of life and consequently cross a number of national and local government competences including; planning, leisure and recreation, health, education and crime. Table 2.1 illustrates the relationship of the Strategy process to other guidance, strategies and initiatives.

NATIONAL POLICY

Urban White Paper

2.2 In November 2000 the Government published its Urban White Paper “Our towns and cities: the future - Delivering an urban renaissance”. The White Paper recognises that well managed public open spaces improve the attractiveness of urban areas and help to promote a healthier lifestyle. It also highlights the need for improvements in their management and maintenance.

2.3 The White Paper identifies the need for more imaginative thinking about open space planning and design and proposes three key areas of action:

- Development of a shared vision for the future of our parks, play areas and open spaces;
- Improved information on the quality and quantity of parks and open spaces and the way in which they are used and maintained;
- Improved planning and design of new parks, play areas and public spaces and the management and maintenance of existing ones.

2.4 This study will provide the up to date information and analysis on open spaces in Havering to inform the shared vision and improved management and protection measures.
2.5 The Urban Parks Forum and an Urban Green Space Task Force was established and given a remit to advise the Government on its proposals for improving the quality of urban parks, play areas and green spaces. To address the problem of the poor state of open space and recreation facilities the Urban White Paper promised new planning guidance on open space, sport and recreation (PPG17). It specifically referred to ‘parks, play areas and public spaces’, recognising that they were "vital to enhancing the quality of urban environments and the quality of our lives".

PPG17 – Sport, Open Space and Recreation

2.6 According to Planning Policy Guidance Note 17 on Sport, Open Space and Recreation published in July 2002. Open spaces, sport and recreation underpin people’s quality of life and are fundamental in delivering broader Government objectives, these include:

- **Supporting an urban renaissance** – local networks of high quality and well managed and maintained open spaces, sports and recreational facilities help create urban environments that are attractive, green and safe. Green spaces within urban areas perform vital functions as areas for nature conservation and biodiversity and by acting as ‘green lungs’ can assist in meeting objectives to improve air quality;

- **Supporting rural renewal** - the countryside can provide opportunities for recreation and visitors can play an important role in the regeneration of the economies of rural areas. Open spaces within rural settlements and accessibility to local sports and recreational facilities contribute to the quality of life and well being of people who live in rural areas;

- **Promotion of social inclusion and community cohesion** - well planned and maintained open spaces and good quality sports and recreation facilities can play a major part in improving people’s sense of well being in the place they live. As a focal point for community activities, they bring together members of deprived communities and provide opportunities for people for social interaction;

- **Health and well being** - open spaces, sports and recreational facilities have a vital role to play in promoting healthy living and preventing illness, and in the social development of children of all ages through play, sporting activities and interaction with others; and

- **Promoting more sustainable development** – by ensuring that open space, sports and recreational facilities (particularly within urban areas) are easily accessible by walking and cycling and that more heavily used or intensive sports and recreational facilities are planned for locations well served by public transport.

- Source: PPG 17, 2002
2.7 In establishing the value of existing recreational facilities to the community and the need for new facilities, PPG17 recommends that Authorities should undertake robust assessments of the existing and future needs of their communities for open space, sports and recreational facilities. Guidelines describing how such assessments should be completed are set out in ‘Assessing Needs and Opportunities: A Companion Guide to PPG17’ (ODPM, 2002). This study addresses almost all of the issues pertaining to playing pitches and allotments which are identified in the guide.

2.8 The guidelines recommend that audits of local open space needs should:

- Cover the differing and distinctive needs of the population for open space and built sports and recreational facilities including those working in and visiting areas;
- Include audits of existing open space, sports and recreational facilities including usage, accessibility, costs and opportunities for new open space and facilities. Audits should establish the quantity and quality of spaces; and
- Identify specific needs and quantitative or qualitative deficits or surpluses.

2.9 PPG 17 advises Local Authorities to use the information gained from their assessment of needs and opportunities to set locally derived standards for the provision of open space, sports and recreational facilities in their areas. Such standards form the basis for redressing quantitative and qualitative deficiencies through the planning process. The Companion Guide to PPG17 provides guidance as to how Local Authorities should identify and apply provision standards based upon assessments of local need.

2.10 Research undertaken by Atkins on behalf of the London Planning Advisory Committee (LPAC, 2000) identified that whilst standards may provide a useful basis for comparison, it is generally considered that on their own, standards are inadequate in addressing a wide range of mainly qualitative factors that include issues such as sustainability and biodiversity, accessibility and socio-economic trends in planning and also the changing use and function of open space.

2.11 The assessment of demand is not a precise science and many of the established standards are essentially intuitive rather than based on up to date research into how people use open space.

Approaches to Planning Open Space Provision

2.12 The recently published PPG17 and Regional Planning Guidance for London (RPG3) advises local authorities to draw up their own open space standards including
standards for outdoor pitch sports for inclusion within their UDP. Such standards should be based upon a robust and defensible assessment of local needs.

2.13 The Transport, Local Government and the Regions select committee in its report “Public Spaces: The Role of PPG17 in the Urban Renaissance” (February 2002) and PPG 17 both emphasise the need to recognise the multiple roles which open spaces perform and their relevance to the Government’s wider objectives for the urban renaissance and the quality of life.

**Urban Green Space Task Force**

2.14 The Urban Green Space Task Force was set up in January 2001 to advise the Government on its proposals for improving the quality of urban parks, play areas and green spaces and take forward the open space proposals outlined in the Urban White Paper “Our Towns and Cities: the future”. Its objective is to create green spaces which are safe, accessible and sustainable and which cater for everyone. The use of innovative partnership working is encouraged. The Task Force recognises the importance of working with local communities to ensure high quality design and maintenance of these areas.

2.15 Its Final Report “Green Spaces, Better Places” was published in May 2002 together with its sister document “Improving Urban Parks, Play Areas and Green Spaces”. Whilst the report emphasises a comprehensive and integrated approach towards open space several of the recommendations relating to management and resources are applicable to allotments and open spaces with an element of outdoor sports provision.

2.16 The report recommends long term strategies for managing supply and demand of open space in order to meet continuing social and demographic change. Furthermore, open space and recreation should occupy a more prominent role within wider corporate strategies to support community needs such as safety, health and services for children and young people, elderly people and those who are disadvantaged.

2.17 The work of the Task Force also includes consideration of more integrated approaches to planning, designing, managing and maintaining green spaces, linking these to community strategies, local development plans, cultural strategies and area plans. It has researched the potential for improved partnerships and the creation of good practice networks to improve current practice.
Strategy for Sustainable Development

2.18 The Second annual report on the Strategy for sustainable development “A Better Quality of Life” was published in March 2002. Sustainable development is now at the heart of local authority decision-making and long-term planning. The Local Government Act 2000 has given Councils the duty of preparing Community Strategies for promoting and improving the economic, social and environmental well-being of their areas and contributing to the achievement of sustainable development in the UK.

2.19 These strategies will involve all key local partners through local strategic partnerships which will be the main vehicle for delivering Neighbourhood Renewal and Community strategies building on the success of Local Agenda 21.

2.20 The Sustainable Development Strategy sets out a number of factors which are needed to build sustainable communities in our cities, towns and rural areas including:

- Meeting people’s social needs: promoting better health, housing and access to services and recreation;
- Improving local surroundings: revitalising town centres and tackling degraded urban environments;
- Reducing crime and the fear of crime;
- Addressing problems of poverty and social exclusion in the most deprived communities;
- Making it easier for people to get involved in their communities; and
- Co-ordinating policies to bring these objectives together.

Sports Policy and Strategy

2.21 Sport England is the agency responsible for advising the Government on sports matters. It also acts as a statutory consultee on certain developments relating to sports pitches. In addition it is responsible for distributing several sources of funding and fostering:

- Promotion of social justice in sport;
- Increased sports participation;
- Development of community sports programmes and facilities; and
• Appropriate planning for sport and recreation.

2.22 Further reference to Sport England Guidance is made throughout this document where appropriate. The most relevant documents relating to playing pitch management and provision and the role of playing pitches in regeneration initiatives are:

• Towards a Level Playing Field (2003)
• Planning Across Boundaries: Guidance on Local Strategies for the Development of Sport (2001);
• Playing Fields for Sport Revisited (2000);
• Sport and Regeneration (2001); and
• Planning Policies for Sport (1999).

2.23 The Cabinet Office has also been taking an increasing interest in sport through the Social Exclusion Unit and Performance and Innovation Unit.

2.24 The Government’s Policy Action Team report (PAT 10) on the contribution of the arts and sport to regeneration found that participation and the provision of services to support participation in sport can help address neighbourhood renewal by improving communities performance on the four key indicators of more jobs, less crime, better health and improved educational attainment. It also recognised that sport can play a significant role in strengthening local community cohesion. The report placed importance on connecting the sports development agenda with the rest of the social inclusion and community development agenda.

2.25 The Government’s Performance and Innovation Unit is currently undertaking a project on Government policy in relation to sport. It notes that sports participation can bring beneficial impacts to the participant including:

**Health** – regular physical activity can significantly reduce the incidence of heart disease, stroke and some cancers and improve function and coordination, reducing the risk of accident and injury – especially amongst older people. Sports based physical activity is also beneficial to mental health, with the benefits strongest for participation in team sports;

**Education** – OFSTED reports in May 2000 found that schools that focused on sport and physical education raised academic standards more rapidly than their counterparts. They have also found that sport can reduce social exclusion, improve attendance records, and become hubs of community sports development; and
Social Exclusion – Evidence exists to suggest that participating in sporting activities increases people’s sense of integration into their local community. This community integration is then in turn likely to have beneficial outcomes such as reducing crime and increasing educational attainment.

REGIONAL POLICY

2.26 Regional Planning Guidance 3 (RPG3, 1996) sets out the framework for consideration of open space by London Boroughs in relation to their UDP’s. In addition to seeking the protection of Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land, RPG3 emphasises the contribution that London’s open spaces make to the quality of the environmental and quality of urban life.

2.27 The Greater London Authority (GLA) has now completed the Spatial Development Strategy which replaced RPG 3 as the strategic planning framework for open space at regional level. The London Plan, published in Feb 2004, reinforces the guidance provided in RPG 3. In particular it:

- Recognises the importance and value of London’s open space network in its widest sense and encourages Borough’s to develop functional and physical linkages between open spaces and improve accessibility to open space based on local needs;

- Advises Borough’s to develop local standards as set out in the open space hierarchy, to identify broad areas of open space deficiency and to identify priorities for improvement based upon assessments of local need;

- Re-emphasises the need for Borough’s to resist development of Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. Borough’s are also encouraged to protect local open spaces that are of value or have potential to be of value to local communities; and

- Encourages the production of open space strategies at Borough level to protect, create and enhance open spaces in accordance with the forthcoming GLA Guide to Open Space Strategies.

2.28 This study has been undertaken in parallel with the preparation of the GLA’s Guide to preparing Open Space Strategies, which was published in March 2004. The Guide recommends the following framework for the preparation of an Open Space Strategy.
In November 2001, the GLA’s green spaces investigative committee called on the mayor to create a London parks forum to find more money and improve the protection and management of green spaces. The London Parks and Greenspace Forum has recently been established and will work in partnership with other organisations to gather data, share information and experience and secure funding.

**SUB REGIONAL INITIATIVES**

**The Green Arc**

The ‘Green Arc’ is a strategic initiative aimed at significantly improving the environment and accessibility of the Green Belt open space and countryside around the north and east of London and in the Southern parts of Hertfordshire and Essex (incorporating all of the London Borough of Havering). The concept was conceived during 2002, and Land Use Consultants were commissioned by the Green Arc Steering Group to produce a Project Report on the Green Arc (2004). The Green Arc is intended to link the Green Grid initiatives in Thames Gateway with the green infrastructure proposed for the London - Stansted - Cambridge growth area projects. It has the following vision:

“Bringing the big outdoors closer to people through the creation and protection of an extensive, attractive and valued recreational landscape of well connected and accessible countryside around London, for people and wildlife.”
2.32 It is our understanding that the steering group is currently in the process of appointing a Project Director, to take the project forward. The aforementioned Project Report also recommended that a project plan should be produced, to provide the overall working strategy for the partnership. The initiative has the potential to guide, integrate and inform the various strategies mentioned below.

**East London Green Grid**

2.33 The Green Grid Initiative was identified in RPG9a as a potential mechanism for improving the environmental quality of the area. In 2003 funding was obtained to start working up detailed proposals for the East London Green Grid. The Green Grid Strategy is a long term project to develop a vast network of existing and new green space which link parks, commons and nature reserves across town centres and major residential and commercial areas.

2.34 The Strategy is underpinned by the belief that green spaces are more than an aesthetic backdrop to the built environment. When designed creatively and they are properly managed, they can bring a number of cross-cutting benefits to the local community, including their potential contribution towards improving public health, linking communities, attracting investment, managing flood risk and encouraging biodiversity. Greening the Gateway outlines the government vision for ensuring that publicly accessible green spaces are integrated into regeneration plans for the Thames Gateway.

**Greening the Gateway**

2.35 This non-statutory document reflects government policy and is intended to provide guidance to inform the more detailed strategies being prepared to deliver *Greening the Gateway*. The Thames Gateway Partnership supports the Green Grid, and provides support for conservation, enhancement and education within areas developing networks of green corridors and open spaces. The two overriding objectives of *Greening the Gateway* are:

- That a network of varied and well-managed greenspace should be the setting for new and existing residential and commercial areas;

- That the landscape should be regarded as functional green infrastructure, recognising wide range of potential benefits from healthy recreation, to wildlife protection and enhancement and flood risk management.
The initiative aims to improve linkages between the north and south of the Borough, and in particular existing greenspace projects within Havering and potential green grid / infrastructure networks

**Thames Chase Community Forest – The Thames Chase Plan**

2.36 The Thames Chase Community Forest was established as one of 3 trial community Forests in 1990, through the initiative of the then Countryside Commission. The primary objective of the national programme of Community forests is to achieve major environmental improvements around towns and cities supporting natural biodiversity, with associated provision for access, leisure and education, with the aim of more attractive places in which to live, do business and enjoy leisure time.

2.37 The Thames Chase Community Forest covers some 40 square miles, part of which covers the London Borough of Havering. It is leading the way in providing a framework for the conservation and creation of large areas of wetland, grassland and woodland in the Borough. Community forests are planned to be a mosaic of wooded landscapes, in addition to other uses including farmland, meadows, nature areas, river areas, river valleys and other publicly accessible open spaces. One of the implications of this is that land ownership within the forest is diverse. The Community Forest has been in existence since 1990, as one of 12 community forests around England, and comprises a 14-strong partnership of organisations. The objectives of the Thames Chase are established in the Thames Chase Plan, first published in 1992 and fully revised in 2000).

2.38 The Thames Chase Plan includes a number of development proposals relating to Havering:

- Stubbers Adventure Centre – potential to create a woodland setting to compliment the activities at the centre;

- Warley Hill – offers an opportunity to create a woodland screening the M25 adjacent to Jermains Wood, using natural regeneration to help extend the ancient woodland.

- Creation of a new community woodland will be developed on the edge of Cranham in partnership with the Woodland Trust accessible to local residents;

- Screen planting along the M25 and A127 will be developed;
• Large scale woodlands should be developed at Pages Farm.

2.39 These proposals have been integrated within the Green Network plan in Chapter 10.

LOCAL POLICY

Community Strategy

2.40 Havering Strategic Partnership, in association with Havering Council, published Havering’s Community Strategy in 2002 with the intention of improving the overall quality of life in Havering.

2.41 The Strategy looks forward within a five year period (to 2007) by establishing a vision to work towards; ‘Putting people first by creating the best opportunities, the best environment and the best public services that we can for everyone who lives, works or visits here’.

2.42 To achieve this vision, six themes have been identified to develop and deliver commitments and key actions. These six themes are:

• Increased community participation

• Better health and welfare

• A more prosperous community

• Improved lifelong learning

• A safer community

• A quality environment

2.43 Several objectives to improve the quality of life have been established under the six themes outlined above. Some of the objectives most relevant to this report include:

• Improve people’s health and the quality of life

• Improve the range and quality of affordable leisure and cultural opportunities

• Improve the range and quality of facilities and support for community activities
Protect, maintain and improve the quality of streets and open spaces

Protect and care for wildlife, and improve the green environment

Walking / Cycling Strategies

2.44 It is understood that the Council does not currently have any specific policies regarding walking or cycling.

Local Open Space Planning Framework - Unitary Development Plan (UDP)

2.45 Havering Council published its adopted UDP in 1993 and now under a process of review. This report will assist in the preparation of the Local Development Framework.

2.46 The purpose of the UDP is to guide development in the Borough by setting out a framework of policies and proposals against which planning applications and development proposals will be assessed.

The UDP sets out policies to ensure that open spaces are protected and enhanced. The most relevant policies relate to the following issues:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leisure and Recreation</th>
<th>The Environment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retention and Enhancement of existing Leisure Facilities</td>
<td>Environmental Improvement Schemes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouragement of Dual Use of School Facilities</td>
<td>Protection of Trees and Woodland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retention of Open Space</td>
<td>Protection of SSSIs and Nature Reserves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allotments</td>
<td>Public Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Chains</td>
<td>Nature Conservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal Recreation in the Countryside</td>
<td>Protection of Common Land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to the Countryside</td>
<td>Thames Chase Community Forest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational Water Activities</td>
<td>Green Belt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational Facilities</td>
<td>Restriction of development within the Green Belt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Encouragement of Wildlife Habitats</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.48 The report sought to conduct a short but intensive review of all of Havering’s leisure services and facilities including parks. A review of the range of existing facilities, community needs, possible funding sources and potential new management arrangements took place where by operational issues were identified, for this study the most relevant issues raised included:

**Sports**

- The need for a sports development strategy;
- Poor use of existing facilities;
- Need for improved quality of facilities;
- Need for improved school club links;
- Net spending per head well below London average

**Parks**

- Lack of a long term strategy and effective planning;
- The need for clarification of the role of parks and their relationship with other activities;
- Nature Conservation given a low priority;
- Parks have low profile;
- Below average no. of playgrounds reaching minimum standards;
- Good / over provision of sports pitches;
- Lack of information in parks;
- Poor quality of facilities within parks / below average no. of playgrounds reaching minimum standards;
The Review suggests that Havering develop a parks strategy that recognises the different roles of different parks. This report will be able to assist in the development of such a strategy.

**Havering Biodiversity Action Plan**


The Plan concentrates on specific species and habitats that are characteristic of Havering.

Each species is given a brief background, an explanation of its current status as well as factors affecting the species. Action currently taking place to preserve the species is also listed. However, no general Borough-wide measures intended to preserve or enhance biodiversity are listed.

**South Havering Draft Environmental Strategy**


The Strategy had the sole aim of ‘to provide environmental regeneration to the area of benefit, especially the south of Havering’, and in order to achieve this set out three main objectives

- To promote the conservation, protection and improvement of the environment
- To provide facilities in the interest of social welfare and for leisure and recreation
- To promote the education of the public in matters relating to the environment, its protection, conservation and improvement

The Strategy then lists a number of restoration and afforestation projects along with a number of public access improvements to existing open spaces.
Regeneration Initiatives

2.56 Havering has major opportunities for regeneration with over 200 acres of brownfield land earmarked for development.

2.57 Havering represents a substantial proportion of the Thames Gateway which is increasingly focused on outer east London to provide development opportunities for the future growth of the Capital.

2.58 ‘An Urban Strategy for London Riverside’, adopted by Heart of Thames Gateway Ltd but contributed to by Havering Council, sets out a brief strategy on how London Riverside, which is largely within the southern end of the Borough, can adapt to change in the near future.

2.59 One of the points raised by the Strategy which is most relevant to this report is the opportunity to capitalise on the River Thames, surrounding open spaces and nature conservation in wild spaces such as Rainham, Wennington and Aveley Marshes. A framework of green corridors and routes to the river is planned for this area of Havering.

CROSS-CUTTING BENEFITS

2.60 The Urban Green Spaces Task Force Report states that “strategic planning for parks and green spaces must take place alongside strategies for housing, community development and safety and economic regeneration” (p10). Local authorities should recognise that most open space, with good planning and management, can perform multiple functions. Amongst the most important are:

Recreation

- Parks and open spaces provide the setting and facilities for formal and informal recreation. From walking the dog to playing football or bowls, it is important that people have a wide range of activities to choose from.

Culture, Education and Tourism

- Many spaces form an important part of London’s cultural heritage and are places where cultural activities take place. These activities can include community events, shows, carnivals and firework displays. The educational value of parks is also important. Many schools make use of nearby open spaces for ecology and sporting purposes.

Economic Development and Regeneration
• Relevant council programmes should be including green space as an essential aspect of neighbourhood regeneration. Such space can significantly enhance the quality of life, promote community spirit and attract business and residents to an area.

Visual Amenity

• Neglect can turn green spaces into eyesores. However, well maintained green spaces can provide variety in the urban scene and provide an outlook for those living nearby. They also contribute to a general appreciation of a local environment.

Community Identity

• Parks and other open green spaces can contribute to a sense of community ownership, pride and belonging.

Health

• Parks can be promoted to encourage exercise and as places for quiet and relaxation, they also provide a ‘lung’ of fresh air away from the traffic and pollution of the roads.

Environment and Biodiversity

• There are possibilities for biodiversity in even the most built up areas of the Borough. Some sites may have potential to be corridors for flora and fauna. Green space also plays a role in collecting water run-off from developed sites helping to mitigate against flooding.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

2.61 This study is based on the national, regional and local open space planning framework and takes into account new government thinking on sustainable development and the role that parks play in the quality of life of residents.

2.62 It recognises that most open space, with good planning and management can perform multiple functions and provide a variety of benefits which cut across the Council’s strategic priorities. An Open Space Strategy is vital to bring all those who are responsible and have an interest together with a common purpose and a shared understanding of what can be done to enhance and maintain green space for the future.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTEXT</th>
<th>KEY RELATIONSHIPS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DTLR: Urban Green Spaces Taskforce, Neighbourhood Renewal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DTLR: Urban Green Spaces Taskforce, Green Spaces Better Places (2001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DTLR: Improving Urban Parks, Play Areas and Open Spaces (May 2002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ODPM: Living Places, Cleaner, Safer, Greener (October 2002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social Exclusion Unit PAT 10 Report – Arts and Sport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DCMS: Local Culture Strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DfES: Education Development Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban Parks Forum: Public Parks Assessment (2001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Urban Landscape Transnational Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DEFRA: Strategy for Sustainable Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National Playing Fields Association: The Six Acre Standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RPG3: Regional Planning Guidance for London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GLA: Green Spaces Investigative Committee, Scrutiny of Green Spaces in London (2001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LPAC: London Open Space Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Heart of Thames Gateway: An Urban Strategy for London Riverside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-regional Programmes</td>
<td>Greening the Gateway and Thames Gateway Green Grid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thames Chase Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Green Arc Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Havering Corporate</td>
<td>Havering Corporate Asset Management Plan 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statutory Plans</td>
<td>Unitary Development Plan (adopted) 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Havering Council Strategies, Studies and Service Plans</strong></td>
<td>Havering Environmental Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Havering Community Strategy (2002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Havering Local Agenda 21 (1997)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leisure Property Study (2004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South Havering Draft Environmental Regeneration Study (1999)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Havering Crime and Disorder Audit (2002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community and Stakeholder Groups, Citizens Panels, Sports clubs, ‘Friends’ groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Departmental e.g. park and nature conservation management plans</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

INTRODUCTION

3.1 The Companion Guide to PPG17 identifies that it is impossible to identify local needs properly without involving local communities. In order to identify the needs of the community a telephone survey of residents within the Borough was undertaken to inform the study. The findings of this Residents’ Survey are summarised here and have been considered within this study.

3.2 In addition to considering attitudes and perceptions of needs and priorities a review was undertaken of a number of objective indicators which influence open space needs.

PERCEPTIONS OF OPEN SPACE NEED

3.3 In November 2004 1,000 residents of Havering were interviewed in a telephone survey. The objectives of the survey were as follows:

- To identify groups of residents which use open spaces and sports facilities;
- To assess patterns of usage and determine the purposes for which the open spaces and sports facilities are used;
- To explore attitudes towards and perceptions of open spaces and sports facilities;
- To identify reasons for non-use; and
- To determine issues, problems and potential improvements that could increase usage of Havering’s open spaces and sports facilities.

3.4 As reported in the Urban Green Space Task Force (UGSTF) reports, use and perceptions of open spaces and sports facilities are likely to vary between particular demographic groups (notably age, gender and ethnicity). The Havering survey also sought to identify whether use of and attitudes towards open spaces and sports facilities did in fact differ between several socio-demographic groups.
The Survey Report describes the methodology of the study in more detail. The main findings of the consultation relevant to this study are listed below. The detailed findings are incorporated into the relevant chapters of Volumes 1 and 2;

**Use of Open Spaces**

- 76% of respondents take part in some sporting or recreational activity on a weekly basis, although only 41% of respondents typically spend more than 3 hours participating in indoor and outdoor sports/recreation, 44% being male and 38% female. 52% of 16-24 year olds compared with 32% of over 60s participate in this amount of activity.

- 67% visit either a country park or large open space at least once a year, use of these spaces does not vary according to area in which respondents reside but youngest and oldest respondents are less likely to visit these spaces than the remaining groups. Overall, 61% of males and 73% of females visit these types of spaces. Harrow Lodge Park was the most frequently mentioned park (11%), followed by Bedfords Park (6%), Hornchurch Country Park (6%), Upminster Park (6%) and Raphael Park (6%).

- 39% of residents take walks in the countryside, although only 22% of those aged 17-24 year olds participate in this form of activity. 17% walk dogs in the countryside. Residents living in North Romford are most likely to use this form of open space recreation (42%).

- 20% of respondents visit smaller local parks, these spaces are more popular amongst female respondents and least popular with older respondents (over 60).

- Outdoor sports facilities are used by only 14% of respondents. Male and younger respondents are more likely to use these spaces. Males are more likely to participate in this form of activity.

- Only 3 respondents were allotment users, making it difficult to draw conclusions on this type of space.

- Overall, 24% of respondents don’t use open spaces, this includes 21% males and 26% females. Patterns of non-use also vary by age with 38% of those aged over 60 represented as non-users compared to 10% in the 16-24 age group. In most sub areas non users represent 28-29% of users, however, within Hornchurch and Upminster and Cranham sub areas non users represent non users represent 13% and 16% of respondents.
• Respondents tend to make the most frequent visits to open space types in closest proximity to home. 26% use smaller local parks several times a week compared to 20% who visited country or larger parks several times a week.

• Respondents who visit outdoor sporting facilities are most likely to stay for the longest period of time (more than 2 hours). Users of cemeteries (54%), amenity areas (64%) and children’s play areas (23%) are most likely to stay for less than 30 minutes.

Reasons for Visits

• The most popular reason for visiting open spaces is walking (39%) followed by children’s play (30%). A significant percentage of respondents also use open spaces to get fresh air (18%), exercise (16%), to walk their dogs (17%) and participate in sport (14%) indicating that spaces within the Borough support a wide range of recreational roles.

• Males are more likely than females to cite exercise as a reason, females are more likely than males to visit open spaces in order to play with their children. Older respondents are more likely to cite sitting out and relaxation as a reason (11%), while younger respondents are more likely to visit an open space to meet friends or participate in sport.

Mode of Travel

• The car (42%) and walking (53%) are the most popular means of travelling to open spaces. The more local open spaces tend to be reached on foot, while more people tend to drive to open spaces which could be slightly further afield. Few respondents travel by modes such as bus or train. Country / larger parks receive the largest proportion of visitors who cycle (4%).

Quality of Open Spaces

• The majority of respondents consider the parks and open spaces they use to be good quality (64% good or very good). The types of spaces perceived to be of the greatest quality were Natural greenspace areas (75% Very good or good) and country parks (68%). Smaller open spaces receive less positive quality scores (49% small parks and 36% amenity space).
Satisfaction with Open Spaces

- Respondents were asked to identify whether they were satisfied with levels of open space provision in their area. Overall, 68% of respondents were either very satisfied or satisfied. 14% were dissatisfied or very dissatisfied. Respondents from North Romford (19%), Central Romford (19%), South Havering (18%) are less likely to be satisfied than those residing in other sub areas.

Quality of Life

- The majority of respondents recognise that the open space in their local area does contribute to their quality of life. 75% of respondents feel that local spaces contribute a lot/a little to their quality of life. 85% of open space users were represented within this category compared with 44% of non–users. Respondents living in the Central sub area (Romford) and North Romford had the lowest levels of respondents identifying that open spaces make a positive contribution with only 48% and 42% of respondents identifying a positive contribution. Only 3% of respondents feel that these spaces under perform a lot in this aspect.

Non-use

- Few respondents identified problems with the parks and open spaces themselves as a deterrent to use but instead suggested that non-use was determined by personal constraints such as poor health (15%), time constraints (32%), disability (12%), lack of interest (13%), too far (4%), safety fears (14%).

Improvements

- Of the improvements suggested, the most frequently mentioned relate to cleaning up of the environment in terms of removing litter / graffiti and dog mess (32%), other suggestions included improved safety (25%), park wardens (23%), 10% more / improved benches / litter bins and 10% more / improvements to sports facilities.

ASSESSMENT OF LOCAL OPEN SPACE NEEDS

3.5 There are a number of objective indicators which influence levels of open space need within the Borough.
Demographic Profile

3.6 The demographic profile of a borough has a direct influence on sport participation levels and open space usage as people’s involvement in sport generally varies according to age. Table 3.1 illustrates the demographic profile of the London Borough of Havering compared to the London and England average.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Cohort</th>
<th>Total in Age Cohort</th>
<th>% Havering</th>
<th>% London</th>
<th>% England</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 – 4</td>
<td>12,429</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 – 7</td>
<td>8,588</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 – 9</td>
<td>5,965</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 – 14</td>
<td>14,655</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>2,813</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 – 17</td>
<td>5,626</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 – 19</td>
<td>5,038</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 – 24</td>
<td>11,735</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 – 29</td>
<td>13,173</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 – 44</td>
<td>49,414</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 – 59</td>
<td>43,977</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 – 64</td>
<td>11,162</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 – 74</td>
<td>21,198</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 – 84</td>
<td>14,258</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85 – 89</td>
<td>2,911</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90 &amp; Over</td>
<td>1,306</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>224,248</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Census (2001)

3.7 Table 3.1 reveals that Havering has comparable proportion of children under the age of eighteen residing in the Borough compared to the national average. There is a slightly lower proportion of younger adults aged between 18 and 44 year olds residing in the Borough than within London and England as a whole. Conversely, Havering has a greater proportion of residents over 45 than England as a whole, with the proportions of retired residents significantly higher. One of the consequences of the Borough’s demographic profile is that the demand for certain sports in Havering may be slightly lower than the national average, due to the fact that younger people generally have higher participation rates in sport.

3.8 Research undertaken by RSGB (2003) and Hayslip and Panek (1989) has investigated the use of public parks in England with regards to Social Inclusion. The findings from the study found that open space use varied according to age: younger age groups being more likely to use parks than older ones:
“The extent and nature of participation in leisure and recreation change with a person’s age. Generally speaking, participation in leisure activities declines with age, although there are variations according to one’s income level, personality, interest, health condition, ability level, transportation, education level and a number of social characteristics.”

3.9 RSBG found that those between the age of 25 and 44 were found most likely to make use of a given open space, with 70% of respondents claiming to have used a park during the course of the last year.

3.10 Due to the fact that Havering has a slightly lower proportion of people aged between 25 and 44 residing in the area than the national average (28% compared to 29%), one would expect the various open spaces in the area to experience a slightly lower level of demand. This trend is compounded by the fact that the Borough has a higher proportion of people living in the area above the age of 65.

Ethnicity

3.11 The ethnic profile of Havering must also be considered as it is likely to have an influence on sport participation levels in the Borough. Table 3.2 demonstrates that the Borough has a significantly lower proportion of non-white inhabitants (8%) than the London average (29%).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Group</th>
<th>Population Havering</th>
<th>% Havering</th>
<th>% London</th>
<th>% England</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White: British</td>
<td>206,365</td>
<td>92.0</td>
<td>59.8</td>
<td>87.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White: Irish</td>
<td>3,390</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White: Other White</td>
<td>3,666</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed: White and Black Caribbean</td>
<td>827</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed: White and Black African</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed: White and Asian</td>
<td>705</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed: Other Mixed</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Asian British: Indian</td>
<td>2,756</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Asian British: Pakistani</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Asian British: Bangladeshi</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Asian British: Other Asian</td>
<td>659</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or Black British: Caribbean</td>
<td>1,554</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or Black British: African</td>
<td>1,377</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or Black British: Other Black</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>886</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Ethnic Group</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>224,248</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Census (2001)

---

Hayslip and Panek; 1989, as cited in Pigram et al; 2003, p51
3.12 All ethnic populations, apart from Asian or Asian British Pakistani, are lower in Havering than the London average. The largest populations other than White (all) as identified by the 2001 census are Black, or British Black, Caribbean (0.7%) and Black or Black, or British Black, African.

3.13 In October 2000, Sport England published the results of its national survey of sports participation and ethnicity which considered participation rates for the top ten sports by ethnic group. The survey found that ethnic minority groups had an overall participation rate of 40% compared with a national average of 46%. Despite this overall trend, regular participation in football amongst ethnic minority groups exceeded participation rates amongst the population as a whole for both men and women. Participation was highest amongst Black, Black African and Black Caribbean groups. For cricket there is a more mixed picture with regular participation rates amongst Pakistani, Indian, Black Other and Bangladeshi groups exceeding the national average. Rates amongst the other ethnic groups were below the national average.

3.14 RSGB also found that the use of parks varied with regards to ethnic groups. The findings strengthen the notion discussed above that those from Black and Ethnic Minority communities are less likely to participate in sport-related activities compared to white people. This information is shown in Table 3.3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>White %</th>
<th>Black and Ethnic Minority %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.15 Given that there is not a high proportion of non-white inhabitants in Havering, demand for parks in the Borough may be greater when compared to areas characterised by higher percentage of non-white residents.

**OPEN SPACE NEED INDICATORS**

3.16 Several indicators have been derived to show variations in open space need within the Borough. These are described below and highlighted in Figures 3.1-3.6.
Population Density

3.17 Population density represents an indicator of open space need as it provides an indication of access to public open space in its widest sense including civic spaces, amenity greenspaces and parks and the availability of private open space in the form of back gardens and yards.

3.18 Figure 3.1 indicates population density by Census Super output area derived from the 2001 Census. The measure of density used is dwellings per hectare which has been calculated from the total population divided by average household size within the Havering (2.3 persons per household) divided by area of the census super output area. The density indicators shown in Figure 3.1 relate to gross densities including all open space, infrastructure etc.

3.19 Figure 3.1 shows that lower population densities are predominantly located around the fringes of the Borough, more markedly in the south and western segment of Havering (Harold Wood, Cranham, Upminster and Rainham). The higher densities are distributed in a line of “clusters” along the eastern part of the Borough and in the north (Gooshays and Heaton). Medium population densities predominantly spread from the middle of the Borough (St Andrew’s) northward.

3.20 The Interim Housing Density Guidance document adopted by the Council in April 2003 provides guidance on the residential densities to be sought in new development. The density guidelines for Havering are based upon an adapted version of the London Plan Density-Parking matrix, density guidelines vary according to factors including public transport accessibility, house type, setting (central, urban, suburban) and whether the site lies within a Conservation Area or Special Policy Area.

3.21 The Guidance identifies 6 PTAL zones which have the greatest potential to increase densities. Romford town centre has the greatest potential to accommodate new residential development. It is recommended that development will take the form of terraced housing or apartment blocks. For terraced housing developments in Romford it is recommended that population densities should range between 55 units to 175 units per hectare; while flats should range from 80 units to 435 units per ha. Wards to experience moderate increases in development, at locations close to town centres and rail stations, are Upminster, Hornchurch, Upminster Bridge, Gidea Park, Harold Wood and Elm Park. Capacity has been forecast for detached (30-65 units per ha), terraced (50-110 units per ha) and apartment block development. The rest of the Borough is to have density ranges of between 30 and 80 units per hectare.

---

2 At a lower density range of between 80 and 150 dwellings per ha.
with a detached or terraced capacity. The areas with potential for increased residential densities are likely to experience increased need for open space provision if these areas coincide with existing deficiencies in access or quality. A framework to guide developer contributions for open space and sports provision should be used to identify the appropriate type and level of contribution.

**Housing Type**

3.22 Housing type is another indicator of open space need as, like density, it provides an indication of access to private open space in the form of gardens or yards. Figure 3.2 shows the percentage of dwellings within each ward which are either terraced houses, flats or apartments.

3.23 Out of a total of 444,155 dwellings located in the Borough, 26.3% are terraced, apartments, or flats. This compares with 49% in London as a whole, and just under 20% in England. This suggests that properties in Havering have a higher proportion of private open space than elsewhere in the country.

3.24 The highest proportion of terraced, flats, or apartments (51-70%) are situated along the north and eastern segment of the Borough. This helps to understand why the higher population densities are located here. The lowest provision of terraced, flats or apartments is located on the fringes in the form of a crescent beginning northward from Havering Park right through to Rainham and Wennington (it includes the following wards, Gooshays, Harold Wood and Upminster).

**Child Densities**

3.25 Child densities provide an indication of the need for children’s play provision within the City. The demographic information above demonstrates that Havering has a slightly lower proportion of children between 0-15 than the London average (18.5% compared with 19.1%), but is similar to that of England as a whole (18.3%). Figure 3.3 shows the % of the population within each ward aged 0-15 years old based on 2001 Census data.

3.26 The highest child densities are located to the north and south of Havering (patches found to the north in Mawney and Gooshays, and to the south in Rainham and Wennington). The lowest child densities are predominantly situated to the east in Upminster and patches to the north in Heaton and Havering Park.

---

3 There are zones where this density range does not apply, they are in the Emmerson Park; Hall Lane and Gidea Park Special Policy Areas, as well as Gidea Park Special Conservation Area and London Riverside.
Health

3.27 Recent best practice guidance identifies the contribution of open space towards healthy living. Open spaces have a preventative effect on ill health as a population which is healthy in mind, body and spirit is more productive and makes less demand on medical services. Green spaces help to reduce stress, provide formal and informal opportunities for physical activity and sport and provide environments for relaxation and stress relief.

3.28 Within Havering, parks and open spaces with public access provide potential benefits to health. The areas of the Borough which would benefit most from improvements in the quantity and quality of open space provision are those areas where levels of poor health are high. Figure 3.4 identifies the percentage of the population within each ward not in good health (derived from the 2001 Census). It demonstrates that there are high proportions of the population above the national average of 9%.

3.29 Figure 3.4 shows that the highest proportion of people in good health are located in a block spanning from the north-west to the south-east of the Borough. Emerson Park is the only ward showing to have the highest proportion of its population in good health (71-80% of its population has good health). The lowest proportion of people in good health is situated in the north (the ward of Heaton).

Indices of Deprivation

3.30 Research suggests that the propensity of people to participate in sport is influenced by the affluence of the area in which they live. Not only is the provision of sport facilities likely to be better in more affluent areas, but the level of disposable income that is available to spend on sport and leisure activities is higher.

3.31 Figure 3.5 shows the indices of deprivation of ranking for the Borough. It is evident that the poorest areas are clustered from centre of the Borough, spreading north-west, south-east and east ward. The ward with the highest proportion of deprivation is Cranham where indices of between 81-100% were recorded. The most affluent areas are located on the eastern fringe of three wards; Gooshays, Romford Town and South Hornchurch, where indices of between 0-20% were recorded.

Composite Assessment of Local Need

3.32 Differential levels of need within the Borough were considered based upon the above findings. Figure 3.6 provides a composite assessment of need based on areas which have relatively high gross residential densities (medium or high), areas which had levels of terraced/flatted dwellings above 31%, areas with above average child
densities (above 21%), areas with above average proportions of the population not in good health (under 70%) and areas in the top 0-40% Deprivation Index ranking. The greater the number of these criteria fulfilled, the greater the need for open space within the particular area.

3.33 Figure 3.6 illustrates that the areas that fulfil the greatest number of criteria, and therefore have a greater need for open space, are much of Hacton ward, western parts of Harold Wood ward, south western parts of Gooshays ward, much of the residential areas of Havering Park ward and Brooklands ward, western parts of Emerson park ward, eastern parts of Cranham ward and central Elm Park.

3.34 Town centre and more rural areas tend to generally fulfil fewer criteria, with more suburban estates in greater need for open space.

A VISION TO ADDRESS OPEN SPACE NEEDS

3.35 The review of existing policies and strategies at national, regional and local level, an objective assessment of open space indicators (based upon census data) and the findings of the residents survey of open space and sport facility usage patterns and perceptions provide a framework within which to derive open space standards which address local needs and priorities. The findings also provide a basis to develop a vision and objectives to address local needs. Chapter 10 identifies how the needs identified within the assessment can be taken forward.
4. APPROACH TO PLANNING AND OPEN SPACE PROVISION

INTRODUCTION

4.1 PPG17 and the London Plan advises local authorities to draw up their own standards for open space, sports and recreation provision for inclusion within their Local Plans. These standards should be based upon a locally based assessment of open space needs.

APPROACHES TO PLANNING OPEN SPACE PROVISION

4.2 PPG17 recommends that any assessment takes into account:

- The overall level of supply in Havering, including the degree to which provision meets needs from beyond the local authority boundary;
- The accessibility of locations;
- The level of usage of facilities;
- The particular functions which certain facilities may perform, for example as a meeting place for one age group or community;
- The potential for a recreational use to contribute to wider social or regeneration objectives for Havering;
- The potential for new use, for example by achieving dual use of a facility or by bringing a private open space into public use;
- The potential to focus improved recreational provision of a particular site, in preference to lower level use of less accessible locations.

4.3 The two main approaches traditionally used to assess open space needs are the National Playing Fields Association (NPFA) six acre standard and use of an open space hierarchy.
4.4 The NPFA standard relates playing space provision to population and recommends that there should be a minimum of 6 acres (2.43 hectares) of outdoor playing/recreational space per 1000 people. The standard recommends that the 6 acre provision is broken down to take account of the different needs of different age groups. This standard can be easily applied but takes little account of the distribution of open space and people’s access to it. The application of this standard to Outdoor Sports is discussed in more detail in Volume 2. Children’s play provision is assessed in Chapter 5.

4.5 Recreational roles can be either active/formal e.g. sports, or passive/informal e.g. dog walking. The activity may have dedicated provision e.g. sports pitches, or informal provision where there are no formal facilities but other evidence suggests an activity takes place. Non-recreational roles include the ecological, educational, social, cultural and amenity roles that an open space might play.

4.6 The Government’s companion guide to PPG17 ‘Assessing Needs and Opportunities’ (2002) recommends that the hierarchy approach can provide the basis to develop local standards as it identifies characteristics, size and effective catchment of different types of open spaces.

4.7 The London Plan (2004) encourages, in Policy 3D.11, Borough’s to undertake audits of existing open space and assessments of need, in accordance with the guidance given in PPG17, as part of the production of an open space strategy.

4.8 To assist in the production and preparation of such open space studies, the Greater London Authority has produced best practice guidance entitled ‘A Guide to Preparing Open Space Strategies’ (2004). This document recommends that a hierarchy approach is used, but adapts the approach used in PPG17 to best reflect the types of open space found within London (Figure 4.1).

4.9 However, it is recommended that local authorities develop their own open space typologies to reflect local characteristics and facilities and the recreational and non-recreational functions of open spaces. An understanding of the types of open space will provide a basis for analysing the results of the site audits and enable an assessment of whether the range and types of open space functions in the local area meet the needs of local people.

4.10 This study reviews the existing open space hierarchy in line with recent guidance to provide a comprehensive basis for assessing the quantity, quality and accessibility of open spaces in Havering.
SURVEY METHODOLOGY

Survey Design and Methodology

4.11 The survey of public, private and educational open space was undertaken during September and October 2004 by appropriately qualified planning and landscape consultants. A seven page survey pro-forma was developed to capture the key features and characteristics relating to each site. Many of the questions followed a criteria based approach to assessment informed by a survey guide to enable a consistent basis of assessment. The pro-forma and explanatory notes are attached as Appendix A.

4.12 Open space sites within the Borough were identified from the following information sources:

- A review of the Councils adopted UDP proposals map;
- The Council’s property register;
- A desk top assessment of Ordnance Survey mapping of Havering;
- A desk top assessment of aerial photography of Havering.

4.13 The resulting list of 354 sites was then reviewed by the Council. During the site visit phase, some sites were scoped out of the assessment if they had been incorrectly identified as an open space (such as junior school sites without playing fields or other areas of greenspace). Other sites, which were not included in the initial list of open spaces, were added to the list. The final number of open spaces included in the study is 316.

4.14 Open spaces which serve the needs of Havering residents but are outside of the Borough boundaries were also considered as part of the assessment. Along the western fringe of the Borough there are no significant deficiencies in access to public parks, children’s play provision or natural and semi-natural greenspace. Although there are no deficiencies, there are a number of spaces in the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham which meet the needs of Havering residents including:

- Central Park in Dagenham, (District Park); and
- Eastbrookend Country Park (Metropolitan Park).
4.15 Given the scale of the survey and resource limitations, the range of data collected on site was targeted towards those functions and characteristics which were necessary in order to fulfil the purposes of the brief and meet the requirements of national planning policy guidance. The main objectives of the study were:

- To collect information on total amount of open space and its distribution across Havering;
- To collect sufficient information on the function of each space to allow a classification to be made on the basis of the parks hierarchy and to inform an assessment of playing pitches;
- To collect sufficient information on the condition of facilities and landscape to allow an informed assessment of the quality and of each open space; and
- To collect sufficient information on the roles and functions performed by each site to allow an informed assessment of the value of open spaces.
- The study included all publicly accessible open spaces greater than 0.4ha in size, consistent with GLA guidance. Amenity space provision of less than a sub area basis (refer to chapter 7).

Approach to Analysis

4.16 The detailed approach to individual aspects of the analysis is explained within the relevant chapters. This report provides an analysis of key findings relevant to the UDP. The full findings of the site surveys are included within an electronic copy of the database which will allow more detailed analysis of the individual open spaces surveyed.

DEVELOPMENT OF AN OPEN SPACE HIERARCHY

4.17 Open space provision in Havering is currently classified according to a modified version of the former LPAC open space hierarchy. The LPAC hierarchy was used by most London Boroughs, at the time of UDP preparation in 1995.

4.18 The LPAC hierarchy has now been replaced by the GLA to reflect the provisions of PPG17 and adopted as part of the London Plan. The updated hierarchy, identified in Table 4.1, takes into account issues relating to the quality and accessibility of open space in London.
Open Space Typology

4.19 During the site assessments each open space was classified with reference to the typology of open space types included within the Annex to PPG17 (Table 4.4).

4.20 The identification of the open space type was based upon consideration of the size, its primary role and function, recreational value, access arrangements and physical character. The other roles performed by spaces are considered in Chapters 7 and 8.

4.21 Public parks were classified according to the GLA hierarchy, as illustrated in table 4.1.

Approach to Public Park Provision

4.22 The modified LPAC hierarchy previously used by Havering has now been updated by the GLA. The GLA’s best practice guidance ‘Guide to Preparing Open Space Strategies’ (2004), suggests that the updated hierarchy is used by London Boroughs when preparing open space strategies. For the purposes of consistency and cross-boundary thinking the updated hierarchy provided the basis for public park classification during the survey (Table 4.1).

4.23 The classification of parks within the different levels of the hierarchy was determined by the size of the space, the degree of public access, usage patterns and catchment area derived from the residents survey, the range of facilities provided, the physical character of the park and the recreational value of the space.

4.24 The term ‘Public Parks’ used within this assessment therefore refers to the six types of open space identified within Figure 4.1. Figure 4.1 illustrates the typology of open spaces within Havering. All of the open spaces classified as parks within the parks hierarchy are publicly owned (all by London Borough of Havering). The ownership of all open spaces in Havering is illustrated in Figure 1.2.
### Table 4.1 - GLA Public Park hierarchy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Open Space Categorisation</th>
<th>Approx Size of Open Space and Distance from Home</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Regional Parks and Open Spaces**  
(Linked Metropolitan Open Land and Green Belt corridors)  
Weekend and occasional visits by car or public transport | 400 hectares  
3.2 - 8 km | Large areas and corridors of natural heathland, downland, commons, woodland and parkland also including areas not publicly accessible but which contribute to the overall environmental amenity.  
Primarily providing for informal recreation with some non-intensive active recreation uses. Car parking at key locations. |
| **Metropolitan Parks**  
Weekend and occasional visits by car and public transport | 60 ha  
3.2 km or more, where the park is appreciably larger | Either i) natural heathland, downland, commons, woodland etc, or ii) formal parks providing for both active and passive recreation.  
May contain playing fields, but at least 40 hectares for other pursuits. Adequate car parking. |
| **District Park**  
Weekend and occasional visits by foot, cycle, car and short bus trips | 20 ha  
1.2 km | Landscape setting with a variety of natural features providing for a wide range of activities, including outdoor sports facilities and playing fields, children’s play for different age groups, and informal recreation pursuits. Should provide some car parking |
| **Local Parks**  
Pedestrian visits. | 2 ha  
0.4 km | Providing for court games, children’s play spaces or other areas of a specialist nature, including nature conservation areas. |
| **Small Local Parks and Open Spaces**  
Pedestrian visits especially by children, particularly valuable in high density areas | 0.4- 2 ha  
Less than 0.4 km | Gardens, sitting-out areas, children’s play spaces or other areas of a specialist nature, including nature and conservation areas. |
| **Pocket Parks**  
Pedestrian visits especially by children. | Under 0.4 ha  
Less than 0.4km | Gardens, sitting-out areas, children’s play spaces or other areas of a specialist nature, including nature and conservation areas. |
| **Linear Open Spaces**  
Pedestrian visits | Variable  
Where feasible | The Thames, canals, other waterways and associated open spaces and towpaths; paths; disused railways; nature conservation areas; and other routes which provide opportunities for informal recreation.  
Often characterised by features or attractive areas which are not fully accessible to the public but contribute to the enjoyment of the space. |
### Table 4.2 - Differences between existing UDP public park hierarchy and the GLA London Plan public park hierarchy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Open Space</th>
<th>Havering UDP hierarchy</th>
<th>Greater London Authority Planning Guidance- Parks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Parks</td>
<td>Typically over 60 ha</td>
<td>Typically over 60 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.2km from home</td>
<td>3.2 km from home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Parks</td>
<td>Typically 20-60 ha</td>
<td>Typically 20 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2km from home</td>
<td>1.2 km from home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Parks</td>
<td>Typically 2-20 ha</td>
<td>Typically 2 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within 800m from home</td>
<td>Within 400m from home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Local Parks/ Open Spaces</td>
<td>Less than 2ha</td>
<td>Typically 0.4-2ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within 800m from home</td>
<td>Within 400m from home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pocket Parks</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Under 0.4 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Within 400m from home</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.25 The key differences between the current UDP hierarchy and the GLA are illustrated in Table 4.2. The main difference between the two hierarchies are the different catchment areas relating to Local Parks and Small Local Parks (The adopted Havering UDP recommends an 800m catchment area for Small Local Parks and Local Parks whereas the GLA hierarchy recommends a 400m catchment area). The existing Havering Parks Hierarchy does not include a category relating to Pocket Parks. Table 4.3 illustrates the differences between the two hierarchies in terms of the number of parks.
Table 4.3 - Number of parks classified under each park type when using the current UDP hierarchy and the GLA hierarchy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Park Type</th>
<th>Number of parks - Current UDP hierarchy</th>
<th>Number of parks – GLA hierarchy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regional Parks</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Parks</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Parks</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Parks</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Local Parks/ Open Spaces</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pocket Parks</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.26 Table 4.3 shows the number of parks within the upper levels of the hierarchy is lower when compared with the current Havering hierarchy, this is partly due to the introduction of the small local parks and pocket parks categories. In addition the revised classification of spaces reflected not only its size but also the range of functions supported. Where the spaces did not have the appropriate range of facilities required for a particular park category, such as children's play and other recreation, the space was then classified according to the facilities currently provided. For example, a space over 20ha would meet the size requirements for a District Park but, if it did not provide recreation facilities associated with the GLA definition of a District Park it would be classified as a Local Park. Large spaces of this type have the potential to be upgraded to District Park status with the introduction of additional facilities.

4.27 It is recommended that the categories used within the GLA hierarchy are used within the Council’s forthcoming Local Development Framework. Chapter 5 reviews the appropriate size and accessibility (catchment) levels to be used within a revised Havering parks hierarchy.

Range of Facilities Provision within Public Parks

4.28 Park quality and attractiveness of parks is an important factor in people’s use of open spaces. The PPG17 companion guide recognises the importance of the predisposition of individuals to use parks and relative attraction of different parks. A highly motivated and mobile user may be prepared to travel further to reach a park than the average person, while another person living immediately adjacent to the same park may never visit it at all.
4.29 The variety of user demands or aspirations are recognised as a fundamental principle of the Parks Hierarchy (Table 4.1). However, in practice even if an area is not deficient in open space it may be that the open space leaves certain recreational needs unmet. Table 4.4 shows the range of facilities provided within Havering by type of public park.

### Table 4.4 - Park Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park Type / Features</th>
<th>Pitch Sports Dedicated</th>
<th>Court Based Sports Dedicated</th>
<th>Other Activity Dedicated</th>
<th>Putting</th>
<th>Paddling Pool</th>
<th>Skateboard Facility</th>
<th>Sheltered Seating / youth shelter</th>
<th>Toilets</th>
<th>Refreshments / Cafe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District Park</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Park</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Park</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pocket Park</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Local Park</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.30 Table 4.4 shows that some public parks do not provide the full range of typical facilities that would be expected for that type of park. The potential for increasing the range of facilities should be undertaken on a park by park basis taking into account the character of the parks and proximity of other parks which may have an oversupply of certain facilities. Chapter’s 6 and 7 examine the quality of provision and different roles the open spaces play in more detail. A framework for guiding future investment is also provided through relating the quality and value of spaces to existing and future needs.

4.31 Chapter 10 identifies measures for addressing qualitative deficiencies through targeted enhancements to the existing green network.

### Other Types of Open Space

4.32 In addition to public parks there are a number of other forms of open space provision within the borough. These have been categorised according to nine different types of open space as defined within Table 4.5 (taken from the Annex to PPG17).
Table 4.5 - Other Open Space Provision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Open Space</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Provision for children and teenagers (incorporated into public park hierarchy)</strong></td>
<td>Play areas (including LAPs, LEAPs and NEAPs), skateboard parks, outdoor basketball goals and ‘hanging out’ areas (including teenage shelters).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Amenity Green Space</strong></td>
<td>Includes informal recreational spaces and housing green spaces. This category would include green spaces in and around housing areas, large landscaped areas, and domestic gardens.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outdoor Sports Facilities / Playing Fields</strong></td>
<td>Those sites which are not located within a public park and which the primary role is for formal recreation. Sites include tennis courts, bowling greens, sports pitches, golf courses, athletics tracks, school playing fields, other institutional playing fields and outdoor sports areas. Categorise by ownership i.e. public/private/education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Allotments / Community Gardens / Urban Farms</strong></td>
<td>Open spaces where the primary use is allotment gardening or community farming.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cemeteries and Churchyards</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Natural or Semi-Natural Urban Greenspaces</strong></td>
<td>Woodland (coniferous, deciduous, mixed) and scrub, grassland (e.g. downland, meadow), heath or moor, wetlands (e.g. marsh, fen), open and running water, wastelands (including disturbed ground), bare rock habitats (e.g. cliffs, quarries, pits).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Civic spaces / pedestrianised areas</strong></td>
<td>More formally laid out hard surfaced public spaces including squares, pedestrian streets, sitting out areas and space surrounding the docks. These spaces would not normally have a formal recreational function.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Green Spaces within Grounds of Institution</strong></td>
<td>Open space located within the grounds of hospitals, universities and other institutions which are accessible to the general public or some sections of the public. This definition also includes education sites where there is only hard surface and or amenity open space (no pitch sports provision).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
<td>Agricultural Land and former airfields which perform a structural or amenity role.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.33 It is necessary to set locally based standards of provision for the following categories of open space where it is important that local needs are provided for locally on a consistent basis:

- Provision for children and teenagers (refer to Chapter 5);
- Outdoor sports fields and playing field needs (refer to Chapter 5 and Volume 2);
• Natural or semi-natural greenspace (refer to Chapter 7);
• Allotment provision (refer to Chapter 8).

4.34 It is not possible to set Borough-wide standards of provision for the remaining types of open space provision. However, amenity greenspace and civic spaces should be integrated within new areas of residential, mixed use and commercial development within the Borough. Chapter 7 considers amenity greenspace provision in more detail.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

4.35 It is considered that the use of the GLA open space hierarchy is the most appropriate basis of planning open space in Havering. This study has used this approach to address the issues identified in PPG17. However the size and access criteria to be used in conjunction should reflect the Havering context. These issues are considered further in Chapter 5.
5. ASSESSMENT OF SUPPLY

INTRODUCTION

5.1 This chapter examines the current supply of public parks and provision for children and teenagers within the Borough through the application of the hierarchy defined in the previous chapter. It provides the following:

- An analysis of the current provision in terms of its quantity and accessibility;
- Benchmarking of existing provision against ideal levels of provision and levels of provision in other Borough's;
- A recommended access standard for each level of the parks hierarchy based upon analysis of existing and future open space need, existing usage and travel patterns, and the potential to introduce additional spaces to address deficiencies;
- Application of the proposed access standard to identify deficiencies in provision, in terms of access to parks; and
- Analysis of existing children’s play provision and identification of appropriate standards to meet existing and future needs in terms of quality and access.

EXISTING OPEN SPACE PROVISION

5.2 Within Havering a total of 316 spaces were identified using the methodology described in Chapter 4. Together these spaces comprise some 1747.27 ha of land within the Borough.

5.3 Table 5.1 indicates that private outdoor sports facilities and playing fields are the most common form of provision representing 20.2% of total open space area. Metropolitan parks have the second largest land take representing 18.2% of all open space area. In terms of the number of spaces, playing fields and outdoor sports facilities for educational use represent the most common form of open space provision in Havering with 71 sites.
5.4 A summary of open space provision within the Borough by type and ward is included within Appendix B. Where spaces lie within 2 or more wards the space was attributed to the ward which included the greatest proportion of the space.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Open Space Type</th>
<th>No. Spaces</th>
<th>Area (ha)</th>
<th>% Total Open Space</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Park</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>318.32</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Park</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>107.89</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Park</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>145.79</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Local Parks / Open Space</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20.38</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pocket Park</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear park/open space</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>149.18</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Park Provision</strong></td>
<td><strong>83</strong></td>
<td><strong>744.78</strong></td>
<td><strong>42.6</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amenity Green Space</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>27.61</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cemeteries and Church Yards</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>55.19</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural and semi-natural greenspace</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>218.55</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Sports Facilities / Playing Fields (public)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>55.37</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Sports Facilities / Playing Fields (private)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>352.59</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Sports Facilities / Playing Fields (education)</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>240.34</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allotments and community gardens</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>33.80</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Spaces and pedestrianised areas</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenspaces within grounds of institution</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18.84</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Other Space Provision</strong></td>
<td><strong>233</strong></td>
<td><strong>1002.49</strong></td>
<td><strong>57.4</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Open Space</strong></td>
<td><strong>316</strong></td>
<td><strong>1747.27</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PUBLIC PARK PROVISION

5.5 Table 5.1 shows the number of public parks within the Borough by type. There is a total of 744.78 ha of public park provision within Havering. Public parks constitute 42.6% of the total open space area. In order to derive an appropriate quantitative standard of public park provision a number of indicators have been reviewed including:

- Levels of existing open space provision by ward and the Borough as a whole;
- Indicative population thresholds required to support each type of park provision;
- Analysis of the size of parks within each level of the hierarchy to test the appropriateness of size ranges identified within the GLA Parks within the Havering context;
Comparative benchmarking of existing open space standards and levels of public park provision in other outer London Boroughs.

Open Space by Ward

5.6 Overall within the Borough there is 7.79 ha of open space and 3.32 ha of public park provision per 1,000 population. However, Table 5.2 demonstrates that the levels of provision vary significantly between wards. The overall level of public park provision ranges between 0.39 ha per 1,000 in Romford Town to 13.9 ha per 1,000 in Havering Park.

Table 5.2 – Open Space by Ward

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>Total Park Space* (Ha)</th>
<th>Total Open Space (Ha)</th>
<th>Public Park Area per 1,000 Population (Ha)</th>
<th>Total Open Space Area per 1,000 Population (Ha)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brooklands</td>
<td>19.47</td>
<td>13024</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>6.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cranham</td>
<td>22.58</td>
<td>12242</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>6.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elm Park</td>
<td>158.46</td>
<td>12048</td>
<td>13.15</td>
<td>14.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emerson Park</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>11396</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>2.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gooshays</td>
<td>33.52</td>
<td>13991</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>14.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hacton</td>
<td>12.25</td>
<td>12494</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>2.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harold Wood</td>
<td>50.17</td>
<td>12004</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>5.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Havering Park</td>
<td>173.11</td>
<td>12366</td>
<td>13.99</td>
<td>17.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heaton</td>
<td>34.19</td>
<td>11778</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>5.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hylands</td>
<td>14.26</td>
<td>12380</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>3.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mawney</td>
<td>23.13</td>
<td>12556</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>3.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pettits</td>
<td>22.72</td>
<td>12831</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>11.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rainham and Wennington</td>
<td>12.71</td>
<td>12114</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>8.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romford Town</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>13200</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Hornchurch</td>
<td>12.98</td>
<td>12,592</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>5.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Squirrel's Heath</td>
<td>12.96</td>
<td>11780</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>2.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Andrew's</td>
<td>56.96</td>
<td>12,778</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>6.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upminster</td>
<td>75.70</td>
<td>12674</td>
<td>5.97</td>
<td>18.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>744.78</td>
<td>224248</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>7.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Total park space includes the sum of the following for each ward: Linear Park/ Open Space, Metropolitan Parks, District Parks, Local Parks, Small Local Parks/ Open Spaces and Pocket Parks.

Source: Population data taken from 2001 Census

5.7 It should be recognised, however, that ward level comparisons are potentially misleading and should be viewed in the context of overall levels of open space provision and the pattern of land uses within each ward. For example, Elm Park has 13.15ha of public park provision per 1,000 population because the ward includes 2 Metropolitan Parks; Site no.45 (The Brettons) and site no. 31 (Hornchurch Country
However, neighbouring Rainham & Wennington ward has just 1.04ha of public park provision per 1,000 population. When these figures are looked at in isolation, the residents of Elm Park seem to have access to far more public park provision than their Rainham & Wennington counterparts. However, the 2 Metropolitan parks within Elm Park are located on the border between the two wards and so access to these spaces from the south of the Elm Park is as adequate as access to these spaces from the North of Rainham & Wennington.

5.8 The quantity of provision at ward level should not be viewed in isolation from the deficiency maps indicating accessibility to public park provision (refer to Figure 5.5).

5.9 The public park provision figures listed in Table 5.2 include Metropolitan Park provision. The 4 Metropolitan Parks within Havering are much larger than other park provision within the Borough and are located within just 2 wards; Havering Park and Elm Park. Because Metropolitan Parks are larger and accommodate a wider range of functions, they usually serve a larger catchment area (as indicated in Table 4.2), where as smaller parks will serve a much more local catchment area. When analysing public park provision by ward it is therefore useful to compare park provision levels with and without Metropolitan parks, which skew the amount of park provision by ward and average levels of provision for the Borough as a whole.

5.10 Table 5.3 illustrates public park provision by ward excluding Metropolitan park provision. The table also groups wards together by sub-area in order to gain an indication of public park provision on a slightly larger scale. These ward groupings help overcome the cross boundary problem identified with ward level comparisons.
Table 5.3 – Park Provision by Sub Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub Area/Ward</th>
<th>Public Park per 1,000 pop</th>
<th>Public Park (excluding Metropolitan Parks) per 1,000 population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Romford</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Havering Park</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mawney</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>1.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pettits</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>1.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7.87</td>
<td>1.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harold Hill and Harold Wood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heaton</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gooshays</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harold Wood</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>4.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>3.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooklands</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romford Town</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Squirrel's Heath</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hornchurch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hylands</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Andrew's</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>4.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hacton</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>2.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upminster</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emerson Park</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cranham</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>1.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upminster</td>
<td>5.97</td>
<td>5.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>2.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Havering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elm Park</td>
<td>13.15</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Hornchurch</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rainham and Wennington</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5.01</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>1.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.11 It is evident from Table 5.3 that average public park provision falls from 3.30ha per 1,000 population to just 1.99ha if Metropolitan Parks are excluded from the analysis.
5.12 The most serious deficiencies, in terms of quantity of public park per 1,000 population are located within the Central and South Havering sub-areas. The Central sub-area has 0.99ha of public park provision per 1,000 population whilst the South Havering sub-area has 1.01ha of public park provision per 1,000 population. Although this rises to 5.01ha per 1,000 population when the 2 Metropolitan Parks in Elm Park are included. This means that the sub area is not particularly well provided for in terms of smaller parks which serve a more local catchment area although the Metropolitan Parks do perform this role for those living within 800m.

Indicative Park Thresholds

5.13 The indicative threshold population for each type of public park type within the Borough was derived by calculating the area of each catchment and applying average population densities for the built up area of the Borough (excluding the Green Belt and marshes area). At present there is a population density of 52 persons per ha. Table 5.4 shows the indicative threshold population for parks within the hierarchy. Local and Small Local Parks typically serve a catchment with a population of some 11,000 people or 4,800 households. District Parks have a catchment threshold of some 25,000 people.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catchment Type</th>
<th>Size of catchment area (ha)</th>
<th>Rounded Threshold Population</th>
<th>Rounded Threshold Households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>800m radius (Local, Small Local and Pocket Parks)</td>
<td>201.06</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>4,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1200m radius (District Parks)</td>
<td>452.39</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>10,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3200m radius (Metropolitan Parks)</td>
<td>3216.99</td>
<td>177,000</td>
<td>77,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N.B Threshold populations rounded to nearest 100

5.14 From the size of the threshold population within each type of catchment area, it is possible to establish the theoretical level of provision that would be necessary to meet the needs of the whole Borough. Table 5.4 demonstrates that a small local park, with a catchment area of 800m will serve approximately 11,000 people. This means that Havering, with a 2016 population of 230,900 would need 58 small local parks in order to serve its entire population. Table 5.5 identifies differences in actual public park provision levels and minimum theoretical levels.
Table 5.5 –Comparison of public park provision and indicative park population thresholds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park Type</th>
<th>Current provision</th>
<th>Number of parks required (based 2001 population density)*</th>
<th>GLA Min Park Size (ha)</th>
<th>Minimum Area of Parks required (based on 2001 pop density)(ha)*</th>
<th>Area of Current provision (ha)*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pocket, Small Local and Local</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>168.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>318</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: * Rounded to nearest whole number

5.15 Table 5.5 demonstrates that, assuming the population is evenly spread, parks were no larger than the minimum size and that park catchments did not overlap, that the Borough would be adequately provided with Pocket Parks, Small Local Parks and Local Parks and Metropolitan Parks but would be underprovided with District Parks. It is important to understand that this is a theoretical exercise, as the population density will vary throughout the Borough and catchment areas will never fit perfectly together without overlapping. The average size of open spaces within Havering is greater than the minimum identified within GLA standards.

Size of existing spaces

5.16 The range of open space sizes within each park category was reviewed to ensure it was broadly consistent with the GLA size parameters. Although there were a few outliers within each category which were slightly larger or smaller than the GLA size threshold and range, the spaces performed the spaces retained within the appropriate park category if the relevant functions associated with the space were represented within the space.

ACCESSIBILITY OF PUBLIC PARK PROVISION

5.17 To identify a locally based access standard for public park provision we have reviewed the appropriateness of using the catchment distances recommended at the regional level in the GLA Parks hierarchy. To establish a locally based access standard it is necessary to consider a range of indicators to identify how well the existing distribution of provision meets the needs of the community:

- Consideration of the distribution of parks by ward/population (considered above);
• Examination of existing patterns of open space access by park type considering the mode of transport and travel times;

• Consideration of existing access patterns by age and gender and sub area within the Borough to identify under served groups/areas;

• Identification of community perceptions of existing levels of open space provision, and analysis of the perceptions of open space non users to identify if it is community priority to improve accessibility to open space provision;

• Application of proposed park catchments to the current distribution of public parks within the Borough to identify existing deficiencies in access;

• Identifying the significance of access deficiencies considering land use patterns and local needs (considering objective indicators and public perceptions);

• Consideration of the potential to address access deficiencies through identifying potential opportunities to increase park provision.

Defining Effective Catchment Areas

5.18 Existing patterns of use provide the most robust basis upon which to base a future access standard. The telephone survey undertaken as part of the study identified usage levels, travel modes and travel times for different types of open space provision in the Borough. The findings of the survey have been compared against other surveys of park use undertaken for other local authorities in London by Atkins and other consultants and by surveys conducted at the national level.

5.19 However, existing usage and travel patterns cannot be used directly as the basis for deriving an access standard to address future needs without considering whether a standard reflecting existing usage patterns addresses the needs of the community. This issue is considered later in this chapter.

Effective catchment distances

5.20 The catchment distances defined below relate to the typical effective catchment area for each park type. The effective catchment area represents the area from which 70-80% of park users are likely to be drawn from. An assumption is made that the catchment area and threshold population should reflect the average for each park category. Variations in catchment areas size and the number and frequency of visits can be explained by a number of factors including:

• The range of facilities and environments within the park and their quality and condition affect the attractiveness of the space to potential users. Parks with a
wider range of facilities than may be expected will have extended catchments perhaps beyond the distance parameters identified in Table 4.1. The number and frequency of visits is also likely to be higher;

- The demographic and socio-economic structure of the population residing within the park catchment and the extent to which park facilities meet their needs;

- The pattern of land use within the park catchment particularly patterns of residential development and population density;

- The range of park and open space opportunities within the locality will influence levels of usage at individual spaces.

5.21 However, it is important to consider variations in catchment area size for spaces within the same level of the hierarchy when identifying priorities for enhancing the quality and access of spaces.

Converting travel time to distances

5.22 Research undertaken on behalf of LPAC in 1992 identifies that a 5 minute pedestrian travel time represents a distance of 400m on the ground for less mobile sections of the community including parents with young children, the elderly and disabled. However, a straight line distance cannot be directly used to represent a pedestrian catchment on a map as the actual walking distance is influenced by severance factors (e.g. railway lines, busy roads), topography, the location of park entrances and the morphology and grain of the surrounding pedestrian route network⁴.

5.23 Taking account of these factors the area included within a catchment is typically reduced by some 50%. The research recommends that a fixed radius 70% of the catchment distance is used to represent catchment area spatially, therefore a fixed radius of 560m from the edge of the open space has been used to represent an 800 metre walking distance on the ground.

5.24 In this example the 800m catchment distance would be adopted as the standard, however, it is recommended that both radii are plotted to emphasise the importance of adopting a more sensitive approach to assessing the catchments of parks on a case by case basis.

⁴ ‘Open Space Planning in London’ – LPAC (1992), Page 107, Paragraph 6.2.19
Havering Green Spaces, Sport and Recreation Study

Existing Patterns of Use

Pocket Parks, Small Local Parks and Local Parks

5.25 According to the Resident’s Survey 81% of those surveyed travelled to pocket parks, small local parks and local parks on foot with 50% of journeys taking up to 5 minutes and 77% of journeys taking up to 10 minutes, therefore a 10 minute catchment area reflects existing patterns of usage. A 560m distance represents a 10-minute walking distance applied as a fixed radius from the edge of the open space.

5.26 It is therefore recommended that an 800m access standard is used in relation to local and small local parks, rather than the 400m catchment identified at the regional level by the GLA guidance.

District Parks

5.27 The Residents’ Survey identified that approximately 70% of users travelled to District parks, such as Harold Wood Park and Central Park, by foot. The effective catchment area of district parks in the Borough is 15 minutes walking distance (equivalent to 1.2km). However, there is some variation between parks. Approximately 80% of journeys to Belhus Wood Park take up to 15 minutes. However, District Parks such as Harold Wood and Central Park have a smaller 10 minute effective catchment area. This is largely due to the location of Belhus Wood Park, at the southernmost edge of the Borough and its distance from centres of population. It is recommended that a 1.2km effective catchment area is used for District Parks to reflect existing patterns of usage but also the potential to enhance the range of provision at those spaces with smaller catchment areas.

Metropolitan Parks

5.28 According to the Residents’ Survey, the chosen mode of transport for users of Metropolitan Parks is mixed. 48% of respondents that use Havering Park travel to the park by foot, whilst the same proportion travel to the park by car. 47% of users of Hornchurch Country Park travel by car whilst 42% travel by foot. Users of Bedford Park, however, are more likely to travel by car (78%). This may be due to the provision of good quality facilities at this location, therefore increasing the size of the catchment area the park serves, as well as the fact that it is situated at the northern end of the Borough. Approximately 80% of visitors to these parks reported that they travel up to 15 minutes to reach a Metropolitan Park. There are 4 Metropolitan Parks in Havering. It is important to note that these parks also draw on a larger catchment area from neighbouring Boroughs such as Barking & Dagenham, Redbridge, Epping Forest, Brentwood and Thurrock. Although the effective catchment for metropolitan
parks is 15 minutes (1.2km) for Havering users, it is recommended that a 3.2km catchment area is adopted in relation to metropolitan parks to reflect the usage patterns of users originating outside the Borough boundaries. The 3.2km catchment represents a 20 minute journey time by public transport.

5.29 There are currently no Regional Parks within Havering.

Verification of proposed catchment distances

5.30 It is necessary to test the robustness of using existing usage and travel patterns as the basis of deriving park access standards by considering how well they reflect community needs, 5 factors have been considered.

Usage levels

5.31 The usage of public parks within Havering has been compared with similar surveys undertaken by Atkins in other London Borough's. Within Havering 52% of residents use Regional, Metropolitan Parks or Large Public Parks and Gardens and 20% use small public parks at least once a year. Use of larger parks is greater in Hackney and Haringey by 5-10%, but use of smaller parks is greater in Havering by around 5%. The differences in use indicate that park usage levels in Havering are broadly comparable with other London Boroughs.

Comparison of access patterns by sub area with the distribution of spaces

5.32 Public park deficiencies exist within all sub areas within the Borough, however the largest deficiencies in public park access are Collier Row (North Romford), Gidea Park (Central Romford), Emerson Park (Upminster, Cranham & Emerson Park) and Hornchurch (Hornchurch).

5.33 On average 83% of users travel up to 15 minutes travel to reach a large public park (Metropolitan & District Levels of the Hierarchy). However, within Upminster, Cranham & Emerson Park and Harold Wood and Harold Hill only 79% and 81% of park users are within 15 minutes travel time.

5.34 On average 77% of users travel up to 10 minutes travel to reach a small public park (Local and Small Local Park levels of the hierarchy). However, within South Havering, North Romford and Upminster, Cranham & Emerson Park, only 69%, 73% and 81% of park users are within 10 minutes travel time.

5.35 For both forms of park provision differences in travel times between sub areas of the Borough are relatively small. Whilst there is a broad correlation between deficiency
areas and areas with longer travel times the differences are small and are typically within the 70-80% range required to define the effective catchment area.

Patterns of non-use

5.36 Within the Borough approximately 39% of adults use open spaces either several times a year or less. However levels of non use and low use are higher than average in South Havering (41%), Central (Romford) (43%), North Romford (45%) and Harold Hill and Harold Wood (44%). Differences from the average could reflect the ease of access to spaces or variations in quality. However across the Borough 4% of non/low users cited too far away or cannot get to as a reason for lack of frequent usage. The only sub area with a greater than average score was Central where 8% cited this reason. This indicates that this area has the most significant access deficiency and reflects the smaller size of public parks within this area and deficiencies in access.

Community satisfaction with existing levels of open space provision to identify if it is community priority to improve accessibility to open space provision

5.37 The residents survey asked respondents whether they were satisfied with existing levels of open space provision within their area. Within the Borough as a whole 68% were satisfied within existing provision. This indicates general support for broadly maintaining the existing level of open space provision the Borough. The sub areas where dissatisfaction with current levels of provision was greatest were North Romford (20%), Central (19%) and South Havering (18%). Community dissatisfaction of these levels is likely to be significant enough to identify addressing open space deficiencies as a policy priority.

Opportunities to increase provision

5.38 The Borough is subject to a number of regional strategies that seek to increase the provision of, and access to, open space within the Borough. Building on the Borough’s close proximity to the Green Belt, the Thames Chase Community Forest, The Green Arc and the Thames Gateway Green Grid all aim to create a network of accessible open space up to and beyond 2016. These improvements in access and quantity of open space will help to offset some apparent deficiencies in public parks.

Application of Park Catchment Areas

5.39 Figures 5.1 to 5.4 demonstrate the distribution of the different types of public park throughout the Borough and identify their assumed catchment areas by foot, car and public transport in accordance with the criteria in the Parks Hierarchy (Table 4.1) modified to reflect the Havering context. This provides a basis for identifying the
parts of the Borough which are not adequately served (in terms of access) by public parks.

5.40 The identification of areas of open space deficiency is very sensitive both to the actual catchments adopted for different types of parks and the manner in which they are applied. It should be recognised that the process of identifying deficiencies is a desk-top application of the hierarchy catchments and does not take into account other criteria, e.g. quality and function, which also inform the catchment of a park. These issues are discussed further in Chapter 6.

**Pocket Parks and Small Local Parks**

5.41 Within the Borough there are 34 open spaces which fulfilled the criteria of a Small Local Park or Pocket Park. Although some spaces meet the correct size criteria for a Local Park, some have been classified as a Small Local Park where the range of provision and facilities do not meet the required standard for a Local Park. Figure 5.1 identifies the distribution of Pocket Parks and Small Local Parks and areas which are outside of the catchment area for this form of provision. It demonstrates that large areas of the Borough are outside the 800m catchment area of Pocket and Small Local Parks, although some of the areas outside of the 800m catchment area are served by larger parks which can fulfil the function of pocket and small local parks. It should therefore be noted that areas deficient in access to pocket and small local parks may not be deficient in terms of access to parks in general (see Figure 5.5 for areas deficient in public parks). Areas outside the 800m catchment include large parts of St Andrew’s, Emerson Park, Romford Town and Pettits wards, as well as smaller parts of Harold Wood, Gooshays, Cranham, Upminster, Rainham and Wennington, Hacton, Brooklands and Mawneys. The largest concentrations of small local park deficiency are within the central and north western parts of the Borough.

**Local Parks**

5.42 The open space assessment identified 21 open spaces which fulfilled the criteria of a Local Park. Figure 5.2 identifies areas within Havering which fall outside the 800m pedestrian catchment areas of Local Parks. It demonstrates that despite there being a wide distribution of Local Parks in Havering there are still parts of the Borough that fall outside the 800m catchment area, although some of the areas outside of the 800m catchment area are served by larger parks which can fulfil the function of local parks. It should therefore be noted that areas deficient in access to local parks may not be deficient in terms of access to parks in general (see Figure 5.5 for areas deficient in public parks). The wards which have a significant proportion of their total area outside of an 800m local park catchment are the Hacton, St Andrews, Cranham, Elm Park and Hylands wards. Brooklands, Gooshays, Havering Park, Mawneys,
Harold Wood, Heaton, South Hornchurch, Rainham and Wennington and Emerson Park wards also have some minor access deficiencies to local parks.

5.43 Although Small Local Parks in some cases have the potential to meet demand for local parks where none are accessible, these parks do not currently provide the range of provision that would be expected of a local park.

District and Metropolitan Parks

5.44 The open space assessment identified 5 open spaces which fulfilled the criteria of a District Park.

5.45 Figure 5.3 identifies the distribution of District Parks within Havering and illustrates that there are many areas which are outside the District Park catchment area of 1.2km. The District Parks are disproportionately located to the east of the Borough. The wards largely outside a 1.2km catchment are Havering Park, Mawney, Pettits, Brooklands, Romford Town, Hylands, St Andrew’s, Hacton, Elm Park, South Hornchurch, and a large proportion of Rainham and Wennington.

5.46 Figure 5.4 identifies the distribution of Metropolitan Parks and demonstrates that all wards are within the 3.2km catchment area of at least one Metropolitan Park.

Park Deficiency Areas

5.47 Figure 5.5 identifies areas deficient in access to all public parks as classified by the parks hierarchy. Parks deficiency areas have been derived by considering pedestrian access to any form of public park (Metropolitan Parks, District Parks, Local Parks, Small Local Parks, Pocket Parks and Linear Open Spaces). Other open space provision including all types of open space not included within the parks hierarchy and are excluded from this figure.

5.48 Those areas of the Borough which are deficient in public parks are defined as those which are further than 800m from any form of public park (this includes the dark blue areas identified in Figure 5.5). Areas defined as deficient are illustrated on Figure 5.5:

- Zone 1- Colliers Row - reasonably large area outside of the adjusted (to take account of street morphology and other barriers to access) 800m catchment area which straddles Pettits and Mawneys wards;
Zone 2- Gidea Park – corridor area, which roughly follows the railway line through Squirrels Heath and Harold Wood wards, outside of the adjusted 800m catchment area;

Zone 3- Emerson Park – reasonably small corridor area that runs through the centre of Emerson Park ward out side of the adjusted 800m catchment area;

Zone 4- Cranham – reasonably small area just south of Upminster tube depot outside of the adjusted 800m catchment area;

Zone 5- Hornchurch – reasonably large corridor, which roughly follows the District Line within the northern part of Heaton ward, outside of the adjusted 800m catchment area; and

Zone 6- Rainham - large area outside of the adjusted 800m catchment area, but, as described below, largely within a non-residential zone.

Those areas which are located further than 560m from any public park are shown in light blue. Figure 5.4 takes account of those areas of the Borough which are served by public parks located beyond the Borough boundary.

Significance of Deficiency Areas

It is important for the assessment to relate quantitative deficiencies (as identified in Table 5.5 and illustrated in Figure 5.5) to the character, density and other needs of areas within the Borough. Deficiency areas within wards with a high proportion of dwellings that are terraced flats or apartments, such as areas identified in Figure 3.2, are likely to be more significant than other deficiency areas as residents are less likely to have access to private gardens. Areas within wards with a more suburban character may also have significant concentrations of private open space which, although may not be accessible to the general public, provides relief from the built up area and contributes towards visual amenity.

The pattern of land use also influences the significance of open space for several deficiency areas. For example, the high level of deficiency in access to public parks in south Rainham and Wennington and South Hornchurch (Zone 6 shown on Figure 5.5) is because the areas form part of the Rainham Marsh and Eastern Road Hotel Employment areas (EMP2 and EMP13). Furthermore, the areas consist of a high proportion of natural or semi-natural greenspace in the form of Rainham Marshes. Large deficiency areas also exist towards the south east of the Upmister ward, but the population density is very low in this largely rural area.
PROPOSED QUANTITY AND ACCESSIBILITY STANDARDS

PUBLIC PARK PROVISION

Quantitative component

5.52 At present there is public park provision within the Borough of 3.32 ha per 1,000 population.

5.53 To meet the needs of the Borough up to 2016 it is recommended that the existing provision of Metropolitan Parks is maintained at 2016 this will equate to 1.34 ha / 1,000 population. No further provision of Metropolitan Parks is required to meet the future needs of population as all parts of the Borough lie within the catchment of an existing Metropolitan Park.

5.54 A provision standard of 1.84 ha / 1,000 is recommended in relation to other types of public park provision (District, Local, Small Local and Linear Parks) in order to enable sufficient access and quantity of provision within the Borough. In order to address the deficiencies in access the quantity of public park provision should increase by some 10ha (1.3%). The additional provision (incorporated within the standard) is necessary to alleviate those significant deficiencies in access to public park provision (illustrated in Figure 5.5). The 10ha comprises of an additional 5 small local parks (average size 2 ha). These may need to be brought forward at new open space sites or through the adaption/redesign of existing spaces. The exact size of parks should reflect development constraints and opportunities. Additional facilities, such as improved children’s play provision and recreational facilities, may also need to be introduced to sites 41(Lodge Farm Park) and 42 (Raphael Park) to alleviate the access deficiency to District Parks which exists in central Romford.

5.55 The standard of provision to meet the needs of the Borough up to 2016, has been derived by taking existing levels of park provision (average per 1,000 population) + the additional provision required to address existing deficiencies in access (10 ha). The resultant standard is based upon 2016 population forecasts, the end date for the forthcoming LDF. The recommended quantity standard for public parks is therefore 1.84 ha of public park provision per 1,000 population (based upon GLA projections for 2016 of 237,040 residents in the Borough).

Benchmarking with other edge of London Borough’s

5.56 This approach of maintaining existing park provision (reflecting the average for the Borough) whilst attempting to alleviate any deficiencies in access is the same approach used by the London Borough of Croydon, which is the only other outer
London Borough to have completed its open space strategy at the time of writing. Croydon’s strategy does not recommend a separate standard for park provision but notes that the Borough has 4.30 ha of total public open space per 1,000 population and recommends that this should be adopted as the standard up to 2016. Based upon the forecast increase in population in the Borough, the standard implies that there will be a significant net increase in provision.

5.57 Several other outer London boroughs were contacted during the production of this assessment including LB Bexley, LB Bromley, LB Harrow, LB Hillingdon and LB Sutton and LB Barnet and LB Waltham Forest with a view to compare the amount of open space and park provision with Havering. However, due to differences with the classification of open spaces, the statistics obtained could not be compared to Havering due to definitional problems. For example, the London Borough of Waltham Forest has just 202ha of Council managed parkland compared with 744ha of parkland managed by Havering. But Waltham Forest’s figures do not include Epping Forest, which is managed by the Corporation of London, or much of the west of the borough, which is managed by the Lea Valley Regional Park.

5.58 Some Borough’s could provide the total area of Council managed sites, including amenity spaces and playing pitches, but could not disaggregate public park provision from these figures. Similarly, comparisons with the total amount of open space within outer London boroughs are equally as difficult. Bexley, Bromley and Hillingdon could provide figures for the total amount of open space within their Borough’s, but these included the total amount of Green Belt land, including agricultural land, where as the Havering assessment does not include publicly inaccessible land within its parks standard. It is therefore not appropriate to compare the amount of open space and park provision with other edge of London boroughs.

**Accessibility component**

5.59 The following access standards are recommended for adoption. The rationale for the standards broadly reflects the GLA parks hierarchy amended to reflect patterns of usage in the Borough, community expectations and the physical context of the Borough and potential to increase provision.

- All residents within the Borough should have access to a Metropolitan Park within 3.2km from home;
- All residents within the Borough should have access to a District Park within 1.2km from home;
- All residents within the Borough should have access to a Local Park, Small Local Park or Pocket Park within 800m from home;
• All residents within the Borough should have access to an area of public park within 800m from home. The definition of a public park is as identified within the parks hierarchy defined within Chapter 4.

5.60 Quality standards in relation to public parks are considered in Chapter 6.

OPPORTUNITIES TO ALLEVIATE PUBLIC PARK QUANTITY AND ACCESS DEFICIENCIES

Addressing deficiencies in quantity

5.61 Proposals for new housing development should be accompanied by proposals to improve open space provision. The nature of such improvements should reflect the additional open space needs generated as a result of the proposed development.

5.62 If the proposed development is located within an identified area of deficiency for public park provision it will be necessary for additional land to be brought into public park use. The developer will be required to make a contribution towards the provision of a public park. It may be appropriate for such provision to be incorporated within the curtilage of the development. Alternatively a contribution to off-site provision may be appropriate.

5.63 If the proposed development is not located within an area which is deficient in either quantity or access to public provision, then consideration will be given to any deficiency in public park quality or value. The developer will be required to make a contribution towards the enhancement of the quality of public park provision including the range facilities and their condition.

Adaptation of other forms of open space

5.64 Figure 5.6 identifies other forms of open space provision located within the parks deficiency areas. It is possible to reduce park deficiency areas by upgrading the roles and range of functions provided at other publicly accessible open spaces and negotiating for community use of non-public open spaces. The other open spaces which are publicly accessible within the deficiency areas are identified below:

• Amenity Green Space

• Allotments
• Natural and Semi-Natural Urban Green Spaces

• Outdoor Sports Facilities/ Education Playing Fields

• Outdoor Sports Facilities/ Private Playing Fields

• Cemeteries and Church Yards

5.65 With reference to Figure 5.6, opportunities to alleviate deficiencies in public park provision are considered below:

• Colliers Row- Site 138 (Playing fields off King George’s Close) has the potential to accommodate facilities to upgrade its status to a public park.

• Gidea Park- Site 283 (Sunflower Way flood lagoon) has the potential to upgrade the amenity space to include facilities associated with a small local park.

• Emerson Park- No opportunities exist to upgrade publicly accessible spaces to public park status within the deficiency area.

• Cranham- No opportunities exist to upgrade publicly accessible spaces to public park status within the deficiency area, although site 53 (Ashfield Gardens allotments), which is currently an allotment site, could become a public park if an over supply in allotments becomes apparent.

• Rainham- No opportunities exist to upgrade other publicly accessible sites into public parks, although the deficiency is not particularly significant due to the very low level of residential population situated within it. However, the London Riverside Conservation Park, which is currently being developed at Rainham Marshes and the land south of Coldharbour Lane, will provide a new large conservation park which will help to alleviate this deficiency.

District Park access deficiencies

5.66 Large parts of the west of the Borough are outside of the 1.2km catchment area of a District Park. This is because, as discussed above, parks classified as District Parks are disproportionately located to the east of the Borough. District Parks have a larger range of facilities than Local Parks and Small Local Parks and so any deficiency in access to these spaces can be addressed by improving facilities at existing spaces.
5.67 Metropolitan parks will also be able to fulfil the role that District Parks play in providing a range of facilities for Borough residents. Figure 5.4 illustrates that Havering’s 4 Metropolitan Parks are located largely towards the west of the Borough, with 2 towards the north west and 2 towards the south west. In addition, just outside of the Borough within Barking & Dagenham, lies Eastbrookend Country Park (Metropolitan Park) and Central Park (District Park). The fact that there are no District Parks within the west of the Borough is therefore not of great significance as large areas of the west Borough will be within the 1.2km catchment area of the spaces described above.

5.68 However, even when taking into account the role of Metropolitan Parks and the spaces outside of the Borough, central Romford will still be outside of the catchment of a District Park. Site no’s 42 and 41 (Raphael Park and Lodge Farm Park) are currently Local Parks which could have extra facilities, such as improved children’s play and recreational facilities, introduced to fulfil District Park status.

Improving Public Park Accessibility

5.69 It will be important to consider what practical measures could be undertaken to extend the present catchments. Such measures could include creating more park gates, or establishing clearly sign posted routes to parks which avoid busy roads. Quiet roads could be ‘greened’ to enable safe access to a network of parks.

5.70 The information collected on non-public spaces within these areas of deficiency can also be interrogated to assess whether they could play a role in meeting the deficiencies. The quality of facilities and condition of open spaces should also be taken into account when prioritising investment. In areas deficient in public parks and where there are limited opportunities to increase supply, either by the creation of new spaces, improving other types of public open spaces, or by increasing public access to private spaces, the only way of addressing deficiency will be to ensure that the potential of existing spaces is fully realised where appropriate, and there is improved access to them where possible. This is discussed in the next chapter.

5.71 At the District park and Metropolitan park level efforts should be made to improve the accessibility of these parks by public transport through the creation of better links between parks and major public transport routes or, where this is not possible, considering how routes to parks from transport stops and interchanges could be sign-posted and made more pleasant.
PLANNING CHILDREN'S PLAY PROVISION

5.72 Open space provides an important role in serving Children's play needs. It is widely acknowledged that the importance of children's play extends far beyond the activity itself but contributes towards child development through the development of a wide range of physical, social and emotional skills and abilities. The key issues relating to children's play are the nature and location of play, the influence of age and gender, safety and risk issues and consideration of the types of play environments needed to meet play needs.

5.73 Location of play – The outdoor environment is a key environment for children’s play particularly during summer months. Play takes place in a range of environments many of which are not planned play environments it can include the street, back gardens and ‘natural/wild’ areas such as woods, areas of wasteland, disused buildings, back alleys and garage areas in addition to conventional planned play areas. All of these spaces afford opportunities for play and a range of different experiences which are likely to appeal to particular groups of children. Studies of children’s play have emphasised the appeal and use of unofficial play areas in addition to planned children’s play areas.

5.74 Age and gender – Age and gender strongly influence the nature and type of play. Coffin and Williams (1989)⁵ suggest a five fold evolution of play over the course of childhood:

- Toddlers aged 1-3 tend to play alongside rather than with other children. Activity focuses upon experimentation with new found abilities and role play;

- Pre-school children show higher levels of inquisitiveness, practice new physical skills, enjoy constructional play and begin to acquire skills in social play;

- Primary school children (aged 5-10) commonly develop interests in the environment (animals and plants in particular) and explore environments more widely. They continue enjoy constructional play and play involving movement, ball play and wheeled objects. This age group is highly sociable.

- Older children (aged 10-13) are more competitive, show wider incidence of sexes playing apart and roam further from home. Playing games and organised activities is important for this group and more time may be spent in conversational and social activity. Constructional and movement play continues to be important; and
Adolescents (aged 14-16) display more focused patterns of activity, including interests in hobbies, music and dance; greater independence which may be reflected in informal street based groups, and some return to mixed group activity. It is debatable whether this group actually recognise their actions as ‘play’.

5.75 Parkinson (1987)\(^6\) notes the influence of gender both on locations of play and the distance from home. Females are more likely to go on organised outings and play in the garden at home. In comparison boys are more likely to play in the street or at a friend’s house. Both sexes utilised planned playgrounds although boys tended to patronise facilities located further from home. As children get older there is a greater desire for more adventurous, risk taking activities outside of controlled environments which may include negotiation and testing boundaries. Parkinson notes that these activities are part of growing up and are necessary in order to provide a degree of challenge and excitement for older children.

5.76 Safety and risk – parental perceptions of risk and safety influence patterns of play including when and where children may play and with whom, although parental influences decreases with age. The need for parental supervision (perceived or actual) is particularly strong in relation to toddlers and pre-school children, although supervision of primary and older is increasingly common. Behaviour patterns of parents with children have altered significantly in response to growing fears over safety of children particularly relating to car and cycle accidents, assaults, and abductions, accidents whilst at play, drug taking and substance abuse and anti social behaviour. Despite the fact that the risk of accidents is relatively small, parents seek to place restrictions on their children’s mobility and independence in response to these concerns and anxieties which leads to more localised patterns of play or a greater degree of supervised play including parents transporting children from a to b.

5.77 Within the context of the issues identified above traditional forms of children’s play provision have been criticised. Some forms of equipped play areas can be almost valueless in meeting the developmental needs of children. The design of play areas has also been criticised for taking the needs and concerns of adults such as noise and disturbance more seriously than children’s play needs. Williams (1995)\(^7\) notes several problems with existing patterns of children’s play provision including:

• An over-emphasis on unsupervised play areas containing fixed equipment rather than informal play opportunities;

• The pre-occupation with safety surfaces resulting in the creation of unchallenging environments directed primarily at younger children; and

• A strong emphasis on the ‘containment’ of children within dedicated ‘play’ areas to discourage young people congregating in other areas.

5.78 To overcome these problems Williams identifies the need to engage children and young people in the identification and design of play opportunities as part of the planning process in order that play environments meet local needs and priorities.

Standards of Play Provision

5.79 There are currently no adopted national standards relating to children’s play provision. However, a structured approach to the planning and provision of children’s play areas has been developed by the National Playing Fields Association (NPFA). The standards of provision recommended by the NPFA were revised in 2001 and reflect changing views towards children’s play provision. In particular the guidelines emphasise the need to provide both designated areas and casual play opportunities which respond to the needs of different age groups and which are of value to the development of children and young people.

5.80 The NPFA recommends a minimum standard of outdoor space for children’s play of 0.8 hectares per 1000 people by:

• Providing Local Areas for Play (LAPs), Local Equipped Areas for Play (LEAPs) and Neighbourhood Equipped Areas for Play (NEAPs) in locations based upon walking time; and

• Providing the balance as casual playing space within areas of amenity open space.

5.81 This study has identified provision for children’s play in Havering. It has also included an assessment of the role of open space for informal children’s play as well as dedicated play provision in the form of dedicated play areas. Dedicated children’s play provision was assessed against the NPFA criteria for classification as a LEAP or NEAP, the full range of criteria is outlined in the guide to the pro-forma included in Appendix A, however the assessment included consideration of the number and range of types of activities/opportunities were provided, provision of informal and
hard surface play areas, safety issues and consideration of other amenities (seating, bins etc).

Table 5.6 – Formal Children’s Play Provision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Children’s Play Provision (excl. 71 School Sites)</th>
<th>No Open Spaces with Provision</th>
<th>% Open Spaces</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LEAP or NEAP</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Children's Play Provision</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Play sites*</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Children's Play Provision</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>73.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (excluding housing play sites and school sites)</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Housing Play Sites are found on sites smaller than 0.4ha and do not form part of the main assessment.

5.82 Of a sample of 245 open spaces, which did not include school sites, Table 5.6 demonstrates that 68 sites have some kind of children’s play provision. 29 children’s play areas do not meet all of the criteria set by the NPFA for a LEAP or a NEAP. There are 39 open spaces that have play areas which fulfil the criteria associated with a LEAP or NEAP criteria. However, a number of open spaces with ‘Other children’s play provision’ fulfil some of the criteria for a LEAP and could be classified as such if minor improvements were made to the play space. Similarly, some spaces which are classified as a LEAP could be reclassified to a NEAP if minor improvements are made.

5.83 In addition, there are 19 ‘Housing Play Sites’ within the London Borough of Havering. These sites do not form part of the main assessment and have not been plotted on Figure 5.7 as they are under 0.4ha in size and therefore do not meet the criteria for the study (refer to para 4.12). It has been assumed that these play areas do not currently satisfy the criteria for a LEAP or a NEAP, as they typically consist of little more than one or two items of play equipment, and may not conform to modern safety standards. A schedule of Housing Play Area sites is included in Appendix E.

5.84 The condition of children’s play provision in Havering was scored according to the range and type of play equipment and other facilities including provision of seating, skateboarding facility, rebound wall, hard playing surface, informal games area, absorbing safety surface and play area boundary. This score was used to classify the condition of children’s play, as shown in Table 5.7.

Table 5.7 – Condition of Children’s Play Provision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Condition of Play Equipment</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>36.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>32.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.85 Under a third of children’s play areas in Havering are considered to be in a ‘poor’ condition (32.5%). The remainder are mostly in a ‘good’ condition (36.7%) with 22 sites (30.8%) considered to be in a ‘Fair’ condition. To improve the quality of individual play spaces, existing spaces should aim to fulfil the criteria set out by the NPFA to qualify as a LEAP.

Access to Children’s Play Provision

5.86 The distribution of children’s play provision is shown in Figure 5.7. The distribution of children’s play areas within open spaces is not even across the Borough, meaning that there are areas of the Borough that are not provided with dedicated Children’s play areas. Figure 5.7 identifies areas of the Borough which are outside the 280m and 400m catchment of current LEAPs and NEAPs. It also shows the location of play areas that do not satisfy the NEAP or NEAP criteria. Figure 5.7 also illustrates other publicly accessible open spaces which may have the potential to incorporate children’s play provision.

5.87 The distribution of play areas, and those areas that are deficient in children’s play provision are outlined below by ward:

- **Havering Park** – one section of the urban area, along Clockhouse road, is deficient in terms of its access to a children’s play area. However, if those play areas which do not satisfy the LEAP/NEAP criteria are removed from the appraisal, the majority of the urban area would become deficient with regards to children’s play provision that complies with NPFA standards. There are no housing play sites that have the potential to be upgraded to help alleviate the deficiency in access to children’s play provision.

- **Mawneys** – 3 LEAP/NEAPs were identified in the ward, and a further 5 children’s play areas were identified that do not satisfy the NPFA criteria. In addition to this, a further 3 housing play areas were identified within the ward. Presently, the centre of the ward contains areas which are deficient in terms of their accessibility to a LEAP/NEAP. Upgrading the various sites within the ward that do not meet the NPFA criteria would reduce the proportion of the ward that is currently deficient in terms of access to a LEAP/NEAP.

- **Pettits** – Only 1 play area meets the NPFA criteria, although there are 2 further play areas which do not meet NPFA standards. The majority of the ward is deficient in access to a LEAP / NEAP, although potential does exist to
upgrade sub-standard sites. An area in the west of the ward does not have access to a LEAP, a NEAP, or a sub-standard play area. There is also a pocket of the ward to the east which is deficient in terms of access to a play area.

- **Heaton** – There are only 2 compliant play areas, meaning that the majority of the ward is further than 400m from a LEAP or a NEAP. The south of the ward is particularly poorly served, although 2 housing play area sites have been identified that may have the potential to be upgraded to NPFA standards (at Heaton Avenue and Tavistock Close).

- **Harold Wood** – Large areas to the west of this ward are deficient in terms of access to LEAP/NEAP play areas. 2 ‘other play areas’ have been identified, which may have the potential for upgrading. Enhancing the Tavistock Close (in Heaton Ward) play area would also help to reduce the deficiency area in the ward, although a further 1-2 sites would be required to eliminate the deficiency area completely.

- **Gooshays** – The ward has a relatively large portfolio of play area sites, 2 of which conform to LEAP or NEAP standards. The main area which is poorly served in terms of access to a play area is located in the east of the ward.

- **Hylands** – The ward is relatively well equipped with LEAP or NEAP standard play equipment with a small deficiency area apparent within the centre of the ward. No opportunities exist to alleviate this small deficiency within existing open spaces.

- **St. Andrews** – Large parts of the ward are outside of the 400m catchment area with little opportunity to introduce new facilities within open spaces, as other open spaces within the deficiency areas are inaccessible to the public.

- **Hacton** – Large parts of the centre of the ward are outside of the 400m catchment, again with little opportunity to introduce new facilities at other open spaces within the deficiency area due to their restricted access status.

- **Elm Park** – Large parts of the ward are deficient in access to children’s play facilities with only the northwestern part of the ward within the 400m catchment area for a LEAP or NEAP standard playground. Sites 45 (The Brettons) and 31 (Hornchurch Country Park) have the potential to introduce some children’s play facilities to alleviate the deficiencies.
• South Hornchurch – Much of the population centre of the ward is within the 400m catchment for a LEAP or NEAP standard playground and most of the ward is within the 400m catchment for some other form of children’s play provision assessed as part of the site visits. The north eastern part of the ward does lie outside of these catchment areas but the deficiency is alleviated by a small facility within a housing estate.

• Rainham & Wennington – Most of the population centre of the ward is within the 400m catchment area for some form of children’s play provision assessed as part of the site visits.

• Upminster – Parts of the south and west of the population centre of the ward are outside of the 400m catchment area for children’s play facilities. Opportunities exist to introduce new play equipment at sites 303 (Cranham Marsh) and 196 (Clockhouse Gardens).

• Cranham – Much of the south of the ward is outside of the 400m catchment area for children’s play. No further opportunities exist to introduce additional facilities at other open spaces as these are inaccessible.

• Emerson Park – Small parts of the south, west and north of the ward are within the 400m catchment area for children’s play facilities but much of the ward lies outside it. Opportunities do exist at site 73 (Elliots Playing Field) to introduce children’s play equipment which would help to alleviate the deficiency area. However, even if new equipment is to be introduced at site 73, a large section of the middle of the ward will still lie within a deficiency area.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Distribution of Open Space

5.88 Havering has some 3.32ha of public parks per 1000 population. The provision of public parks equates to 42.62 % of the total area of open space in the Borough.

5.89 Those areas of the Borough which are deficient in access to public parks include parts of Havering Park, Pettits, Squirrels Heath, Harold Wood, Hacton, Emerson Park, Upminster, Rainham and Wennington and South Hornchurch wards. There are some other publicly accessible open spaces, all of which include amenity greenspace, public playing fields and natural and semi-natural greenspace, may have the potential to address the lack of public park provision.
5.90 The hierarchy of open space has been amended and the typology of open space expanded to reflect the findings of the Residents’ Survey and the roles of different open space types, and accessibility issues.

5.91 All parts of the Borough are within the catchment area of a Metropolitan Park. It is recommended that existing levels of provision are maintained. At 2016, provision of Metropolitan Parks will equate to 1.34 ha/1000.

5.92 For other types of public park provision a public parks standard of 1.84 ha per 1,000 population is proposed for new development in the Borough based upon established levels of provision per 1,000 population and the additional provision required to address existing deficiencies in public park access.

5.93 The study has identified locally based park access standards based upon existing patterns of usage, travel patterns and community perceptions and expectations. All residents should have access to public park provision of some form within 800m of home. Appropriate access to Local Park, District and Metropolitan Park provision should also be provided in accordance with the standards identified.

5.94 Measures to extend the existing catchments of existing parks will need to be considered in order to reduce deficiencies in access. Measures will be different for each park but could include creating more park gates, ‘greening’ of routes and better signposting. Priority areas for improvement are discussed in more detail in Chapter 10.

5.95 This study has identified provision for children’s play in Havering. 38 open spaces out of a sample of 245 open spaces have play areas which fully fulfil the criteria associated with the NPFA LEAP and NEAP criteria. However, a number of open spaces with ‘Other children’s play provision’ fulfil some of the criteria for a LEAP and could meet this quality standard if minor improvements were made to the play space. Similarly, some spaces currently categorised as a LEAP could be reclassified as a NEAP with minor improvements.

5.96 The assessment identifies the areas deficient in access to formally provided children’s play provision but also identifies other publicly accessible open spaces which have the potential to meet children’s play needs.
CHILDREN’S PLAY PROVISION

Quantity and Accessibility Component

5.97 There are significant areas within Havering which are deficient in access to dedicated Children’s play areas. In order to ameliorate those deficiencies, it is recommended that additional opportunities for both formal and informal children’s play are brought forward.

5.98 The following access standards are recommended for adoption.

- Residents should have access to 0.8 ha per 1,000 population of children’s play provision consistent with the NPFA play area size standards. Provision could take the form of dedicated open space provision or form part of an other type of publicly accessible open space (e.g. public park, natural or semi-natural greenspace);

- All residents within the Borough should have access to areas of formal and informal play provision for children and teenagers within 400m from home.

Qualitative Component

5.99 Children’s play provision within the Borough should be of adequate quality and provide the range of facilities associated with the size of the facility. The NPFA 6 acre Standard (2001) should be used to assess levels of adequacy in terms of the range and quality of provision.

5.100 Proposals for new housing development should be accompanied by proposals to improve children’s play provision. The nature of such improvements should reflect the additional play provision needs generated as a result of the proposed development. The exact form of play provision should be identified following consultation with the local community to identify local priorities.

5.101 If the proposed development is located within an identified area of deficiency for children’s play provision it will be necessary for additional land to be brought into use for the purposes of children’s play. The developer will be required to make a contribution towards the provision for children and teenagers. It may be appropriate for such provision to be incorporated within the curtilage of the proposed development. Alternatively, a contribution to off-site provision may be appropriate.

5.102 If the proposed development is not located within an area which is deficient in access to formal children’s play provision then consideration should be given to any
deficiency in quality or value of existing children’s play provision. The developer will be required to make a contribution towards the enhancement of the quality of existing provision which may include improving the range facilities for particular age groups not well served at present and improving the condition of facilities provided.
6. QUALITY OF SUPPLY

INTRODUCTION

6.1 Research into Open Space Planning highlights the importance that users of open spaces place on quality of facilities and condition of landscape.

6.2 As qualitative factors are often difficult to assess objectively, it is important to establish a methodology to enable the consistent scoring and ranking of the condition and quality of spaces. Many aspects of open space quality raise detailed issues of park management and maintenance which are beyond the scope of this study.

QUALITY ASSESSMENT

6.3 The range and condition of facilities within each open space were assessed using a scoring criteria method derived from the Civic Trust Green Flag standard assessment. The standard is based partly on a physical site appraisal of 27 criteria relating to the range, quality and condition of park facilities and park management arrangements which accounts for 70% of the overall score and a desk research element which comprises of the remaining 30% of the score.

6.4 The open space assessment included consideration of 18 green flag criteria which could be assessed through a visual appraisal of the site. The dimensions of quality considered were:

- The conservation of natural features;
- The conservation of landscape features;
- The conservation of buildings and structures;
- The provision of educational interpretation facilities;
- Standards of aboricultural and woodland management;
- Whether the space was welcoming;
- The accessibility of a site and the safety of site access;
• How well signposted the space is;
• Whether there is equality of access to and within the space;
• The safety of equipment and facilities;
• Levels of personal security within the space;
• Evidence of dog fouling and availability of appropriate provision (designated bins, dog walks);
• The appropriate provision of facilities for the type of space;
• The quality of facilities;
• The cleanliness of a site including litter and waste management arrangements;
• Standards of grounds maintenance and horticulture;
• Standards of building and infrastructure maintenance; and
• Standards of equipment maintenance.

6.5 The criteria which were not assessed related to the sustainability of management and maintenance practices (4 criteria), the level of community involvement (2 criteria), marketing and promotion (2 criteria) and implementation of the park management plan (1 criteria).

6.6 Each of the 18 criteria was attributed a score between 0 and 10, where 0 is considered to be very poor and 10 is considered to be exceptional. The score for each of the criterion was evaluated against a range of issues relating to each factor these are described fully within the guide to the site survey pro-forma (refer to Appendix A). The green flag scoring system used to assess each criteria within the standard is as follows:

• 0-1 Very Poor;
• 2-4 Poor;
• 5-6 Fair;
• 7 Good;
• 8 Very Good;
• 9 Excellent;
6.7 Not all of the criteria were applicable to each type of open space (e.g. conservation of buildings, equipment maintenance). Therefore an average score was derived for each open space based upon those aspects of quality considered. However a percentage score was also calculated which assumed all 18 quality variables.

6.8 The minimum quality standard required for an open space to reach the Green Flag standard is 66% (taking account of the desk top and site based aspects of the assessment). The open space must achieve an overall score of more than 60% on the site based assessment.

6.9 Figure 6.1 categorises each open space according to their overall quality score. It is evident that Havering shows no evidence of “very poor” open space. The findings of the quality assessment are encouraging. Whilst Hacton is the only ward to indicate open space provision of “excellent” quality. Other wards have spaces of predominantly “fair” to “very good” quality. There are some concentrations of open spaces of poor quality in the north and south of Brooklands ward, to the east of Upminster and Squirrels Heath wards, and to the north of Harold Wood ward.

6.10 Table 6.1 provides an indication of how each type of open space performs against the 18 Green Flag criteria assessed on site. The average score shows the average of those variables scored at each site. Whilst the “Average all criteria column” provides an indicator of how each site fares against all 18 criteria and represents the overall quality of each open space type. It is evident that the ‘amenity greenspace’ category is the best “average ranking” open space type with a score of 8.4, which falls within the “very good” category. This average score takes into account all of the total possible assessment variables mentioned above. The “other” open space category is the lowest ranking open space category, scoring just 0.6 out of the categories it had been assessed by (which varied on a site by site basis) and just 3.0 out of all 18 categories, i.e. “poor”. Table 6.1 shows that the average score for all open spaces in Havering as a whole is 6.3, which comes under the ‘Fair’ category.
Table 6.1 – Quality Assessment by Space Type (Overall Average Scores)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Open Space Type</th>
<th>Average (all criteria)</th>
<th>Average assessed criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allotments, Community Gardens and Urban Farms</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amenity Green Space</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cementeries and Church Yards</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Spaces / Pedestrianised Areas</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Park</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenspaces within Grounds of institutions</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear Open Space / Green Corridors</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Park</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Park</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural or Semi-natural Urban Greenspaces</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoors Sports Facilities / Education Playing Fields</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoors Sports Facilities / Private Playing Fields</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoors Sports Facilities / Public Playing Fields</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pocket Park</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Local Park / Open Space</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Average</strong></td>
<td><strong>5.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>6.3</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.11 Table 6.2 demonstrates the average scores for various green flag categories for different open space types. The scores used are the average assessed criteria for scores derived from the variables assessed and do not include the variables which did not apply to the space. It is evident that the provision of educational information is generally lacking, at an average score of around 0, which is within the ‘poor’ category. With the exception of Metropolitan parks (which had an average score of 8.4, “very good”), this aspect has the most potential for improvement. The highest average scores related to personal safety, dog fouling and litter and waste management.
## Table 6.2 Quality Assessment: Average Scores for Each Space Type According to Different 'Green Flag' Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Open Space Type</th>
<th>Welcoming</th>
<th>Good and safe access</th>
<th>Signage</th>
<th>Equal access for all</th>
<th>Safe equipment and facilities</th>
<th>Personal Security</th>
<th>Dog Fouling</th>
<th>Appropriate Provision of Facilities</th>
<th>Quality of facilities</th>
<th>Litter and waste management</th>
<th>Grounds Infrastructure and Horticulture</th>
<th>Equipment Maintenance</th>
<th>Conservation of Natural Features</th>
<th>Conservation of Landscape Features</th>
<th>Conservation of buildings and structures</th>
<th>Arboriculture</th>
<th>Provision of educational information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Park</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Park</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Park</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Local Park / Open Space</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pocket Park</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear Open Space / Green Corridors</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allotments, Community Gardens and Urban Farms</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amenity Green Space</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cemeteries and Church Yards</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Spaces / Pedestrianised areas</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenspaces within grounds of institution</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural or Semi Natural Greenspace</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Sports Facilities / playing fields (education)</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Sports Facilities / playing fields (private)</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Sports Facilities / playing fields (public)</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average All Spaces</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.12 Table 6.2 demonstrates that the Natural and Semi Natural Greenspace type scores consistently low, at around 4-7 on all categories. This is likely to be because the category is made up of spaces such as Hatters, Abbey and Jermaines Wood together with some ‘green wedge’ buffers which help shield major roads from the surrounding area, all of which are generally not maintained.

6.13 Public parks tend to score consistently higher (at around 5-8) in most of the categories when compared to other types of open space, which have much more mixed results. This may be due to the management arrangements of public parks which generally aim to take care of all of the assessed variables; where as other types of open space may have little or no management arrangements.

6.14 Amenity green space, the most abundant space type in the Borough, scored between 4 and 6 for almost every category except for provision of educational information. They are generally rated as ‘fair’ to ‘good’ in all but four of the ‘Green Flag’ categories (quality of facilities; equipment maintenance; conservation of buildings and educational information). More could be done to the quality of facilities and equipment maintenance on these sites.

6.15 Table 6.2 demonstrates that overall most open space types score 5 or above on the conservation of natural features conservation of landscape features. However, with regard to and conservation of buildings and structures, average scores range between 4 and 8. Scores are generally above 5 for the welcome, good access, and equality of access criteria.

6.16 An important aspect to a qualitative assessment is the need to integrate decision-making on park improvements with the assessment of the quantity and accessibility of provision. In areas deficient in public open space and where there are limited opportunities to increase supply, either by the creation of new spaces, or by increasing public access to private spaces, the only way of addressing deficiency will be to ensure that the potential of existing spaces is fully realised where appropriate, and there is improved access to them where possible.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

6.17 Open space policy has been primarily concerned with the quantity and distribution of open space. This study updates this information but also considers the range and condition of facilities within open spaces and the quality of those facilities.

6.18 Open spaces can fulfil many urban needs often in highly sustainable ways. They are generally local facilities accessible to people of all ages and backgrounds. They can
be used for exercise, education, meeting people, community events, and to encourage the movement of flora and fauna. They also contribute to the visual amenity of a local area, breaking up the urban fabric and providing an escape from the traffic and built environment.

6.19 The analysis undertaken in this chapter illustrates that some of the parks do not provide a typical range of facilities. The characteristics identified within the parks hierarchy should be used as a guide to illustrate the range of amenities that people might expect.

6.20 A strategy for improving the range and condition of facilities within parks should be developed to take into account:

- The unique character of these parks and the potential to incorporate further facilities;
- Whether there is a deficiency in the provision of open space in the area;
- The proximity of other parks which may have an oversupply of certain facilities;
- Recommendations from the Sports Assessment (Volume 2);
- Recommendations to enhance the Green Network (Chapter 10); and
- The local social conditions (Chapter 3).

6.21 The companion guide to PPG17 (2002) suggests that an understanding of the Borough’s characteristics will help to inform the priority given to different parts of the Strategy and can identify possible priorities for open space improvements. Chapter 7 develops a priority matrix to relate the quality and value of existing provision to local need to provide framework for identifying future investment priorities.

6.22 Investment in improved provision should be tied to a tailor-made management plan for each individual park. The 1995 Comedia report ‘Park Life – Urban Parks and Social Renewal’ (p79) recommends that this would involve as a minimum:

- Defining the purpose of each park and open space;
- Undertaking at least a minimal form of survey to establish who uses the park and what for;
- Re-formulating budgets so that expenditure is tied to objectives;
• Developing new guidelines for open space that are more flexible and responsive to needs.

6.23 Consultation with local user groups and other stakeholders help to define the sorts of facilities, amenities and activities that might be required in a certain area. The Residents’ Survey identifies the sorts of improvements people would like to see to existing open spaces (discussed in Chapter 3).

PROPOSED QUALITY STANDARD

Public Parks

6.24 Public parks within the Borough should be of good quality and provide the range of facilities associated with their respective tier of the parks hierarchy. The Green Flag assessment identifies spaces with a ranking of 6 or above to be considered as good quality. Those public parks which either under perform in terms of their value to the local community or their condition should be improved consistent with the guidelines identified. Open spaces identified within Chapter 10 for improvement should be prioritised.
7. VALUE OF OPEN SPACE

INTRODUCTION

7.1 Value is a different and separate concept from quality. It relates to three things:

- Context: a space which is inaccessible may be of little value, irrespective of its quality. If there is a high level of open space provision in an area some of it may be of relatively little value, conversely if there is very little provision even a space of mediocre quality it may be valuable.

- Level and type of use: context should also be interpreted in terms of use by people and wildlife.

- The wider benefits it generates for people, biodiversity and the wider environment.

7.2 The benefits and value of open spaces to local communities extends beyond their active recreational role. Both public and private open spaces perform recreational and non-recreational roles contributing to community and quality of life. These roles are examined under the following headings:

- Recreational;
- Structural;
- Amenity;
- Historical / Heritage;
- Ecological;
- Educational;
- Cultural; and
- Social.
7.3 The recreational value of open spaces in Havering has been assessed by considering the recreational roles performed at each site and indications of informal use.

7.4 Non-recreational roles relate the value or function of an open space to the structure or amenity of the Borough as a whole. Open spaces with significant ecological or nature conservation value are identified later in this chapter and proposals are made to improve the accessibility of local residents to areas of nature conservation.

7.5 The educational, cultural and social roles relate to indirect benefits and values associated with presence and use of open spaces. Assessment of the additional benefits and value offered by individual open spaces is significant when considering their importance.

RECREATIONAL VALUE

7.6 The recreational value of open spaces in Havering has assessed by considering the recreational roles performed at each site and the indications of informal use. Active recreational roles include pitch sports, other outdoor sports and other active recreational activities such as allotment gardening. Informal recreational activities include walking and dog walking, children’s play, teenagers ‘hanging out’, sitting out, relaxation and other pastimes such as remembrance at memorial gardens and cemeteries.

7.7 A recreation score was derived for each open space based upon the number of active and informal recreational roles each space performed, whether they represented a major or minor role within the open space and whether there was dedicated provision or whether the activity was supported informally. Indications of informal use were also included within the score. Appendix D provides further details of the scoring system used to assess recreational value. A standardised % score for each space was derived.

7.8 Table 7.1 identifies the number, and percentage, of open spaces within the Borough which performed selected active and informal recreational roles. It also identifies whether these roles were major or minor and whether the provision was deemed ‘dedicated’ or ‘informal’.

7.9 A major role is defined as where either 40% of the site area or estimated usage is dedicated to the role identified. A minor role was identified where the activity represented a lower level of usage or land take. ‘Dedicated provision’ is defined as a

---

8 Some tables may have a total site score of 315. This is because site 175, “Havering Well Gardens” (in Hylands ward) has been omitted in some calculations.
site where equipment designed for that particular recreational use is evident, with ‘informal provision’ defined as a site where the recreational activity takes place without such equipment. The % columns for the minor and major role, and for the dedicated and informal provision, show what % of the sites that offer the particular recreation type have been identified under the particular category.

Table 7.1 – Recreational Role of Open Spaces

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recreation Type</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Active Recreation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pitch Sports</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court Sports</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf/Putting</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watersports</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noisy Sports</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Activity</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Informal Recreation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking/Dog Walking</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>25.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's Play</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teenagers Hanging out</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sitting Out/Relaxation</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycling</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Activity</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.10 Table 7.1 illustrates that the most common role which open spaces perform is for walking/dog walking followed by children’s play. It is interesting to note that of the 74 sites identified as playing a role for ‘Teenagers hanging out’, just 4.1% have dedicated provision for this use. Under 20% of all sites accommodated some form of pitch sports.
Table 7.2 - Indications of Informal Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Informal Use</th>
<th>No. Open Spaces</th>
<th>% Total Open Spaces</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Desire Lines</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skateboarding</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMX</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycling</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball Practice area</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kick about area</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>28.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog walking</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>35.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: all 316 sites

7.11 The survey also recorded use of open spaces for informal uses which do not require the provision of dedicated or specialist facilities. Informal use of open space was assessed by observing whether there was evidence of informal kick-about or basketball practice areas, skateboarding, cycling and BMX use, people walking their dogs, or desire lines (Table 7.2). The most common types of informal use identified at open spaces in the Havering Borough are dog walking (35% of all spaces) and kick about areas (28% of all spaces). This type of use may fluctuate depending on the time of day and season, and can be further assessed through the results of the residents survey.

STRUCTURAL ROLE

7.12 The structural role of open spaces as identified by the site surveys are shown in Table 7.3. Open Spaces which are considered to perform a structural and/or amenity role are illustrated in Figure 7.1.

7.13 Table 7.3 illustrates the number of open spaces which provide different types of structural role. These sites form significant elements in the Borough’s overall physical structure and include a combination of green open spaces, such as public parks and gardens, cemeteries, green spaces within grounds of institutions and natural/semi natural greenspace. They provide a physical and visual break between major residential areas and help to distinguish between different neighbourhoods and communities.
### Table 7.3 - Structural Role of Open Spaces

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structural Role</th>
<th>No. of Open Spaces</th>
<th>Area of Open Space (ha)</th>
<th>% Total Area of all Open Space</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clearly distinguishable from the built up area providing separation between different communities</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>1076.9</td>
<td>49.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributes to the special identity of Havering</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>888.7</td>
<td>41.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creates a positive and significant open space experience when passed or crossed while travelling on the adjacent main road networks and railways</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>942.2</td>
<td>43.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributes to the sense of place of the local area</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1035.8</td>
<td>48.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helps to define neighbourhoods within the urban area</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>485.5</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodates recognised and recognisable features of local importance (e.g buildings/structures, landscape, events and activities)</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>1265.6</td>
<td>58.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total open spaces with structural role</strong></td>
<td>140</td>
<td><strong>1773.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>82.2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total open spaces with no structural role</strong></td>
<td>175</td>
<td><strong>385.2</strong></td>
<td><strong>17.8</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Structural Land Use Designations                                                                     |                    |                        |                               |
| Metropolitan Open Land                                                                                | 38                 | 474.7                  | 22.0                          |
| Green Belt                                                                                            | 4                  | 33.3                   | 1.5                           |
| Thames Chase                                                                                          | 6                  | 103.7                  | 4.8                           |

7.14 Table 7.3 shows that 140 open spaces in the Borough fulfil at least one of the structural roles identified. The most common structural role is the contribution that open space makes in helping to define neighbourhoods in the local area. A total of 56 open spaces meet this criteria. There are 175 sites that do not have a structural role. Table 7.3 also identifies the number of spaces with structural land use designations. 38 of the surveyed sites were classified as ‘Metropolitan Open Land’ with 6 existing sites forming part of the Thames Chase area.

7.15 It is interesting to note that over two thirds of sites play a structural role, these spaces take up 82.2% of the open space area in Havering. The definitions used to assess each criteria are included in the guide to the proforma in Appendix A.
AMENITY VALUE

7.16 The ways in which open space contributes to the visual amenity of its area are influenced by the amount of open space in the area, the visual envelope of the open space and the contribution it makes to the street scene.

7.17 The following criteria were used to assess the amenity value of open spaces in Havering (see guide to proforma Appendix A for criteria definitions):

- Is it visible from parts of the surrounding area?
- Is it visually attractive?
- Does it have a clearly definable townscape value?
- Does it provide relief from the built up area?
- Site mitigates visual impact of unsightly land uses (buffer, bunding, screening).

7.18 If the open space meets one or more of the above criteria it was considered to offer ‘significant amenity value’. The more criteria the space fulfils the greater the amenity value of the space. The overall amenity value of open spaces within the Borough is summarised within Table 7.4. This illustrates that 88.3% of the total area of all open spaces offer amenity value based upon one or more of the criteria identified above.

Table 7.4 - Amenity Value of Open Space

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amenity Value</th>
<th>No. of Open Spaces</th>
<th>% Total Area of all Open Spaces</th>
<th>Area of Open Space</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Visible from parts of the surrounding area</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>72.4</td>
<td>1561.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visually attractive</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>72.2</td>
<td>1557.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearly definable townscape value</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>180.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides relief from the built up area</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>501.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigates visual impact of unsightly land uses</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>48.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total open space with amenity value</strong></td>
<td><strong>220</strong></td>
<td><strong>88.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>1904.8</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No amenity role</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>253.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area of Special Landscape Character</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>426.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.19 The exact level and type of amenity greenspace provision should be responsive to the nature of the development and the existing level and type of open space provision. Within certain areas of the Borough amenity greenspace and other forms of open space form an integral part of the urban fabric and contribute towards local character and distinctiveness. For this reason it is not appropriate to define specific quantity or access standards relating to such provision. Within areas of deficiency, other forms of open space provision such other open spaces can be of particular value and represent possible opportunities for meeting local deficiencies.

7.20 Amenity space provision within the Borough has been considered on a sub area basis. Consideration has been given to the need for amenity greenspace provision and the supply and quality of amenity space in each sub area.

North Romford (Havering Park, Mawneys and Pettits)

7.21 The majority of the urban area within the North Romford sub area contains semi-detached or terraced properties, which suggests that the level of open space need within the area may be high. In addition to this, the proportion of children living in the sub area is also relatively high, which adds further to the need for amenity greenspace.

7.22 The nature of the built environment means that the majority of properties in this area have relatively small private gardens / back yards. This is particularly true to the north of Romford Town, where the percentage of terraced dwellings is above average. The east of the Pettits ward is typified by a lower density, and therefore contains a larger number of properties with private gardens.

7.23 Due to the fact that the majority of this sub area was a planned neighbourhood developed during the same period, provision does exist for small amenity spaces, designed to enhance the quality of the life for those residing in the area. However, despite the supply of open space within this sub area being relatively high, the quality of the smaller spaces is generally not considered to be good, and many of the spaces have suffered from under investment. One of the consequences of this is that some of the amenity spaces are not currently fulfilling their potential role.

Harold Hill (Gooshays, Heaton and Harold Wood)

7.24 Situated in the north east of the Borough, the Heaton, Gooshays and Harold Wood wards are largely built up areas that were developed as planned settlements. The north of Gooshays, and the south east of Harold Wood are rural areas.
7.25 The south west of the Gooshays ward has the highest need for open space in this sub area, due to the relatively high population density, the high percentage of terraced, flats and apartments, and the relatively high child densities. In terms of health, both Gooshays and Heaton score relatively poorly relative to the Havering Borough as a whole.

7.26 The sub area contains a relatively large amount of open space which performs an amenity role around the urban fringe, with fewer open spaces within the urban area compared to the North Romford sub area. The distribution of amenity spaces is also uneven across the sub area. The east of the Heaton ward, the west of the Harold Wood ward and the south of the Gooshays ward generally have the lowest supply of open space. Amenity spaces that do exist in this area were generally identified as being poor in terms of their overall quality.

Central (Brooklands, Romford Town and Squirrels Heath)

7.27 The central sub area incorporates the Brooklands, Romford Town and Squirrels Heath wards. Given the town centre location of Romford Town ward, the proportion of properties with the highest need for open space is relatively high, although fewer than 10% of properties in the north of Squirrels Heath are terraced, flats or apartments. The south of the Brooklands ward may also have a large need for open space, mainly due to the density of dwellings in this part of the ward. The assessment of amenity space in this part of the Borough identified a number of amenity spaces that are have the potential to be enhanced in this area.

7.28 The provision of amenity space is very low in Romford itself. Given the number of properties in this area without access to a private garden, a high proportion of people residing in the town are unlikely to have adequate access to local areas of open space close to their home. Those residing in the Squirrels Heath area also have limited access to amenity greenspace, despite the need for such types of spaces that was identified in Chapter 3. The only publicly accessible open space identified in this area is Haynes Park. This space is likely to serve an amenity function for the south of the ward, but is situated too far from the north of the ward to serve an amenity function to area north of the railway line.

7.29 Although Brooklands does not have a large amount of amenity space per se, the ward is well served by other types of open space, including playing fields, local parks and allotments. It is recognised that such spaces have the ability to perform an amenity role in addition to their primary function as a more formal type of open space.
**Hornchurch (Hylands, St Andrews and Hacton)**

7.30 The Hornchurch sub area is characterised by relatively low levels of need for open space provision, with the exception of Hacton ward which fulfils a relatively large number of need criteria (refer to Figure 3.6). The sub area has little in the way of planned amenity space and has few small park spaces which can perform an amenity role. The Hacton ward, which is largely made up of a semi detached housing estate, in particular has very few small publicly accessible small spaces which can perform an amenity role even though the need within the ward is high. The amenity spaces which do exist within the ward, at sites 119 and 120, were assessed to be of above average quality but below average value. Site 108, which borders the Inglebourne River, also performs an amenity function through its provision of recreational grassland and children’s play facilities, as does site 109 with its provision of recreational grassland. However, these sites are only easily accessible, and so only perform an important amenity function, to residents that live close to the Inglebourne River.

7.31 Site 39, Harrow Lodge Park, is situated within the middle of the sub area and will perform an amenity function to residents that live close by, as will the small local parks at sites 48 and 105 towards the northern border of the sub area. Residents that live more than 5 minutes walk away from these spaces (some 70% of the population) are generally under provided for in terms of amenity space.

**South Havering (Elm Park, South Hornchurch and Rainham & Wennington)**

7.32 The South Havering sub area is characterised by relatively low levels of need with the exception of the Elm Park ward and central Rainham, which fulfil a relatively large number of need criteria (refer to Figure 3.6). Elm Park ward is largely made up of semi detached housing with two large open spaces at the eastern and western ends of the ward: sites 45 (The Brettons) and 31 (Hornchurch Country Park). These spaces will perform some amenity functions for those that live close by but have little in the way of informal recreational grassland. Site 43, Brettons playing field will perform an amenity role for those that live within the south west of the ward. Some other planned amenity spaces, at sites 125, 122, 35, 37, 124 and 123, do exist situated within blocks of housing and are distributed relatively evenly throughout the ward. The general quality and value of these spaces was assessed to be low. Some areas towards the north of the ward are under provided for in terms of amenity space.

7.33 Similar semi detached housing estates exist in the South Hornchurch ward, again with pre-planned amenity spaces situated between housing blocks. Need within the ward is generally lower than within other wards within the sub area, but the amenity spaces are distributed relatively evenly and appear to serve the ward well, although
most of these amenity spaces were assessed to be of below average quality and value.

7.34 Rainham and Wennington ward has little in the way of planned amenity space within its residential areas. The north of the ward, near to the Inglebourne River corridor, has a large provision of natural greenspace but much of it is inaccessible from the housing estates and does not provide any amenity function such as recreational grassland. Local parks exist at sites 126 and 134, towards the eastern and western ends of the population centres, which provide an amenity function to nearby residents but at least 40% of the population of the ward are outside of a 5 minute walk to these spaces.

Upminster (Upminster, Cranham and Emerson Park)

7.35 The Upminster sub area is characterised by relatively low levels of need, with the exception of a large part of the population centre of Cranham ward and the westernmost part of Emerson Park ward.

7.36 The population centre of the Upminster ward is made up of a large semidetached housing estate to the south of Upminster town centre. Within the estate, few planned amenity spaces exist. Local parks exist at sites 47 and 100, towards the southern and northern ends of the population centre, and they do perform an amenity function but approximately 40% of the population live outside of a 5 minute walk of these spaces. Site 98, which borders the Inglebourne River, also performs an amenity function but is only easily accessible to residents towards the western edge of the ward.

7.37 Cranham ward also consists of a large semi-detached housing estate, with some pre-planned amenity spaces at sites 49, 50 and 51 as well as a local park at site 52 towards the eastern edge of the population centre. With the exception of these spaces, the ward is generally poorly provided for in terms of easily accessible amenity space. Much of the open space that exists towards the west of the ward is inaccessible to the public. Most of the housing estate within the ward benefits from easy access to the large area of natural greenspace that separates it from the M25, but this provides little in the way of an amenity function, other than for those that live directly next to it or for those passing along transport corridors.

7.38 Emerson Park ward is also made up of a large area of semi-detached housing, of which no pre-planned amenity spaces have been included. Much of the central, southern and eastern parts of the ward have no easy access to amenity space or any spaces that perform an amenity function. However, need is lower towards the eastern parts of the ward, compared with the western parts of the ward, which are
provided for to some extent by access to local parks, such as sites 92 and 48, just outside the west of the ward and at site 76, towards the north of the ward, which provide the only amenity functions to nearby residents.

EDUCATION

7.39 Urban open spaces can represent an educational resource for both children and adults either on an organised basis, such as schools using open spaces for activities linked to the curriculum, or on a more informal basis (nature walks etc.). Educational roles should be assessed in terms of the potential benefit to the wider community (not just schools) and include:

- Sport / Organised Games – Sites should be assessed for signs of existing use by schools for active recreation;
- Nature / Environmental Study – Sites should have a range of ecological/environmental features. For the sites to have an existing role there should be some form of interpretation provision (e.g. boards, leaflets, programme of events); and
- Historical Interpretation / understanding – Open spaces which form part of the setting for any of the heritage designations including English Heritage Registered Historic Parks and Gardens, conservation areas, listed buildings, Scheduled Ancient Monuments, or sites located within the extent of the proposed World Heritage Site boundary and buffer zone. For the sites to have an existing role there should be some form of interpretation provision (boards, leaflets part of trail).

7.40 Open spaces were assessed on site for signs of use by schools i.e. for environmental education or other education purposes like sports. It is suggested that a survey of schools’ use of parks and playing fields is undertaken to fully establish the educational role that open spaces play. Questions to be asked could include:

- Location of activity;
- Activity undertaken;
- Frequency of visit;
- Difficulties arising from using the open space;
- Criteria for choosing the open space;
- Other comments.
Open spaces in Havering were assessed on their existing and potential educational roles. A total of 124 (39.37%) open spaces in Havering perform at least one existing educational role. The most common existing role is for sport or organised games, with a total of 32.4% of all open spaces providing this role. Havering has a number of after-school play clubs run by the voluntary sector, especially towards the south of the borough. Along with the borough’s schools, these make up many of the sites which provide an educational role in the form of sport and organised games.

28.6% of all sites were assessed to have the potential to introduce one or more educational roles, with 7% of all sites assessed as having potential to enhance historical understanding. Many of these sites were either parks with heritage value or churches where existing information was assessed to be poor or unavailable. This is illustrated in Table 7.5.

7.42

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Role</th>
<th>No. of Open Space</th>
<th>% of Total Open Spaces</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sport/Organised Games</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>32.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature/Environmental Study</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for enhancing historical interpretation / understanding</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Open Space with Education Role</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>39.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: A single space can have both an existing and a potential educational role

HERITAGE VALUE

The relationship between open space provision and areas of heritage value within the Borough is shown in Figure 7.3. This identifies the location of existing historic parks and gardens, and the relationship between open space provision and Conservation Areas.

The English Heritage Register for Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest identifies nine phases of park and garden development criteria which any site must meet to warrant inclusion on the register:

- Sites with a main phase of development before 1750 where at least a proportion of the layout of this date is still evident, even perhaps only as an earthwork;
• Sites with a main phase of development laid out between 1750 and 1820 where enough of this landscaping survives to reflect the original design;

• Sites with a main phase of development between 1820 and 1880 which is of importance and survives intact or relatively intact;

• Sites with a main phase of development between 1880 and 1939 where this is of high importance and survives intact;

• Sites with a main phase of development laid out post-war, but more than 30 years ago, where the work is of exceptional importance;

• Sites which were influential in the development of taste whether through reputation or references in literature;

• Sites which are early or representative examples of a style of layout, or a type of site, or the work of a designer (amateur or professional) of national importance;

• Sites having an association with significant persons or historical events;

• Sites with strong group value.

7.45 These criteria, set by English Heritage, make specific reference to ‘Parks and Gardens’ only. Many of the open spaces assessed as part of this study do not qualify as either a Park or a Garden. However, cemeteries do fall within the scope of the Register criteria and can be assessed for inclusion.

7.46 Figure 7.3 illustrates that one open space in Havering has been included on the English Heritage Register of Parks and Gardens. It is site 8, Dagnam Park, in the ward of Goosehays.

7.47 At present of the 316 open spaces assessed as part of this study 3 are wholly or partly included within the Scheduled Ancient Monuments designation. These are:

• Site 8: Dagnam Park

• Site 46: Upminster Park

• Site 265: Romford Golf Course
The criteria used to assess the cultural heritage value of spaces are identified in Appendix D. The heritage value of spaces is incorporated within the composite assessment of open space value described later in this chapter.

In addition other open spaces are also of heritage value if they form part of conservation areas or their setting. The 13 open spaces which form part of a Conservation Areas of open space are:

- Cranham Marsh
- The Riding School
- Romford Golf Course
- Corbets Tey School
- Coopers Company School
- St James Oglethorpe Primary School
- Bower Park Centre
- Gascoyne Close
- Bedfords Park
- Raphael Park
- Ockenden Road Land
- Ashfield Gardens Allotments
- Parklands

Open spaces within Conservation areas are of value as they provide a setting for the built fabric within these areas. Measures to enhance the heritage value of open spaces are described in Chapter 10.
SOCIAL AND CULTURAL

7.51 Open spaces can also represent a source of wider social benefits and cultural value providing the setting for sport, community meetings, fairs, firework displays, picnics etc. Social benefits are recognised as perhaps the most obvious benefits and opportunities that urban open spaces provide for City living (Urban Open Spaces, 2003). The social and cultural benefits associated within open spaces include:

- Community focus – A sense of community can be provided by open spaces which host small and large events and both organised and informal gatherings. Open spaces also represent a source of local identity and pride;

- Cultural focus – Parks and open spaces are important for people from different cultures. They provide a venue for religious services, festivals and charity events;

- Social focus – Open spaces provide opportunities for social interaction and the development of social capital through family and group outings, community events and activities, meetings between friends and chance encounters. Participation in physical recreation has shown to contribute towards a reduction of incivilities and anti-social behaviour among participants;

- Health benefits – Open spaces provide benefits to health. Exercise and physical activity contribute towards physical well being. Whilst peace and quiet, social interaction, opportunities for aesthetic appreciation and proximity to nature is beneficial to mental health and well being;

- Educational focus – Open spaces provide opportunities for children’s play which are beneficial to child development. These benefits are not confined to children’s play areas but other features and experiences on offer within open spaces. Open spaces provide visual stimulation, opportunities to develop and appreciation of wildlife and the natural environment, opportunities to improve cognitive, co-ordination and communication skills through play. Open spaces can provide a safe environment for informal play and adventure which can foster a sense of independence; and

- Heritage focus – Open spaces can be of historic value and provide opportunities for people to engage and interpret with the historic environment which can provide a sense of community identity.

7.52 Table 7.6 summarises the existing and potential cultural roles performed by open spaces in Havering. 23% of open spaces already perform a cultural role either through the provision of dedicated facilities to support cultural activities or through
events held within the space, whilst nearly 18% of open spaces within the Borough were identified as having potential to perform culture related functions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural Role</th>
<th>No. of Open Spaces</th>
<th>% of Open Spaces</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>Potential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venue for large scale outdoor events</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dedicated venue for small scale events</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Events Programme</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community/Youth Centre/Meeting Hall</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor Sports Hall/Leisure Centre</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total Open Space with one or more cultural role | 73 | 56 | 23.1 | 17.7 |

Note: A single space can have both an existing and a potential role

ECOLOGICAL ROLE

7.53 The Government has set out the need to promote biodiversity through the preparation of Local Biodiversity Action Plans (LBAPs) which include the provision of natural and semi-natural greenspace. Two definitions of ecological value have been considered to inform the development of an appropriate locally based standard natural or semi-natural greenspace. These are:

7.54 Existing ecological designations as defined at the regional level through the GLA Phase 1 Habitat Assessments (refer to Figure 7.2 & 7.4); and

Existing Ecological Designations

7.56 A desk top analysis of existing nature conservation and ecological designations was undertaken to identify sites of identified nature conservation importance based on the GLA Ecological Appraisal work undertaken in 2001.

7.57 The ecological value of sites was classified by the GLA according to the criteria defined in 'Policy, Criteria and Procedures for Identifying nature conservation sites in London' (revised July 2000), which is recommended by the Mayor of London’s draft Biodiversity Strategy as the basis for such work. Following a GLA ecological survey of Havering in 2001, sites were designated as being of either Metropolitan Importance, of Borough Importance (Grade 1 or 2), or of Local Importance. 70 sites within the Borough met the criteria for one of these ecological designations.

7.58 Table 7.7 provides a breakdown of the total area ecological designations as defined by the GLA ecological appraisals and the number of spaces which are wholly or partly included within these designations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ecological Designations</th>
<th>No. of Open Spaces</th>
<th>% of Open Spaces</th>
<th>Total Area (ha)</th>
<th>Area per 1,000 pop (2001) Ha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site of Metropolitan Importance</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>9.18</td>
<td>1209.59</td>
<td>5.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site of Borough Importance Grade 1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>464.72</td>
<td>2.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site of Borough Importance Grade 2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5.06</td>
<td>401.68</td>
<td>1.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site of Local Importance</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>73.19</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>70</strong></td>
<td><strong>22.15</strong></td>
<td><strong>2149.18</strong></td>
<td><strong>9.58</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes sites of ecological value without public access

7.59 These sites are identified on Figure 7.4 overlayed with the boundaries of sites considered as part of the open space assessment. A significant proportion of the area subject to ecological designations is comprised of private land which is publicly accessible and does not conform with the English Nature definition of Accessible Natural Greenspace.

7.60 Table 7.7 shows that a total of 2149.18ha of land within Havering is designated with one or more statutory ecological designations. This equates to 9.58ha of natural greenspace per 1,000 population (using 2001 figures). Assuming existing greenspace provision within the Borough does not change, Havering would have 9.07ha of natural greenspace per 1,000 population in 2016 (using 2016 population projection figures).
Using this definition of natural greenspace it is also possible to conduct an analysis of natural greenspace by ward. Table 7.8 shows that Rainham and Wennington ward has the greatest levels of provision per 1000 population, with 57.02 ha in 2001. Conversely, Romford Town has the lowest level of natural greenspace per 1000 population with 0.4 ha per 1000 people. Using the GLA population projection for 2016 it is evident that natural greenspace per 1000 population would be 8.62 ha per 1000.

Table 7.8 - Total Areas Subject to Ecological Designations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ecological Designation</th>
<th>Total Population 2001</th>
<th>Ecological Designation per 1,000 population 2001</th>
<th>Population 2016*</th>
<th>Ecological Designation per 1,000 population 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brooklands</td>
<td>26.38</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>13767</td>
<td>1.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cranham</td>
<td>76.55</td>
<td>5.92</td>
<td>12940</td>
<td>5.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elm Park</td>
<td>132.40</td>
<td>10.40</td>
<td>12735</td>
<td>10.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emerson Park</td>
<td>31.28</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>12046</td>
<td>2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gooshays</td>
<td>165.84</td>
<td>11.21</td>
<td>14789</td>
<td>11.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hacton</td>
<td>12.76</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>13207</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harold Wood</td>
<td>108.55</td>
<td>8.55</td>
<td>12689</td>
<td>8.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Havering Park</td>
<td>248.70</td>
<td>19.03</td>
<td>13071</td>
<td>19.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heaton</td>
<td>14.85</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>12450</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hylands</td>
<td>18.90</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>13086</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mawneys</td>
<td>8.06</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>13272</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pettits</td>
<td>65.48</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>13563</td>
<td>4.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rainham and Wennington</td>
<td>690.79</td>
<td>53.95</td>
<td>12805</td>
<td>53.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romford Town</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>13953</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Hornchurch</td>
<td>149.60</td>
<td>11.24</td>
<td>13310</td>
<td>11.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Squirrel's Heath</td>
<td>12.49</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>12452</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Andrews</td>
<td>15.25</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>13507</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upminster</td>
<td>366.03</td>
<td>27.32</td>
<td>13397</td>
<td>27.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2149.18</strong></td>
<td><strong>9.58</strong></td>
<td><strong>237040</strong></td>
<td><strong>9.07</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Population projections for each individual ward are worked out via GLA borough wide projection.

**Accessible Natural Greenspace Provision**

The second definition of natural greenspace considered is the Accessible Natural Greenspace Standard (ANGSt). English Nature has recommended that local authorities set standards relating to natural greenspace using this definition as guide provision. This guidance was formally issued in 1996 within ‘A Space for Nature’. The recommended standards are:

- Provision of at least 1ha of Local Nature Reserve per 1,000 population;
- That no person should be located more than 300m from their nearest area of natural greenspace of at least 2ha in size;
That there should be at least one accessible 20ha site within 2km from home;

That there should be one accessible 100ha site within 5km; and

That there should be one accessible 500ha site within 10km.

These standards are used by a wide range of local authorities throughout the country, including Manchester and Sheffield, to inform natural greenspace provision. However, relatively few authorities outside London have adopted formal standards of natural greenspace provision within their development plans.

The ANGSt model was reviewed by English Nature in 2003 (Accessible Natural Greenspace Standards in Towns and Cities: A Review and Toolkit). The review identified a number of problems with the model.

The definition of natural greenspace used within the model “Areas naturally colonised by plants and animals” was considered to be unclear and impractical. This definition also excludes man made types of vegetation which predominate within urban areas and which have high biodiversity value. A complete knowledge of the history of each site would be required to determine whether a site has been naturally colonised or had resulted from planting and management.

The review also identified the need for more flexibility regarding the distance and size criteria and role within the hierarchy to reflect local circumstances. English Nature has yet to adopt revised natural greenspace standards following the review. However, the review does recommend that the ecological value of greenspace should be determined through undertaking a Phase 1 Habitat survey. The revised PPG17 also recommends that local authorities derive locally based standards of provision rather than adopt nationally derived standards wholesale. However, the ANGst standards reflect the distribution of natural and semi-natural sites required within urban areas to support high levels of biodiversity and flora and fauna communities.

The distribution of accessible natural greenspace provision has been assessed using the findings of the open space site appraisals.

A definition of natural greenspace for use within the study includes the following types of urban greenspace:

Open spaces which are designated with National, or Local nature conservation designations (including SSSIs, SMI, SBI, SLI, LNRs); or
Open spaces where at least 5% of the site is comprised of natural heathland, downland, common or natural woodland, wasteland/derelict areas, water area, or informal grassland.

Table 7.9 – Natural Greenspace Provision (Within open space)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Natural Greenspace Provision</th>
<th>No of Open Spaces</th>
<th>Area (in ha)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Natural Heathland / Downland / Common</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>88.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Woodland</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>214.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetland</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>277.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scrubland</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>180.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unimproved meadows</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>116.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal recreational grassland</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>34.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>111</strong></td>
<td><strong>912.53</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Only includes natural greenspace provision, rather than other types of open space, within ecological designated sites.

7.69 The natural greenspace coverage within open spaces in the Borough is identified in Table 7.9 and illustrated in Figure 7.5. Table 7.9 illustrates the total area of broad habitat types within open spaces as well as the number of spaces where each habitat type is represented.

Quantity of Natural Greenspace

7.70 Within the Borough there are 111 spaces which have at least 5% natural greenspace coverage (35.1% of all 316 open spaces in the Borough). The total area of natural greenspace in Havering using this definition equates to 912.53 ha. This means that there is 4.06 ha of natural greenspace per 1,000 population within the Borough (2001 Census) Assuming that the amount of greenspace within the Borough does not change, Havering will have 3.84ha of greenspace per 1,000 population in 2016 (using 2016 population projections).

Application of the ANGST Accessibility Criteria

7.71 Table 7.10 demonstrates that there are 7 spaces within the Borough which have natural greenspace areas over 20ha in size representing an overall area of 679.93ha.

Table 7.10 – Areas of Natural Greenspace (by size)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Natural/ Semi Natural Urban Greenspace and Other Natural Green Space</th>
<th>No. of Open Spaces</th>
<th>Area (in Ha)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sites &gt; 20 Hectares</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>679.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sites 2-20 Hectares</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>202.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sites &lt; 2 Hectares</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>29.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>82</strong></td>
<td><strong>912.53</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Includes area of ecological designations.
7.72 Figure 7.6 shows the distribution of natural/semi-natural green space, whilst Figure 7.7 identifies the areas of the Borough further than ANGST accessibility criteria.

7.73 Figure 7.7 identifies wards that have large areas that are greater than 300m from an area of natural greenspace at least 2ha in size. It is evident that all wards include areas of deficiency to varying degrees. However, areas with the largest areas of deficiency are concentrated in the east of Havering.

7.74 The following wards have large areas outside the 2000m catchment area of natural greenspace bigger than 20ha:

- Brooklands;
- Romford Town;
- Hylands;

7.75 Individually, just 2 spaces within the Borough are larger than 100ha in size and therefore fulfil the criteria for the 5km catchment within the ANGST standard. Parts of the Upminster and Cranham wards fall outside this catchment area but may be served by such spaces outside of the Borough. No spaces fulfil the criteria of being greater than 500ha in size. The Council should identify the location of the nearest natural or semi natural greenspaces which are located within 5km and 10km of the boundary respectively.

*Deriving an appropriate Standard for natural and semi-natural greenspace*

7.76 The definition which should be used to derive a quantitative natural and semi-natural greenspace standard has been considered.

7.77 The English Nature ANGST approach recommends that the quantitative component is based upon Local Nature Reserves. Section 21 of the National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act 1949, provides local authorities the power to acquire, declare and manage Local Nature Reserves (LNRs). The LNR designation is not a lower level of designation within the hierarchy but represents sites which provide public access to wildlife and natural habitats.
7.78 The adopted UDP states that, when appropriate, the Council will seek the positive management and safeguarding of particularly important areas by, for example, designation of Local Nature Reserves. The suitability of sites is dependent on their habitat type, community value, ownership, public access and availability of resources. There are a significant number of publicly accessible sites subject to ecological designations which are not designated as Local Nature Reserves. In addition strategies at the sub regional level are prioritising the incorporation and enhancement of spaces within the Green Grid and Green Arc network and through afforestation in the Thames Chase rather than through formal designation as LNRs.

7.79 Figure 7.5 illustrates natural greenspace provision within open spaces combined with selected ecological designations within the Borough. It is recommended that areas of natural greenspace and the area included within ecological designations are used to derive a quantitative standard for natural greenspace provision. The reason is that the value of these spaces has been assessed using a phase 1 habitat survey. The definition is more comprehensive in terms of its coverage and includes areas of the Marsh area and Thames Chase where improvements in access are planned over the plan period. Provision by ward is identified in Table 7.8.

Access Standard

7.80 It is proposed that local standards are developed for accessible natural greenspace based upon the lower 3 tiers of the ANGST model. Deficiencies in access should be considered in relation to Figure 7.7 which considers access both designated ecological sites and accessible natural greenspace areas within open spaces. New provision should be provided to address deficiencies in access. However, where provision is already provided the need to enhance the quality of existing provision should be considered in relation to new development proposals.

COMPOSITE VALUE ANALYSIS

7.81 A composite assessment of the value of open spaces was undertaken which considered the context within which the open space lies, the level and type of use associated with the space and the wider benefits it generates for people, biodiversity and the wider environment.

7.82 The following types of value were examined:
The context of the open space including local open space needs, park deficiencies, site access arrangements and barriers of access to and within the open space;

The recreational function performed by the open space;

The structural role of open space in separating and defining communities;

The amenity value of space;

Historical / Heritage value of spaces;

The ecological and environmental roles performed by spaces;

The existing and potential educational value of spaces to the community; and

The cultural roles spaces perform (e.g. community venues, performance spaces).

7.83 The criteria used to assess each of these dimensions of value are described fully in Appendix D. Each of the values were weighted and given a percentage score. These are identified in Figure 7.10 below.

7.84 The value of individual spaces within Havering is illustrated on Figure 7.8. The overall value of spaces within the Borough is summarised within Table 7.11. The value scores were not weighted to reflect the type of open space (unlike the quality assessment). The value scores should be viewed as an indicator of the “richness” of individual spaces. The only major aspect of site value which could not be established from the on site assessments were usage levels of individual spaces. The parks residents’ survey provides an indication of the usage to be established on a park by park basis. This information could then be used to update the value assessment.
7.85 Figure 7.8 illustrates that almost all spaces within the study area have value of some kind along one or more dimensions described above. The open spaces which perform the most roles are likely to be the most valued spaces to the community. However the reverse is not necessarily true.

7.86 With reference to Figure 7.8 the Navy and dark blue colours indicate the open spaces of greatest value. The value scores should not be used to directly compare different types or sizes of open space as for example it is not expected that an amenity space within a housing area should be of the same value as a district park.
Table 7.11 - Composite Value Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Range of Score %</th>
<th>No. Open Spaces</th>
<th>% Open Spaces</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 to 10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 to 20</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>31.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 to 30</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>39.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 to 40</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 to 50</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 to 60</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 to 70</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71 to 80</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81 to 90</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91 to 100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.87 Table 7.11 shows the distribution of value scores. It should be recognised that a score of more than around 15% indicates that an open space is contributing significantly to one or more of the dimensions of value described above. Only rarely do individual open spaces fulfil all of the dimensions of value identified in the highest category, this is why only 4 open spaces score more than 50%. 124 sites (39.4% of all spaces) scored between 21 and 30 %. This is likely to be because amenity greenspace (62 sites) and education playing fields (71 sites) are the most common forms of open space in Havering, which often have a limited number of functions.

7.88 The value scores should not be viewed on a continuum. A space which has a score of 50% does not necessarily contribute twice as much value to the community as a space which scores 25%. It is important to consider each of the different dimensions of “value” individually when considering the value of open space sites to the community.

7.89 The value scores provide a snapshot of existing open space value. However, this is not fixed and can be enhanced over time through improvements to the open space. Some aspects of value are more easily changed than others through enhancement and improvement. The potential to enhance open spaces within the Borough within the context of the Green Network is discussed in Chapter 10.
COMBINING QUALITY AND VALUE

7.90 Assessing the quality and value of open spaces is fundamental to identifying those spaces or facilities which should be given the highest level of protection by the planning system, those which require enhancement and those which may no longer be needed for their present purpose.

7.91 The Companion Guide to PPG17 recommends using this simple high/low classification to provide a means of determining the most appropriate policy approach to each open space. It also provides a basis for linking planning, design, management and maintenance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High Quality/Low Value</th>
<th>High Quality/high value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wherever possible, the preferred policy approach to a space or facility in this category should be to enhance its value in terms of its present primary purpose. If this is not possible, the next best policy approach is to consider whether it might be of high value if converted to some other primary purpose. Only if this is also impossible will it be acceptable to consider a change of use.</td>
<td>Ideally all space and facilities should come into this category and the planning system should then seek to protect them.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low quality/low value</th>
<th>Low quality/high value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wherever possible, the approach to these spaces or facilities should be to enhance their value. If this is not possible, for whatever reasons, the space or facility may be “surplus to requirements” in terms of its present primary purpose.</td>
<td>The policy approach to these spaces or facilities should always be to enhance their quality and therefore the planning system should seek to protect them.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.92 The relationship between the quality and value of open spaces within Havering is illustrated by Figure 7.11 below. It plots the quality and value scores for each open space on a graph. Appendix D illustrates the results of this exercise on a park by park basis.
7.93 Many of the high quality low value spaces represent mono-functional open spaces which only contribute to the community in a limited way. Within areas of identified deficiency (in terms of quantity, quality or access) it is important that such spaces do not under perform in terms of their potential value and multi-functionality and are improved to fulfil their potential.

7.94 The average score for value is 25.1 and the average score for quality is 6.2. Figure 7.11 demonstrates that many spaces in Havering have a fair or good quality score, at around 6 to 8, where as many spaces score between 10% and 30% for the value assessment. This may be explained by the fact that the most abundant open space types in the Borough are education playing fields (22.4% of all sites) and amenity greenspace (19.6%) of all sites), which may often be of reasonable quality but not always represent areas of education, heritage, recreation, environmental and ecological uses and therefore score relatively low on the value assessment. This does not mean that the space is not valued, as it will often have a high amenity value score, it just means that it does not offer the ‘richness’ of other spaces such as public parks.

7.95 286 of the 316 open spaces (90%) score over 15% in the value assessment which indicates that the open space is contributing significantly to one or more of the dimensions of value.
7.96 By using the average scores for value and quality, it is possible to establish how many of Havering’s open spaces are assessed as above and below the average quality and value. Table 7.12 demonstrates that 27.3% of all of Haverings open spaces are assessed as being of ‘high quality and high value’, and 15.2% are of low quality and high value. Low value spaces were quite evenly split between quality with 29.5% assessed as high quality and 29.7% of low quality.

Table 7.12 - Relationship Between Quality and Value

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality-Value Rating</th>
<th>No. Open Spaces</th>
<th>% Open Spaces</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Quality &amp; Value</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Quality High Value</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Quality Low Value</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>29.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Quality and Value</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>27.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

7.97 The value placed on open space is multi-functional and relates to a range of roles. Each open space will have a different mix of values to each individual user.

7.98 The study has shown that many of the open spaces surveyed are being used by schools and communities as an educational resource and location for social events. It is considered that the use of spaces by schools should be investigated further to demonstrate their demand.

7.99 The network of open spaces also provide a valuable ecological resource. Havering benefits from a number of areas of nature conservation interest or importance and such areas offer opportunities for the conservation of wildlife and for raising environmental awareness.

7.100 There are areas of the Borough which are deficient in accessible natural or semi-natural greenspace provision. Chapter 10 identifies open spaces which could possibly address this deficiency subject to new management regimes which adopt some of the landscaping and habitat creation measures identified.

7.101 86 spaces within the Borough (27.3%) were assessed as being of high quality and of high value to the community. Many of the high quality low value spaces represent mono-functional open spaces which only contribute to the community in a limited way. Within areas of identified deficiency (in terms of quantity, quality or access) it is important that such spaces do not under perform in terms of their potential value and multi-functionality and are improved to fulfil their potential.
NATURAL AND SEMI-NATURAL GREENSPACE PROVISION

Quantitative Component

7.102 It is considered that the measurement of land included within ecological designations within Havering provides the most appropriate method to establish a quantitative standard for natural greenspace. Havering currently has 9.58ha of natural greenspace subject to ecological designations per 1,000 population (using 2001 census figures) which will fall to 9.07ha per 1,000 population by 2016.

7.103 Whilst existing ecological sites should be protected through the LDF, given the wide variations in provision between the urban fringe and the built up area it is considered that a minimum standard of 1 ha of natural greenspace per 1,000 population is an achievable standard for new development on a ward level basis.

7.104 Proposals for new housing development should be accompanied by proposals to improve existing natural and semi-natural greenspace provision including ecological designations and natural greenspace areas within open spaces. The nature of such improvements should reflect the additional open space needs generated as a result of the proposed development.

7.105 If the proposed development is located within an identified area deficient in access to natural or semi-natural greenspace it will be necessary for additional land to be brought into use for this purpose. The developer will be required to make a contribution towards the provision of natural and semi-natural greenspace. It may be appropriate for such provision to be incorporated within the curtilage of the development. Alternatively, a contribution to off-site provision may be appropriate.

7.106 If the proposed development is not located within area which is deficient in access to natural or semi-natural greenspace then consideration will be given to any deficiency in quality or value of existing natural or semi natural greenspace areas. The developer will be required to make a contribution towards the enhancement of the quality of existing provision.

Accessibility Component

7.107 The following access standards are recommended for inclusion within the forthcoming Local Development Framework:

- All residents within the Borough should have access to a designated ecological site or natural or semi-natural greenspace of at least 2ha in size within 300m of home;
• All residents within the Borough should have access to a designated ecological site or natural or semi-natural greenspace of at least 20ha in size within 2km of home.

• All residents within the Borough should have access to a designated ecological site or natural or semi-natural greenspace of at least 100ha within 5km of home.

Where it is not possible to achieve the above levels of provision the quality of sites <2ha should be improved or contributions should be directed to improving linkages to existing or planned accessible natural greenspaces within the Borough and surrounding urban fringe area.

**Qualitative component**

7.108 Areas of natural and semi-natural greenspace should be of adequate quality and support local biodiversity. Areas of natural and semi-natural greenspace which either under perform in terms of their value to the local community and local biodiversity should be enhanced consistent with the guidelines identified in this chapter. Those spaces identified within Chapter 10 should be prioritised for improvement.
8. ALLOTMENT NEEDS

INTRODUCTION

8.1 The role of allotments is in a period of transition and their value is undergoing reappraisal. Traditionally allotments were developed within urban areas from the latter half of the C19th onwards to provide the urban poor access to land to grow their own fruit and vegetables. The spread of allotments was linked to development of high density housing without gardens. Growth of allotments intensified once again during the first and second world wars when they were used to supplement national food production.

8.2 Since 1945, provision of allotments nationally has declined due to housing developments which include larger gardens, although there was a brief resurgence in the 1970s following the Thorpe Inquiry on the future of allotments and subsequent initiatives to reinvent allotments as communal ‘leisure gardens’.

8.3 More recently interest in allotments has increased due to public awareness of ‘green’ issues and concerns over links between food and health. Modern housing developments are also being developed with smaller garden sizes which may stimulate demand for community gardens and allotments. Demographic changes including a larger number of older, but relatively healthy individuals could also stimulate demand for allotment plots as allotment participation is highest amongst the over 50s.

8.4 Within the policy arena, the contribution of allotments to urban regeneration, sustainable development and quality of life is being increasingly recognised. Benefits of allotments include:

- Providing access to affordable fresh vegetables, physical exercise and social activity;
- Localised food production brings environmental benefits of reducing use of energy and materials for processing, packaging and distributing food. Allotments also perform a role in recycling of green waste;
- Therapeutic value in promoting good physical and mental health. Gardening is identified as one of the Health Education Council’s recommended forms of exercise for the over 50s;
- Allotments are an important component of urban green space and provide a green lung within urban environments;
- Cultivated and untended plots contribute towards maintaining biodiversity particularly where plots are maintained using organic methods;
- Allotments have an important role to play in the implementation of plans for encouraging local sustainable development and community development. Potential links exist with local schools, and with the mentally and physically ill and disabled; and
- Allotments have an important historical and cultural role in community heritage, values and identity.

POLICY CONTEXT

National Context

The Allotment Acts

8.5 The legal framework for Allotments has developed in a piecemeal fashion and is encapsulated within a number of Acts identified below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Act and Date</th>
<th>Relevance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small Holdings and Allotments Act 1908</td>
<td>Consolidated all previous legislation and laid down the basis for subsequent Acts. Placed duty on local authorities to provide sufficient allotments according to demand. Makes provision for local authorities to compulsorily purchase land to provide allotments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allotments Act 1922</td>
<td>Limited the size of an individual allotment to one quarter of an acre and specified that they should mostly be used for growing fruit and vegetables.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allotments Act 1925</td>
<td>Required local authorities to recognise the need for allotments in any town planning development. Established ‘statutory’ allotments which a local authority could not sell or convert to other purposes without Ministerial consent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allotments Act 1950</td>
<td>Made improved provisions for compensatory and tenants rights. Confined local authority’s obligation to ‘allotment gardens’ only.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.6 For legal purposes there are two types of allotment. ‘Statutory Allotment’ status refers to land of which the freehold or very long lease is vested in the allotments authority, and which was either originally purchased for allotments or subsequently appropriated for allotment use. Statutory allotments are afforded protection under section 8 of the Allotments Act 1925 which provides that the consent of the Secretary...
of States must be obtained for disposal of land by a local authority which they have appropriated for the use of allotments, if it is proposed to sell, appropriate or use that land for a use other than allotments.

8.7 Such consent may not be given unless the Secretary of State is satisfied that:

- The allotment in question is not necessary and is surplus to requirements;
- Adequate provision will be made for displaced plot holders, or that such provision is unnecessary or impracticable;
- The number of people on the waiting list has been taken into account; and
- The authority has actively promoted and publicised the availability of allotment sites and has consulted the National Society of Allotments and Leisure Gardeners.

8.8 Various parameters have been laid down through case law to assist in the definition of ‘adequate provision’ and ‘not necessary’ etc.

8.9 A ‘temporary allotment’ is land rented by the authority but ultimately destined for some other use. Unlike local authority allotments, privately companies and institutions are not under any obligation to provide allotments. Neither temporary nor privately owned allotments are afforded protection under the various allotment Acts although they are subject to protection through planning legislation.

Planning Policy Guidance Note 17 – Sport Open Space and Recreation

8.10 The national planning framework relating to allotments is set out in PPG17 published in July 2002. This guidance identifies the role of informal open space including allotments as performing:

- The strategic function of defining and separating urban areas;
- Contributing towards urban quality and assisting urban regeneration;
- Promoting health and well being;
- Acting as havens and habitats for flora and fauna;
- Being a community resource for social interaction; and
- A visual amenity function.

PPG17 also identifies the issues which Local Planning Authorities should take into account in considering allotment provision and circumstances when disposal may be appropriate.
The Future of Allotments


- Consolidation of allotment legislation;
- Need for increased recognition of the multifunctional value of allotments;
- Need to plan for increased allotment demand. Improvements to quality of provision are required in order to convert latent demand into actual demand;
- Allotments should be integral to local authority leisure strategies and local agenda 21 initiatives;
- Local authorities should publish annually details of allotment provision;
- All local authorities should make clear the designation of sites as either statutory or temporary within Local Plans. Furthermore temporary sites should be identified with their final intended use along with expected date of change of use;
- With the exception of sites which are ultimately intended for use as cemeteries, the report recommends that any ‘temporary’ site which has been in continuous use as allotments for thirty years or more be automatically re-designated as ‘statutory’ subject to an appeal by a local authority;
- All local authorities examine the potential for self-management of their allotment sites.

Growing in the Community

8.12 Following the ‘Future of Allotments’ report a best practice guide on management of allotments was produced by the Local Government Association, DETR, GLA and the Shell Better Britain Campaign in 2001. This guide is referred to further in this chapter.

Local Context

The Havering Unitary Development Plan

8.13 The Havering Unitary Development Plan (June 2004) includes a policy which seeks to protect allotment sites from development (Policy OS8).

ASSESSING ALLOTMENT NEEDS

8.14 The revised PPG17 states that in preparing development plans, local authorities should undertake an assessment of the likely demand for allotments and their
existing allotment provision, and prepare policies which aim to meet the needs in their area.

8.15 There is no formal guidance on how allotment needs should be assessed, however the Local Government Association good practice guide ‘Growing in the Community’ identifies issues which should be considered. Local Authorities are duty bound to provide allotments for their residents if they consider there is demand, under section 23 of the 1908 Allotments Acts (as amended). The 1969 Thorpe Report recommended a minimum standard of allotment provision of 0.2 hectares (0.5 acres) per 1000 population. In the context of Havering this would equate to an area of 44.85ha. In 1996, the National Allotment survey identified an average provision in England of 15 plots per 1000 households. The current rate of allotment provision in Havering is 3.9 plots per 1,000 people.

8.16 It will be important to ensure that local standards of provision reflect local circumstances of supply and demand. This assessment fulfils the requirements of the Revised PPG17 to provide a robust and defensible assessment of allotment needs accounting for different components of demand identified above.

**ALLOTMENT SUPPLY**

8.17 In total, 27 allotment sites have been identified in the London Borough of Havering, equating to a total of approximately 34 ha of actively managed land in the Borough. The average size of the allotment sites in the Borough is around 1.3 ha.

8.18 The site visit programme included a site appraisal for every allotment site identified in the Borough, and a dedicated allotment question was included as part of the pro-forma. This question enabled the team of planners to collect information regarding the total number of plots at each allotment site, the occupancy, site management arrangements, condition, and information relating to the provision of facilities at each site. In order to provide a more robust assessment of allotment provision in the Borough, the information has been verified with the allotment officer at the Council.

8.19 Table 8.2 summarises allotment supply and occupancy in the Borough.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site ID</th>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Size (ha)</th>
<th>Total Plots **</th>
<th>Total Occupied</th>
<th>% Occupied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Archibald Road</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Ashvale Gardens*</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185</td>
<td>Bretons Farm</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td>Chase Cross Road</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>Chelmsford Avenue</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Site ID | Site | Size (ha) | Total Plots ** | Total Occupied | % Occupied
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | ---
61 | Church Road | 1.7 | 31 | 28 | 89
182 | Dunningford | 0.7 | 26 | 25 | 94
111 | Grey Towers | 4 | 43 | 24 | 55
23 | Havering Grange | 0.7 | 22 | 11 | 50
94 | Heath Park | 1.3 | 46 | 45 | 98
91 | Keats Avenue | 1.9 | 30 | 26 | 86
75 | MacDonald Avenue | 1.2 | 17 | 11 | 64
49 | Macon Way | 0.2 | 7 | 6 | 79
117 | Maylands | 1.4 | 44 | 44 | 100
128 | Melville Road | 2.3 | 40 | 40 | 100
125 | Mungo Park | 0.1 | 12 | 12 | 100
103 | Norfolk Road | 1.7 | 39 | 29 | 74
139 | Pretoria Road (east)* | 0.7 | 32 | 25 | 78
263 | Pretoria Road (west) | 5.4 | 172 | 96 | 56
144 | Robin Close | 0.4 | 12 | 6 | 50
147 | Saffron Road | 0.3 | 10 | 7 | 70
9 | Sheffield drive Allotments | 0.1 | 0 | 0 | 0
37 | Sowery Avenue | 0.2 | 10 | 9 | 85
101 | Stewart Avenue | 1.2 | 44 | 42 | 95
174 | Strathmore Gardens | 0.2 | 17 | 17 | 100
116 | Uphavering Terrace | 0.4 | 11 | 8 | 76
167 | White Hart Lane | 2.4 | 10 | 6 | 60
** | ** | ** | ** | ** | **
Total | 34 | 870 | 655 | 74 | 74

* Allotment information was not available for these allotments and has been aggregated based on the information obtained for the other allotment sites  ** Plot information has been aggregated to 10 rod plot

### Table 8.3 - Allotment supply and capacity by ward

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>Allotment Area</th>
<th>Population (2001)</th>
<th>Area (ha) / 1000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brooklands</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>13024</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cranham</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>12244</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elm Park</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>12049</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gooshays</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>13991</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hacton</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>12494</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harold Wood</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12005</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Havering Park</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>12366</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heaton</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>11778</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hylands</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>12381</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mawneys</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>12555</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pettits</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>12832</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rainham and Wennington</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>12113</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Squirrels Heath</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>11780</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Andrews</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>12778</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upminster</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>12672</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emerson Park</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11396</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romford Town</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13200</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Hornchurch</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12592</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>224250</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There are a total of 870 10 rod allotment plots within Havering, spread across a total of 34ha. A number of the gardens are currently fully occupied. These are: Maylands, Melville Road, Mungo Park, and Strathmore Gardens. The average area of allotment gardens per 1000 population is 0.15ha.

MANAGEMENT

The London Borough of Havering is responsible for managing all of the Allotments within Havering. Involvement is limited to occasional mowing of paths between allotments, maintenance and repair of boundary fences and water supply, and clearance of vegetation and rubbish prior to an abandoned plot being brought back into commission. Within the Borough there are a number of allotment associations that are responsible for day to day management and letting of plots.

- Collier Row & District Horticultural Society & Allotment Association
- Grey Towers Allotments & Gardening Society
- Hornchurch & District Allotments and Gardening Society
- Mungo Park Allotment Society
- Romford & District Allotments and Gardening Association
- Romford Smallholders Society
- Keats Avenue Allotment Association.

Sheffield Drive allotment area is totally unoccupied at present, and consequently may represent an opportunity to increase the provision of allotments in the north east of the Borough if the demand exists. The former Brookside Allotments also represent a supply of allotment land although they have not been actively managed for some time. The potential of these sites to meet demand is considered later in this chapter.

Scope exists to make improvements to the overall quality of allotment sites through improving the attractiveness of communal areas and ensuring that selected sites are landscaped / screened to minimise the visual impact of storage sheds and other unsightly allotment related structures. Sites should have adequate water supply and a communal area including possibly toilets and a trading/storage area.
DEMAND ASSESSMENT

8.24 In addition to manifest demand (i.e. the number of occupied allotments) there are also two forms of latent demand:

- **Latent Suppressed Demand** - comprises individuals who would rent an allotment but are unable to do so and is indicated by existing allotment waiting lists. Figures are likely to fluctuate throughout the year with greatest demand in summer months.

- **Latent Potential Demand** - comprises of people who may rent an allotment now or in the future. Influences on potential demand include demographic characteristics, accessibility and availability of allotments, quality and standard of allotment management, public awareness and extent of allotment promotion, potential changes in demand resulting from diversification in allotment usage or initiatives to foster allotment cultivation.

**Latent Suppressed Demand**

8.25 When considering the adequacy of allotment provision within Havering, it is necessary to conduct an analysis of the extent of demand that cannot be met by existing provision. The best indicator of this latent suppressed demand is the number of people that are currently on the waiting list for an allotment plot. However, we have been unable to obtain this information regarding possible waiting lists.

**Accessibility and Demand Catchments**

8.26 The extent of unfulfilled demand needs to be considered in conjunction with the size and distribution of sites (see Figure 8.1). The accessibility of allotment sites and allotment catchment areas are considered below.

**Latent Potential Demand**

8.27 It is also important to analyse the accessibility of allotments within the Borough along with their demand catchments.

8.28 The GLA open space hierarchy identifies that small open spaces under 2ha are likely to have a pedestrian catchment area of 400 metres and that most users will travel from within that area. The residents survey (based on an average of 3 users) identified that 100% of allotment users drove to their allotments and that 100% of journeys took less than 10 minutes. Given the small sample of respondents, and the
likelihood of allotment users to travel by foot to an allotment site, a 10 minute (800m) catchment area (by foot) has been used to determine the effective catchment area. This area has been adjusted to 560m to take into consideration the local street pattern and morphology of the area.

8.29 Figure 8.4 illustrates the catchment area applicable to allotment sites. However, it cannot be concluded that there is sufficient need in the underserved areas for additional allotment sites from this information alone.

8.30 Previous studies have found that although participation is highest amongst those who live in close proximity to their plot, the relationship between site size, occupancy, availability and catchment area indicates that some plot holders are able and prepared to travel to alternative sites where a plot is not available at their nearest site. However, the extent to which local allotment demand can be satisfied outside of the immediate neighbourhood is limited. Many plot holders wish to be near to their plot for reasons of security and ease of access. Some residents are currently excluded from allotment gardening by the distribution and availability of vacant plots within the Borough.

8.31 At present, parts of several wards are not well served by the existing distribution of allotment sites. Table 8.3 illustrates the extent of latent demand in least well served wards. The number of plots represents demand based upon an estimate of proportion of households lying outside of the 800m catchment of existing sites.

Table 8.4 - Estimated Allotment Needs Arising from Households Lying outside Allotment Catchments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>Estimate of % households outside of allotment catchment</th>
<th>No. households 2001</th>
<th>Estimated households beyond allotment catchment</th>
<th>Estimated latent demand (No. Plots)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brooklands</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>5,361</td>
<td>2,681</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cranham</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>5,111</td>
<td>3,578</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elm Park</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4,950</td>
<td>743</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emerson Park</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>4,387</td>
<td>3,510</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gooshays</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>5,906</td>
<td>4,134</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hacton</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>4,835</td>
<td>3,626</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harold Wood</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>5,193</td>
<td>2,597</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Havering Park</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4,824</td>
<td>1,206</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heaton</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>5,147</td>
<td>2,831</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hylands</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4,747</td>
<td>949</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mawneys</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5,178</td>
<td>1,036</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pettits</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>4,982</td>
<td>3,986</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Estimated Allotment Needs Arising from Demographic Change to 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population Estimate</td>
<td>224,248</td>
<td></td>
<td>237,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated No. Households</td>
<td>94,103</td>
<td>99,597*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated plot requirement (Assumes 6.96 plots per 1,000 households)</td>
<td>655</td>
<td>693</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Plots due to Population Increase</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*based on 2001 ratio of 2.38 persons per household
QUALITY AND MANAGEMENT

8.35 The quality, condition and management of allotments also influence potential demand. Allotments which are well maintained and have vacant plots which are available for use with little clearance of scrub and rubbish are likely to prove more attractive than overgrown plots.

8.36 The condition and maintenance of facilities including fences, the water supply, toilets, communal huts, sheds and greenhouses, paths, and waste areas will also influence the attractiveness of allotment sites to potential plot holders, particularly if it is sought to broaden demand and attract new users.

8.37 The condition of allotments in Havering is generally very good due to the high demand for plots. Plots that are rented but left unmanaged are quickly reported to site reps and the occupier encouraged to either start making use of the site again or to give it up for another user.

Initiatives to Promote and Broaden Demand

8.38 The way in which plots are promoted and publicised also influences demand. In line with sustainability objectives to broaden the demand for allotments, the following channels could be used to promote and broaden demand:

- Diversifying use of allotments through promoting activities such as bee keeping, and horticulture (not for commercial purposes);
- Encouraging community plots or plot sharing and integrating allotments with other open space types (e.g. combining allotment provision with outdoor classrooms);
- Testing and encouraging demand by managing a number of demonstration plots at various locations;
- Developing links with voluntary sector organisations and community groups who may benefit from allotment gardening; and
- Improving assistance for new tenants and ‘aftercare’ for existing tenants.

8.39 In addition specific groups likely to benefit from the health and economic benefits that may be derived from allotment gardening could also be targeted. Rent concessions are permitted by allotment law and are granted by many Local Authorities. Concessions could be promoted to additional target groups.
It is estimated that active promotion and marketing of allotments could lead to perhaps a 10% increase in the number of occupied plots within the Borough up to 2016 depending on the scale and success of initiatives. This would represent a take up of about 65 plots.

**DERIVATION OF ALLOTMENT STANDARD**

To fulfil this need and existing latent demand, allotment land will need to be identified and brought forward for allotment use to meet the needs of under served areas and the increased demand resulting from population growth. To summarise total latent demand amounts to 456 plots and comprises:

- Suppressed demand – Not known due to lack of waiting lists;
- Net potential demand from areas underserved by existing provision – 353 plots
- Demand associated with net household growth 2001-2016 – 38 plots.
- Marketing Initiatives (10% of existing demand) – 65 plots

The average number of rods per ha at existing allotment sites within the Borough is around 7 rods per hectare. Based on these figures, Table 8.6 illustrates that it is possible that 10.57 ha of allotment land would need to be brought into use to meet existing deficiencies and needs associated with household growth within the Borough between 2001 and 2016. It should be recognised that this land requirement assumes that the average size of allotment plots does not increase. Taking into account the area of actively managed allotment land and redundant statutory allotments in the Borough. The total allotment land requirement up to 2016 is 43.21 ha (a net increase of 9.21 ha). This equates to a standard of 0.18 ha per 1,000 population.

The wards which should be prioritised for the development of new allotment sites are in identified Table 8.3 above. Wards which include areas of greatest open space need should also prioritised for improvement as these areas have a high proportion of households who do not have access to a back garden (refer to chapter 3).

Eight of the 18 wards within the Borough have levels of provision above the proposed allotment standard. Where existing allotment sites have are underutilised opportunities may exist to rationalise provision. For wards with provision above the standard the tests identified in Chapter 10 should be used to identify whether provision is required and to identify future management options. The allotments strategy described below should be used as the mechanism to achieve the redistribution of provision required within the Borough.
Table 8.6 – Proposed Standard based on Total Land Need to 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suppressed Demand</th>
<th>No. Plots</th>
<th>Area (ha) Assumes 22.8 plots per ha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under served areas</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant Plots</td>
<td>-215</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demographic Change</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing Initiatives (up to 10% increase on occupied plots)</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs arising from Under served areas (Vacant Plots, Demographic Change, Marketing Initiatives)</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>10.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Active Allotment area (ha)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>34.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redundant Statutory Allotments (ha)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>-1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Need (ha)</td>
<td></td>
<td>43.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Standard / 1000 (based on a 2016 population of 237,040)**

0.18

TOWARDS THE DEVELOPMENT OF AN ALLOTMENTS STRATEGY

8.45 The Council has an opportunity to develop a coherent vision for allotments within Havering. This vision should recognise the multiple roles which allotments can play and the benefits of allotment gardening and be used as a basis to gather support and funding for improvements from other sources within the Council, external funding sources and relevant community and voluntary sector partners.

8.46 The vision should include an action plan which seeks to integrate allotment gardening within other strategies and programmes and identifies improvements to individual allotment sites and other projects and initiatives to foster participation in allotment gardening. It will be necessary to identify resources to implement projects including human resources to implement improvements.

8.47 The value of allotments as described earlier in this chapter includes their role as:

- Open space;
- Providing opportunities for informal recreation;
- A sustainable food source;
- A resource for health;
- A community resource;
• An educational tool;
• A resource for biodiversity; and
• A place for composting and the management of green waste.

8.48 At present not every allotment site within the Borough performs all of the above roles. All allotment sites do however form an important component of urban green space as defined in PPG 17.

8.49 Allotments also contribute towards the landscape character of the Borough by providing visual amenity in the form of relief from the built up area or by allowing views beyond the immediate area. Many allotment sites have some form of nature conservation value although those in Havering are intensively cultivated due to high demand.

8.50 Potential may exist to increase the nature conservation value of some sites through identifying areas to develop as wildlife habitat within underutilised areas. At other sites, smaller areas could be enhanced with particular attention given to those allotments located within areas deficient in natural and semi-natural greenspace provision.

8.51 In addition to the functions outlined above, significant scope exists to develop active social and educational roles through links with schools and other community organisations. These roles can be encouraged through specific initiatives which integrate allotments within other strategies and programmes and fostering allotments within the wider community.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Provision

8.52 There is currently provision for 870 allotment holders within the Borough. Overall it is estimated that between 2001 and 2016 there will be demand for an additional 38 plots arising from demographic changes and 353 plots from areas underserved by existing provision and 65 potential additional sites due to marketing initiatives. Therefore, there is an estimated requirement for up to 10.57 hectares of allotment land, depending upon the success of marketing initiatives.

Distribution and Access

8.53 At present significant latent demand exists for allotments within certain parts of the Borough due to lack of accessibility. Demand relating to underserved areas currently runs at 353 plots. However, this figure could be higher due to the high proportion of residences without back gardens within deficiency areas (refer to Figure 3.2 and
Furthermore certain parts of the Borough have levels of provision above the proposed allotments standard. The Council should seek to achieve a redistribution of provision to better reflect needs within the Borough.

8.54 Given that allotment sites do not have to be particularly large, allotment provision could be associated with new development in the Borough. Scope may exist within underserved areas to bring forward allotment land through diversification of existing open spaces such as playing fields and development of allotments on infill sites. Within other local authorities, school sites have proved good locations where there is sufficient space available as funding can be sought to develop allotments jointly as outdoor classrooms for curriculum use and as a community resource. Opportunities for bringing forward new allotment sites should be investigated within wards where there are the highest levels of latent demand and open space need.

Management and Resources

8.55 At present allotment provision is generally funded and owned by the London Borough of Havering. However, additional funding would secure a more comprehensive management and maintenance strategy. This may be achieved by integrating the improvement of allotments within other initiatives relating to regeneration, neighbourhood renewal and Local Agenda 21 and bidding for external funding. Other ways of funding improvements to allotment sites are:

- Increased rents: the best value process provides an opportunity to compare allotment rents to those in surrounding areas and cost of other recreational and leisure activities provided by the Council. It will be important to consider the overall cost and the quality of the service provided and to consider whether service users wish to pay more for an improved service.
- Devolved management arrangements: used to cut the cost of allotment provision through passing day to day management of sites to plot holders. Best value provides an opportunity to consider possible options.

8.56 Several external funding sources exist which could be drawn upon to fund specific projects rather than ongoing management and allotment administration. These may include:

- Local Agenda 21 funds;
- SRB Budgets – There is a possibility that these funds could be tapped for Initiatives relating to allotments, subject to the initiative fulfilling the aims and objectives of the SRB strategy;
- National Lottery New Opportunities Fund;
The SEED programme;
The ENTRUST Landfill tax credit scheme;
The Co-operative Group Community Divided;
The Shell Better Britain Campaign; and
Support in kind including B&Q Quest, BTCV, probation service.

PROPOSED ALLOTMENT STANDARD

Allotment Provision

Quantitative Component

8.57 To meet the needs of the Borough up to 2016 it is recommended that a standard of 0.18 ha of allotment land per 1,000 population is adopted. In order to meet this standard 43.21 ha of allotment land (an additional 9.21 ha) would need to be brought forward up to 2016.

8.58 Proposals for new housing development should be accompanied by proposals to improve Allotment provision. The nature of such improvements should reflect the additional open space needs generated as a result of the proposed development but also take into consideration average garden sizes.

8.59 If the proposed development is located within an identified area deficient in access to allotment provision it will be necessary for additional land to be brought into use for this purpose. The developer will be required to make a contribution towards the provision of allotments. It may be appropriate for such provision to be incorporated within the curtilage of the development. Alternatively a contribution towards off-site provision may be appropriate.

8.60 If the proposed development is not located within an area which is deficient in access to allotment provision then consideration will be given to any deficiency in quality or value of existing allotment sites serving the development. The developer may be required to make a contribution towards the enhancement of existing provision.

8.61 The Council should seek to redistribute the provision of allotments within the Borough from areas with levels of provision above the proposed quantity and access standards to areas of need.

Accessibility Component

8.62 The following access standard is recommended:
• All households within the Borough should have access to an allotment garden within 800m of home;

**Qualitative Component**

8.63 Allotment sites should be of adequate quality and support the needs of the local community. Allotment sites which under perform in terms of their value to the local community consistent with the criteria relating to the role of sites identified in Chapter 8 should be improved. Those sites identified within Chapter 10 should be prioritised for improvement.
9. OPEN SPACE STANDARDS

INTRODUCTION

9.1 A series of locally based open space standards have been recommended based upon the findings of the assessment of local open space needs within the Borough. The assessment, summarised within the preceding chapters of this Volume and Volumes 2, has considered the supply, quality and value of all types of open space provision within Havering and levels of demand for playing pitch and allotment provision. The analysis of local needs has also informed an open space hierarchy for public park and natural and semi-natural greenspace provision within the Borough.

9.2 Assessing Needs and Opportunities, the companion guide to PPG17, recommends that local authorities set local provision standards which incorporate a quantitative, qualitative and accessibility component.

9.3 The purpose of these standards is to afford adequate levels of provision for each type of open space within the Borough based upon existing needs and the future needs of the Borough up to 2016. The standards identified at the end of the relevant chapters and summarised in Table 9.1 will enable the formulation of planning policies to protect existing open spaces where appropriate and to identify areas where additional open space provision is required.

9.4 Whilst planning policies are an effective mechanism to deliver an appropriate level of open space provision and to improve access to open space within the Borough, it is also necessary to prepare an open space strategy to secure improvements to the quality and value of open spaces. Such a strategy will be based upon the qualitative requirements which have been highlighted within this assessment. The study has identified areas of the Borough and individual spaces which should be prioritised for enhancement within such a strategy.

9.5 A standard for playing pitch provision is identified below and relates to the analysis undertaken in Volume 2. We do not recommend that a quantitative standard is adopted for the provision of amenity greenspace or civic spaces. However, it is expected that a design led approach would be used to identify the level of provision appropriate to the context (i.e. levels of overall open space needs, whether the site is located within a conservation area) and the scale and type of the individual
residential, employment or mixed use development. Supplementary planning
guidance should be prepared identifying the design criteria to be used to incorporate
amenity greenspace appropriate to particular types of development.

PLAYING PITCH PROVISION

Quantitative Component

9.6 Volume 2 of this study identifies playing pitch needs within the Borough. To meet the
needs of the Borough up to 2016 in terms of the quantity of pitch provision it is
recommended that that a minimum standard of **0.74 ha of pitch space per 1,000
population** will be required.

9.7 Proposals for new housing development should be accompanied by proposals to
improve playing pitch provision. The nature of such improvements should reflect the
additional playing pitch needs generated as a result of the proposed development.

9.8 If the proposed development is located within an identified area of deficiency in
access to football provision it will be necessary for additional pitch space to be
brought into use. The developer will be required to make a contribution towards the
provision of additional pitch space. It may be appropriate for such provision to be
incorporated within the curtilage of the development. Alternatively, a contribution to
off-site provision may be appropriate.

9.9 If the proposed development is not located within an area which is deficient in either
access to football pitch provision then consideration will be given to any deficiency in
the quality of existing facilities for outdoor pitch sports. The developer will be
required to make a contribution towards the enhancement of the quality of outdoor
pitch sports facilities.

Accessibility Component

9.10 The following access standards are recommended for adoption. The rationale for the
standards is provided within Volume 2.

- All residents within the Borough should have access to a site providing football
  pitch provision in secure community use within 1200km from home;

- All residents within the Borough should have access to a range of other outdoor
  sports facilities.
Qualitative Component

9.11 Outdoor pitch sports facilities within the Borough should be of adequate quality and provide the range of facilities required to meet the needs of sports clubs. Those playing fields in secure community use identified within Volume 2, which either under perform in terms of the range of provision provided or the quality of existing provision, should be improved consistent with the guidelines identified.
Table 9.1 – Summary of Local Open Space Standards (to meet needs up to 2016)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Open Space Type</th>
<th>Quantity Standard</th>
<th>Area required to meet needs up to 2016</th>
<th>Accessibility Standard</th>
<th>Quality Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Parks</td>
<td>Maintain existing Metropolitan Park Provision. Other Public Parks 1.84 ha per 1,000 population.</td>
<td>755ha (including 10ha additional public parks to alleviate deficiencies)</td>
<td>• All residents within the Borough should have access to a Metropolitan Park within 3.2km from home;  • All residents within the Borough should have access to a District Park within 1.2km from home;  • All residents within the Borough should have access to a Local Park or Small Local Park or Pocket Park within 800m from home;  • All residents within the Borough should have access to an area of public park within 800m from home. The definition of a public park as identified within the parks hierarchy defined within Chapter 4.</td>
<td>Public parks within the Borough should meet the Green Flag ‘good’ quality standard. Open spaces identified within Chapter 10 for improvement should be prioritised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children’s Play</td>
<td>0.8 ha per 1,000 population (could be incorporated within any category of public open space provision)</td>
<td></td>
<td>• All residents within the Borough should have access to areas of formal and informal play provision for children and teenagers within 400m from home.</td>
<td>Children’s play provision within the Borough should be of adequate quality and provide the range of facilities associated with the size of the facility. The guidelines set out within the NPFA 6 acre Standard (2001) should be used to assess levels of adequacy in terms of the range and quality of provision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space Type</td>
<td>Quantity Standard</td>
<td>Area required to meet needs up to 2016</td>
<td>Accessibility Standard</td>
<td>Quality Standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Playing pitches      | 0.74 ha of pitch space per 1,000 population.                                       | 166.5ha                               | • All residents within the Borough should have access to a site providing football pitch provision in secure community use within 1200km from home;  
  • All residents within the Borough should have access to a range of other outdoor sports facilities. | Outdoor pitch sports facilities within the Borough should be of adequate quality and provide the range of facilities required to meet the needs of sports clubs. Those playing fields in secure community use identified within Volume 2, which either under perform in terms of the range of provision provided or the quality of existing provision, should be improved consistent with the guidelines identified. |
| Natural Greenspace   | 1 ha of Statutory designated ecological land per 1,000 population.                 | N/A                                   | • All residents within the Borough should have access to a natural or semi-natural greenspace of at least 2ha in size within 300m of home;  
  • All residents within the Borough should have access to a natural or semi-natural greenspace of at least 20ha in size within 2km of home;  
  • All residents within the Borough should have access to a natural or semi-natural greenspace of at least 100ha in size within 5km from home. | Areas of natural and semi-natural greenspace should be of adequate quality and support local biodiversity. Areas of natural and semi-natural greenspace which either under perform in terms of their value to the local community and local biodiversity should be enhanced consistent with the guidelines identified in Chapter 10. Those spaces identified within Chapter 10 should be prioritised for improvement. |
Table 9.1 (Continued) – Summary of Local Open Space Standards (to meet needs up to 2016)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Open Space Type</th>
<th>Quantity Standard</th>
<th>Area required to meet needs up to 2016</th>
<th>Accessibility Standard</th>
<th>Quality Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allotments</td>
<td>0.18 ha of allotment land per 1,000 population.</td>
<td>43.21 ha (including in additional 9.21 ha of allotment land)</td>
<td>• All residents within the Borough should have access to an allotment garden within 800m of home.</td>
<td>Allotment sites should be of adequate quality and support the needs of the local community. Allotment sites which under perform in terms of their value to the local community consistent with the criteria relating to the role of sites identified in Chapter 8 should be improved. Those sites identified within Chapter 10 should be prioritised for improvement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10. MEETING OPEN SPACE NEEDS

INTRODUCTION

10.1 This chapter considers how the open space needs identified within the study can potentially be addressed and prioritised. We have presented the findings in the following format:

- Consideration of the potential scope for change and improvement of individual open space sites;
- Providing a summary of how existing open space needs and deficiencies can be addressed through the definition of a green network concept which provides a series of priorities to help guide the Council in preparing its open space strategy;
- Identification on a sub area basis of how existing deficiencies in open space quantity, quality and access may be addressed to better meet local needs through enhancement of the existing green network; and
- Identification of an approach to areas where existing levels of provision have been met.

SCOPE FOR CHANGE AND IMPROVEMENT

10.2 The open space site assessments included identification of the physical potential for sites to accommodate a range of possible changes. The evaluation of potential is intended to identify possible opportunities and not to assess the feasibility of improvements or identify particular projects.

10.3 Table 10.1 provides a summary of the overall number of open spaces with scope for each of the changes/improvements.
Table 10.1 - Scope for Change / Improvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scope for Change / Improvement Categories</th>
<th>No of Sites</th>
<th>% of all Open Spaces</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Potential for improved site utilisation (through site redesign / improvement)</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>26.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential to improve landscaping</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>19.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential to improve accessibility within the park</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential Opportunities for Introducing other open space uses</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential for usage which could contribute to social / regeneration objectives</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical potential for additional pitches</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential for enhancing historic value</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Potential to intensify use of existing pitches</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical potential to accommodate changing rooms / social facilities</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No real scope for improvement</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>42.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Potential for Improved Utilisation

10.4 During the course of the open space site assessments some 84 sites (26.6 % of open spaces) were identified as having potential for improved site utilisation (see Figure 10.1). Identification of sites indicates that there are either areas within the site which have no particular role or purpose, or that there are facilities or parts of the site which may be under used perhaps due to the quality of the environment or the condition of existing provision.

Potential Opportunities for Introducing Other Open Space Uses

10.5 Some 19 sites (6% of open spaces) were identified as having potential for the introduction of other open space uses (refer to Figure 10.1). Identification of sites indicates that either all or part of the site does not currently fulfil the primary role of the open space suggested by its place within the open space hierarchy. There is the potential for re-defining the primary role of the space or potential to diversify the range of open space functions currently performed by the space to increase its value to the community.

Potential for Usage Which Could Contribute to Social and Regeneration Objectives

10.6 The site assessment identified 13 sites (4.1% of the total) where potential exists for usage which could contribute towards delivering social or regeneration benefits to the surrounding area. This could be where site improvements could enhance the attractiveness of facilities to local users thus increasing participation. Alternatively, improvements to facilities or other qualitative improvements could contribute towards the improvement of the local environment thus assisting in sustaining and enhancing the ‘liveability’ and quality of life in the surrounding area.
Potential to improve landscaping

10.7 Some 63 sites (19.9% of open spaces) were identified as having potential to improve landscaping and the quality of the environment within the park (refer to Figure 10.1). Almost all sites could potentially be subject to minor landscaping improvements. These open spaces were only selected where there was a strong justification for making improvements to improve the value of the site to the community through providing a more varied environment within the park or where existing landscapes are of poor quality and require enhancement measures rather than simple improvements to management or maintenance.

Potential to Improve Accessibility Within the Park

10.8 Some 28 sites (8.9%) were identified as having potential to improve accessibility within the open space (refer to Figure 10.1). Such sites were identified because they have barriers to pedestrians, cyclists or those with mobility difficulties which preclude or discourage potential users from the space, or because the condition of existing paths and routes through the space are inadequate. Another reason for identifying the potential for improving access was the number and attractiveness of entrances to the open space.

Potential to Improve Historic Value

10.9 Some 9 sites (2.8%) of open spaces were identified as having the potential to improve accessibility within the open space. The open spaces of cultural heritage value within the District should be seen as key interpretation assets for schools and lifelong learning programmes. Improved intelligibility of the open spaces can be achieved through enhancements such as planting and modern landscaping which reflects/copies the original forms, and also through the use of sensitive and appropriate interpretation facilities. These can take the form of portable media such as pamphlets or even tours or simple display boards.

10.10 At present disparities are evident in relation to the interpretation facilities amongst the various sites across the District. In most cases where interpretation facilities exist they consist of display boards summarising the historic development of the site. Some of the sites identified in the assessment as being good examples of well-preserved designed landscapes, that are also well-maintained, disappoint by the quality or lack of interpretation facilities.

Potential to Enhance Educational Value

10.11 Some spaces within the Borough were identified has having potential to enhance their educational value. Five of these spaces had opportunities to intensify the use of existing pitches, 2 space had potential to accommodate changing rooms/social
facilities, and 6 spaces had physical potential for additional pitches. The location of these spaces is illustrated in Figure 10.2.

10.12 Potential for other forms of improvement were identified at 30 open spaces (9.5%). The range of improvements identified included improvements to children's play provision and more specific improvements to facilities identified within individual spaces.

Potential to enhance cultural value

10.13 Some 83 spaces (33.3%) were identified as having potential to improve their cultural value by providing a venue for large scale or small scale events or permanent performance or community facilities (refer to Table 10.2).

10.14 The remaining 233 spaces (66.6%) of spaces were identified as having no real scope for improvement. This does not mean that these spaces are exceptional enough so as to require no further improvements, nor should it preclude improvements to such sites and ongoing maintenance and investment that will be required in order to sustain the existing quality of facilities. The spaces in this category were not identified as having potential to be improved either along the lines of the 7 types of improvement identified above or the range of improvements associated with playing pitch sites identified in Volume 2.

10.15 Public parks which were identified as having the greatest opportunity for introducing changes were Upminster Park, Hylands Park, Cranham Playing Fields, Painsbrown Play Area, Tyle Gardens, Brittons Playing Fields, St Andrews Park, North Hill Recreation Ground, The Brettons and Windmill Field.

ESTABLISHING A GREEN NETWORK

10.16 Establishing a defined “green network” for the Borough which summarises existing open space, needs, existing provision and local deficiencies provides a diagnostic tool for identifying priorities for open space improvements on a spatial basis. The network can be used to inform and to develop an open space strategy for the Borough and assist the Council in realising its vision for parks and open spaces (refer to Chapter 2).

10.17 The identification of a green network also provides a basis to consolidate the existing green network within the Borough and look at ways of providing further linkages between presently remote sites. The ultimate aim will be to provide links into the adjoining authorities as part of ongoing Green Arc, Green Grid and Thames Chase initiatives at the sub regional level.
10.18 Each layer of the existing green network is described below along with its role within the network.

10.19 It is important to protect the extensive network of existing green spaces and links within Havering, as they form the basis for its future expansion. These existing routes run primarily along railway, along the river/canal corridors, and through and around parks, sports pitches, cemeteries, allotments, amenity areas, sites of ecological value and other open spaces. Some of these open spaces are linked together by the rivers and railways, forming more extensive networks.

10.20 Figure 10.3 illustrates the existing green spaces network in Havering incorporating existing links between spaces and areas of specific need or open space requirements. The purpose of identifying these aspects of the network is described below along with the potential role such spaces have the potential to play within an open space strategy:

**Existing Links Between Spaces**

10.21 The Local Plan includes a number of policies to encourage the enhancement of recreational routes and green corridors including:

- Pedestrian Routes, Footpaths and Strategic Cycle Routes (STR28);
- Green Belt (Policies STR10 to STR14 inclusive);
- Leisure and Recreation (Policies STR32 to STR35 inclusive);
- Green Chains (LAR9)

10.22 There is some potential to increase the numbers of footpaths between some of the open spaces, thereby allowing or encouraging people to walk between them. This could be carried out comparatively easily, by reducing the impact of traffic along certain routes (possibly under the umbrella of existing safe routes to school programmes), with traffic calming measures, and making safe places for people to cross roads. These measures, in addition to the planting of shrubs and/or trees along streets, would create a more pleasant environment for walking along, whilst also providing a more continuous network for wildlife.

10.23 Informal recreation has considerable health benefits for physical and emotional well-being. The majority of the population are more likely to participate in passive, rather than active recreation, and provision should be made for them to do this, by encouraging them and making it as easy and inviting as possible.
10.24 Future new development should incorporate walking and cycle routes and include open spaces provision as “beads on a necklace”.

10.25 The aim will be to provide a series of differing lengths of routes accessible to the public, as footpaths and/or cycle routes, linking important green spaces together, and picking out areas, features and buildings of historical or other importance, to provide points of interest between them. Where possible, the start and finish points of these routes should link closely to public transport, thereby allowing ease of access to them, to a wider range of the population. The opportunity to provide missing links could be taken in conjunction with any planning proposals in these areas. The Green Network Plan should be used to inform the Councils Public Rights of Way Improvement Plan.

10.26 Creating a green network will help to protect and improve the open spaces, and reduce the likelihood of further new building from taking place in these areas. The network will also help to address open space deficiency by prioritising the introduction of tree planting, cycle and walking routes in deficient areas, improving the local amenity and connectivity to larger open spaces.

10.27 It is important not just to think of creating green routes and corridors within the Borough, but to look at creating links on a more strategic level, with the surrounding areas, in order to take forward as part of the Green Grid and Green Arc initiatives.

**Areas of Specific Open Space Need/Requirement**

10.28 Areas of specific open space need are identified in Figure 10.3. They include those which are:

- Deficient in the provision of public parks;
- Deficient in the provision of natural/semi natural greenspaces greater than 2ha in size (refer to Figure 7.7);
- Deficient in the provision of natural/semi natural greenspaces greater than 20ha in size (refer to Figure 7.7);
- Deficient in access to children’s play provision (not shown) refer to Figure 5.7;
- Deficient in access to allotment provision (not shown) refer to Figure 8.1;

10.29 Chapter 3 identifies parts of the Borough which have a particular need for sufficient open space quality of high quality for the reasons discussed. The areas of greatest need are identified within Figure 3.6.
Areas of Identified Open Space Deficiency

10.30 Deficiencies in public park provision, natural and semi natural greenspace, allotment provision, children’s play and outdoor pitch sports (refer to Volume 2) should be addressed through specific improvements to existing spaces within the areas affected where possible, or through establishing new open spaces where opportunities arise as a result of new housing development. Existing Council land holdings could potentially be used to fulfil local needs particularly where opportunities are linked to other initiatives. The deficiencies within each sub area within the Borough and how they could be tackled are addressed below.

Role of Existing Open Spaces

10.31 The existing and potential contribution of role of different types of open space within the context of the Green Network is described below.

Public Open Spaces

10.32 There are a large number of public open spaces within the Borough, varying greatly in size and scale. Within these spaces, a balance needs to be reached, between providing increased public access, and providing areas of increased ecological diversity, where public access should be controlled or restricted. Factors to be considered when deciding the appropriate balance include the size of space, location i.e. if it is within an area rich or deprived of open space, and the value and importance of the ecological habitat to be protected.

10.33 Measures to improve the quality of these areas, and make them better green chains would be comparatively easy to implement. The relationship between the quality and value of public spaces (identified in Chapter 7) provides a basis to identify open spaces which have the potential for their role to be re-focused to meet identified open space deficiencies.

Sports Pitches and Formal Recreation Areas

10.34 The sports facilities within the Borough fall into both public, voluntary and private ownership. Generally, the sports pitches do little to contribute to the biodiversity of the Borough, as they tend to have short mown grass throughout the whole site, and few or no trees planted. However, there are a number of underutilised reserve pitch sites which are likely to be of high ecological value. Golf courses, with a variation in mown fairways and greens, longer grass and trees and shrubs in the areas of rough, and the provision of water hazards, are ecologically richer habitats, providing more valuable green corridors.
10.35 Simple variations in management and maintenance regimes could increase the diversity of habitats of both the sports fields and golf courses. A greater range in mowing regimes – keeping pitches close mown, and allowing the grass around the edges to grow longer; planting of trees and or hedgerows around the boundaries of these areas; planting of wildflower plugs in the areas of longer grass would all contribute to providing better quality wildlife corridors.

Enhancing the Nature Conservation value of open spaces

10.36 Application of the methods described below will enhance the ecological and biodiversity dimension of the green network. Increasing natural greenspace provision to the English Nature ANGSt standard and enhancing linkages between spaces will encourage a network of linked “habitat islands” of high ecological value linked together with green chains and wildlife corridors. This concept is illustrated in Figure 10.4.

10.37 The ecological value of open spaces can be improved through a variety of well established landscaping and habitat creation methods.

Figure 10.4: Ecological role of the Havering Green Network
For example, land with core areas under intensive use such as sports pitches, may have peripheral areas by the boundaries or between pitches where changes in land management may be accommodated. Enhancement strategies include:

- Tree planting should include a high proportion of, or complete stock of native species, depending on the site. Consider adding native woodland herb species. Street trees should link amenity spaces with parks and natural greenspaces. To maximise ecological and biodiversity benefits an appropriate tree density would be 80 trees per km;

- Management of existing trees by pollarding or coppicing as appropriate, the former being traditional for willows along river corridors;

- Allow development of dead-wood habitats, retaining standing dead timber where safe to do so, and especially fallen (or stacked) dead timber;

- Where space allows, resist linear plantations and add graded and scalloped edges of smaller trees and shrub species, again with native species of local provenance preferred;

- Provide groupings of appropriate native shrubs, particularly where lack of space or other considerations constrains the planting of large trees;

- Replace fences with hedgerows where appropriate;

- Allow development of tall-grass/tall herb communities along the edges of shrub formations, vary and maintain by appropriate mowing regimes adopting late-summer/early autumn cuts over a 2-3 year cycle;

- Where appropriate, encourage a turf of medium height rich in native grass species and native wildflowers, managed by one or two annual cuts with removal of arisings. In certain areas, higher diversity grasslands may already be present, for most areas wildflower seeding would be necessary to enhance species-poor amenity grassland. It is appreciated that enhancement of species poor amenity grassland is difficult due to the possible high nutrient status and rich topsoil in these instances. Soil stripping may be a necessary alternative with subsequent application of appropriate wildflower seed mix in an effort to increase biodiversity;

- Vary landforms to induce variation in drainage and aspect, thereby encouraging natural diversity to develop;

- Continue to seek improvements to river corridors, encourage natural river banks with geomorphological diversity, e.g. cut cliffs, shallow-water margins and ledges, depositional bars, and encourage areas of natural riparian vegetation to form a mosaic between wooded reaches, riparian scrub and open semi-natural grassland and marsh;
Where continuity of river corridors cannot be achieved, seek to restore connectivity through green links beyond the immediate river channel;

- Use landscaping and habitat creation schemes to improve connectivity for wildlife across sites of low diversity e.g. amenity grassland;

10.38 Consider lowering ground levels in river flood plains - this may assist in improving flood storage, and introduce or encourage marshland plants and new water features. This would be a significant project and should be undertaken in conjunction with the Environment Agency as it would involve major earthworks in a floodplain.

10.39 The open space strategy, incorporating sound management at site level, should nevertheless remain flexible so as to be able to respond to environmental change, changes that may result in increasing rarity of certain habitats or species.

**Private Gardens**

10.40 Private gardens create narrow green corridors through and between the residential areas. Whilst the gardens are not accessible to the general public, they form an important resource and habitat for the native flora and fauna of the area, providing invaluable and often irreplaceable links between larger areas of open space. When creating further green chains from areas adjacent to these gardens, their importance should be recognised and utilised. Within areas of greatest open space need within the Borough private gardens and amenity greenspace provision is in short supply. Alternative methods should be pursued to enhance biodiversity (such as street greening initiatives) and deliver the open space functions normally associated with back gardens.

**Cemeteries**

10.41 Cemeteries are an often forgotten, but valuable resource in the provision of habitat diversity. Several cemeteries and church yards within the Borough are also of heritage value. There is potential to link the existing cemeteries into the wildlife corridors within the Borough. Some of the areas are very intensively managed and maintained, allowing limited biodiversity, in other areas there is more limited management to encourage a wider range of habitats. Older cemeteries and margins around many of them have mature trees, and often less manicured edges, which contribute to the diversity of these areas.

**Allotments**

10.42 Allotments present the opportunity to provide links in the wildlife corridors, as they are often very rich and diverse in habitat range. The margins and empty plots are usually left un-maintained, allowing naturally occurring species to colonise and
become established in these areas. They are a valuable resource within the environment and should be protected.

10.43 Uncultivated corners of individual plots and neglected strips can provide a refuge for amphibians and reptiles, invertebrates and small mammals. Vacant plots could be deliberately managed as wildlife meadows. Organic gardening practices are also helpful in maximising biodiversity value and preventing negative environmental effects.

10.44 Chapter 8 identifies that allotments can play a valuable role in improving the visual amenity and nature conservation interest of an area. They are often important links in wildlife corridors. It is recommended that further assessments are undertaken to assess the quality of allotments and cemeteries and other areas of green amenity space, for example, within housing areas and along highways in the Borough, and identify the existing and future contribution they can make to open space provision and biodiversity in Havering, linking them to the wider wildlife corridor networks, when appropriate.

The Role of Private Open Space

10.45 Open space policy has, in the past, concentrated on the provision of public parks. There is a growing recognition of the importance of other open spaces such as sports grounds, cemeteries, allotments and incidental amenity areas in housing areas. Such additional open space can potentially contribute to meeting recreational needs, especially within areas which are deficient in public open spaces.

10.46 This study has dealt with additional open spaces in three ways:

- Survey of private green spaces/spaces which have restricted access but are publicly accessible at certain times;
- Survey of educational open space; and
- The identification of a Green Network.

10.47 The survey of open spaces incorporated an assessment of the private green spaces, i.e. open space where public access is restricted, and school playing fields. These green spaces mostly comprise private playing fields and sports grounds.

10.48 The Government considers that school premises are a resource not only for pupils, but also for the wider community (Draft revised Circular 3/99, p18). Paragraph 7.15 of the Government’s A Sporting Future For All states that: “it is important that young people of all abilities have the opportunity to have access to high quality physical education and sport provision outside school hours".
10.49 However, the Government states that only authorised community use of playing fields should be considered. Such uses may be by:

- Local sports clubs for arranged games/practice;
- Local youth groups for sport or recreation;
- Nursery, pre-school and day care groups;
- After school and out of hours groups;
- Charitable groups for fetes, sports days and other fundraising events.

10.50 Within the study all public and private green spaces have been assessed and mapped regardless of size to illustrate the potential for a green network. These spaces include: allotments, cemeteries, open space corridors such as railway embankments and nature conservation areas.

10.51 These additional green spaces substantially increase the overall supply of open space in Havering but it is important to look at their location, level of access, quality and predominant character. Figure 1.2 illustrates the location of private and restricted access green spaces surveyed.

10.52 To assess whether these spaces could contribute to meeting deficiency at different levels of the hierarchy, the location of the spaces should be compared with the areas of deficiency for different open space types.

10.53 Chapter 5 includes recommendations to illustrate how public park deficiency areas can be addressed where there is no opportunity to create a new open space. Measures to improve access to non-public open space and improve the range and condition of facilities within existing open spaces are identified.

10.54 The measures to address the deficiency areas should be investigated on a cross departmental basis and should inform existing development site proposals, cycle and walking route projects, tree planting initiatives, home zone/safe route initiatives, park improvement schemes, regeneration initiatives. Measures should also be looked at in conjunction with the recommendations from the Best Value Reviews.

**ENHANCING THE GREEN NETWORK TO MEET THE NEEDS OF SUB AREAS**

10.55 The open space needs of different areas within the Borough vary. Four sub areas have been identified based upon groups of wards which broadly correlate to the
needs, deficiencies and opportunities present within the different areas (refer to Figure 1.3 for ward boundaries. The sub areas are:

- North Romford (Mawneys, Havering Park, Pettits);
- Harold Hill and Harold Wood (Gooshays, Heaton, Harold Wood);
- Central (Brooklands, Central, Squirrels Heath);
- Upminster (Emerson Park, Upminster, Cranham);
- South Havering (South Hornchurch, Elm Park, Rainham & Wennington); and
- Hornchurch (Hylands, St.Andrews, Hacton).

10.56 A summary of the needs and deficiencies within each are and the potential opportunities to meet those needs is provided in Table 10.2.
### Table 10.2 – Open space needs by sub area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub Area</th>
<th>Existing Deficiencies</th>
<th>Measures to Address Deficiencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>North Romford</strong></td>
<td><strong>Public Parks – Access</strong></td>
<td>Part of the deficiency area that covers the sub area contains other types of open space. To address this deficiency, there may be opportunities to diversify the use of existing spaces to accommodate functions associated with public parks. Site no.138 (King George Playing Fields) is currently a playing field which could be enhanced to incorporate some of the functions more commonly associated with public parks by improving access and embedding a range of informal recreation opportunities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The North Romford area includes 1 small area that is outside of the 800m catchment area, and therefore deficient, in public parks, located towards the southwest of Pettits ward.</td>
<td>Targeted improvements should be made to the quality of sites: 28 (Lodge Lane Playground), 140 (Rise Park), 141, (Lawns Park), 143 (Chelmsford Avenue Play site), 165 (Land West of River Rom), 166 (White Hart Playsite) and 168 (Hood Walk Playground).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pettits ward is the only ward within the sub area which is below the quantitative standard of 1.84 ha of public parkland per 1,000 population.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The North Romford sub area has 7 park spaces which fall short of the qualitative standard. These spaces are sites 28 (Lodge Lane Playground), 140 (Rise Park), 141, (Lawns Park), 143 (Chelmsford Avenue Play site), 165 (Land West of River Rom), 166 (White Hart Playsite) and 168 (Hood Walk Playground).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Children’s Play Provision</td>
<td>Within North Romford, potential may exist to upgrade the provision of play facilities at Lodge Lane Playground (ID 28) to NEAP / LEAP standards. Similarly, upgrading the land to the West of the river Rom (ID165) would help meet the current deficiency area to the south of the ward. The introduction of a play area at either Lodge Lane (264), or at Harlow gardens would address the current deficiency in the middle of the ward. Within Mawneys, the current deficiency could be addressed by upgrading the existing playgrounds at Hood Walk (168), Mawney Close Playground (172) to NEAP / LEAP standards, although even with the introduction of these measures, a small deficiency area would remain to the south west of the ward. Within Pettits, the upgrading of the existing play facilities at Raphael Park, and the introduction of a play function to North Street Open Space (163), or at the amenity spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Although the overall access to children’s play area in the sub area is generally good, areas to the south of Havering Park, to the west of Mawneys and the southern half of Pettits are deficient in terms of their access to a LEAP or a NEAP.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This is due in part to the relatively large number of existing play areas which are in poor condition, or do not conform to the LEAP/NEAP standard.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural/semi-natural greenspace</td>
<td>With the exception of Mawney’s ward, all other wards within the sub area exceed the quantitative minimum standard of 1 ha of natural greenspace per 1,000 population.</td>
<td>Site no 262 has the potential to be designated as a local nature reserve in order to increase the quantity of statutory designated ecological sites in the sub area. Access to the site should be improved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allotments</td>
<td>Although the sub-area does have a number of areas deficient in terms of access to allotments, large parts of the south east of the sub area, and smaller areas to the south west and the north west are further than 800m from an allotment site. However, in terms of meeting the standard of 0.18ha of allotment land per 1000 population, only Pettits falls below.</td>
<td>In addition to bringing forward allotment space through new development, potential exists to accommodate a multi-purpose allotment/outdoor class room within one of the school grounds located in the area of deficiency. Alternatively, there are a number of public parks and/or amenity areas in the deficiency area that could potentially be converted to allotment use (subject to demonstrated need and community consultation).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amenity Spaces</td>
<td>The sub area generally has a large quantity of amenity greenspace due to the fact that the area was developed as a planned settlement. Nevertheless, the amenity greenspace in the area generally suffers from a lack of investment and is poorly maintained. A number of amenity /small open spaces are therefore currently not fulfilling their potential role.</td>
<td>Targeted enhancements to the open spaces that have been identified as having a high value, but are poor in terms of their overall quality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub Area</td>
<td>Existing Deficiencies</td>
<td>Measures to Address Deficiencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td><strong>Public Parks - Access</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Quantity</strong>&lt;br&gt;A very small area in the northwest of Squirrels Heath ward is outside the 800m catchment area for public parks, with a larger area outside the 560m catchment.&lt;br&gt;All wards within the sub area are below the quantitative standard of 1.84 ha of public parkland per 1,000 population.&lt;br&gt;The Central sub area has no parks which fall short of the qualitative standard.</td>
<td>Part of the deficiency area that covers the sub area contains other types of open space. To address this deficiency, there may be opportunities to diversify the use of existing spaces to accommodate functions associated with public parks. Site no.79 (Gidea Park Sports Ground) is currently a playing field which could be enhanced to incorporate some of the functions more commonly associated with public parks by improving access and embedding a range of informal recreation opportunities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Quality</strong>&lt;br&gt;The Central sub area has no parks which fall short of the qualitative standard.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Children’s Play Provision</strong>&lt;br&gt;The Brooklands ward has small areas to the south east and the north west that are deficient in terms of access to children’s play facilities. The south and west of Romford are deficient in terms of access to a LEAP or NEAP. There is only 1 play space in Squirrels Heath of adequate quality, therefore the majority of the ward is deficient in this type of open space provision.</td>
<td>Measures to address these deficiency areas within Brooklands include making the necessary improvements to the current housing play site at Rush Green Gardens, or introducing a new play site in Gays Field (171). Solutions to the existing deficiencies within Romford may require a different solution, due to the lack of open spaces with the potential to accommodate children’s play areas. The feasibility of introducing a LEAP or a NEAP within the Romford urban area should therefore be encouraged within new developments that may take place in the area. To address the Squirrels Heath deficiency, the feasibility of upgrading the play areas at Haynes Park should be considered in the first instance. Installing new play area at Gidea Park Sports Ground and at Balgores Lane Fields would make a significant contribution towards reducing the levels of deficiency in these areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Natural / semi natural green spaces</strong>&lt;br&gt;Large parts of the north of this sub area are deficient in natural greenspace between 2 and 20ha, with a small, south-westerly part of Romford Town ward and southern parts of the Brooklands also deficient in natural open space.</td>
<td>This deficiency should be addressed through diversifying existing open spaces to incorporate a greater proportion of natural greenspace. In addition green linkages should be improved between deficiency areas and existing natural greenspaces located within the Borough to create linear habitat spaces incorporating linear routes and back gardens. Tree canopy coverage could be enhanced to link doorstep amenity spaces to local parks and natural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quantity</strong></td>
<td>bigger than 20ha</td>
<td>With the exception of Romford Town ward, all other wards within</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the sub area meet the quantitative minimum standard of 1 ha of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>natural greenspace per 1,000 population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Few opportunities exist to create new natural greenspace habitats.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>However, existing areas of open space in the deficiency area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>could be diversified to incorporate an element of natural /</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>semi natural greenspace. In addition green linkages should be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>improved between deficiency areas and existing natural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>greenspaces located within the Borough to create linear habitat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>spaces incorporating linear routes and back gardens. Tree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>canopy coverage could be enhanced to link doorstep amenity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>spaces to local parks and natural greenspaces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Allotments</strong></td>
<td>The south of the Brooklands</td>
<td>The south of the Brooklands ward, the west of Romford and the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ward, the west of Romford</td>
<td>east of Squirrels Heath are the areas which are currently</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and the east of Squirrels</td>
<td>deficient in access to allotment provision. In terms of the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Heath are the areas which</td>
<td>quantity of provision, Brooklands has 0.47 ha of allotment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>are currently deficient in</td>
<td>provision per 1000 population, over the Borough standard of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>access to allotment</td>
<td>0.18ha/1000. Romford Town and Squirrels Heath are both under</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>provision. In terms of the</td>
<td>provided in terms of the quantity of provision compared to the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>quantity of provision</td>
<td>overall standard for the Borough.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Opportunities to bring forward allotment space may arise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>through new development. Potential may also exist to accommodate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>a multi-purpose allotment /outdoor class room within one of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the school grounds located in the area of deficiency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alternatively, there are a number of public parks and/or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>amenity areas in the deficiency area that could potentially be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>converted to allotment use (subject to demonstrated need and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>community consultation).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Amenity</strong></td>
<td>The quantity and quality of</td>
<td>The quantity and quality of amenity greenspace generally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>amenity greenspace</td>
<td>deteriorates from west to east. The provision of amenity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>generally deteriorates from</td>
<td>space in Romford Town is a particular area for concern.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>west to east. The provision</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of amenity space in Romford</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Town is a particular area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>for concern.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Targeted enhancements to the open spaces that have been</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>identified as having a high value, but are poor in terms of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>their overall quality. Create new open spaces in Romford Town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>centre as part of new developments in the area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Sub Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Deficiencies</th>
<th>Measures to Address Deficiencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hornchurch</strong></td>
<td>No opportunities exist to introduce park functions within existing open spaces in the deficiency area. New development within the deficiency area may present an opportunity to provide new public park facilities in the future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Parks</strong></td>
<td>Targeted improvements should be made to the quality of sites: 38 (Park Lane playground), 105 (St Andrews Park), 176 (Chase Nature Reserve) and 177 (Grenfell Park).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access</strong></td>
<td>Opportunities to reduce deficiencies with regards to St Andrews may arise from introducing a new play area in the central area of the ward. There are a limited number of open spaces within the Hacton ward that have the potential to accommodate a children's play area, therefore opportunities for introducing this type of use may rest on the potential to incorporate play areas in new development schemes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quantity</strong></td>
<td>This deficiency should be addressed through diversifying existing open spaces to incorporate a greater proportion of natural greenspace. In addition green linkages should be improved between deficiency areas and existing natural greenspaces located within the Borough to create linear habitat spaces incorporating linear routes and back gardens. Tree canopy coverage could be enhanced to link doorstep amenity spaces to local parks and natural greenspaces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quality</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Children’s Play Provision</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Natural/ semi-natural greenspace</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Quantity</strong></th>
<th>All wards within the sub area meet the quantitative minimum standard of 1 ha of natural greenspace per 1,000 population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Allotments</strong></td>
<td>Despite there being 4 allotments in this sub area, the whole of the Hacton ward is deficient in terms of access to an allotment site. The east of St Andrews also has areas that are further than 800m away from an allotment garden. The southern and northern extremes of the Hylands wards also contain small areas which are deficient in allotment provision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Opportunities to bring forward allotment space may arise in Hacton through new development. Potential may also exist to accommodate a multi-purpose allotment /outdoor class room within one of the school grounds located in the area of deficiency. Alternatively, there are a number of public parks and/or amenity areas in the deficiency area that could potentially be converted to allotment use (subject to demonstrated need and community consultation).</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Amenity Spaces</strong></td>
<td>Hacton ward has a low number of spaces that perform an amenity function, but this is offset by a reasonably high level of residences with back gardens. Central parts of St Andrews ward have few spaces which perform an amenity function and also has a greater proportion of dwellings without back gardens. Spaces which perform an amenity function are therefore required within the centre of the ward.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target improvements to the quality of spaces within the sub area which have high value but low quality.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub Area</td>
<td>Existing Deficiencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Havering</td>
<td>Large parts of the south of the sub area are outside of the 800m catchment area for public park provision. However, the area is largely characterised by employment uses with little in the way of residential. With the exception of the Elm Park ward, all other wards within the sub area are below the quantitative standard of 1.84ha of public parkland per 1,000 population. The South Havering sub area has 9 park spaces which fall short of the qualitative standard. These spaces are 35 (Glens Play Space), 43 (Brettons Playing Field), 121 (Louis Marchesi Play area), 129 (The Glen), 184 (Ongar Way Play area), 188 (Maytree Close), 192 (Chantry Way Play Site), 193 (Walden Avenue), and 300 (Neptune Close).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access</td>
<td>No additional facilities required. However, targeted improvements should be made to the quality of sites 35 (Glens Play Space), 43 (Brettons Playing Field), 121 (Louis Marchesi Play area), 129 (The Glen), 184 (Ongar Way Play area), 188 (Maytree Close), 192 (Chantry Way Play Site), 193 (Walden Avenue), and 300 (Neptune Close).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Parks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children’s Play Provision</td>
<td>Although deficiency areas do exist in the south of the Borough, the significance of these areas is not great as the area is rural in nature. South Hornchurch and Rainham and Wennington are both well served by children’s play provision and contain only small areas that are deficient in terms of children’s play provision (in the north of each ward). With the exception of the north of the ward, most of the Elm Park ward is deficient in terms of access to a LEAP or a NEAP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within the Elm Park ward, there may be potential to upgrade the existing provision of play equipment, that currently does not satisfy the NPFA criteria. Brittons Playing Field (043) and the Louis Marchesi Play area have this potential. An additional site in the south east of the ward would also be required to help meet the requirement. Hornchurch Country Park would be a good location to install a new LEAP or NEAP. Within Rainham and Wennington, upgrading the provision of children’s play in the Glen would have benefits in terms of reducing the area of the ward without access to a play area which meets NPFA criteria. A new play area is also required in the north of the ward, potentially at Abbey Wood Lane, if the current deficiency in this area of the ward is going to be reduced. Within South Hornchurch, upgrading the play areas at Ongar Way, Whybridge Close, and the Brittons Playing Field would reduce the area of the ward without 800m access to a LEAP or NEAP. Upgrading an existing housing play site, at Avelon Road, would also be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural / semi natural green spaces.</td>
<td>Large parts of the population centres of the sub area are deficient in natural greenspace between 2 and 20ha.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantity</td>
<td>All wards within the sub area meet the quantitative minimum standard of 1 ha of natural greenspace per 1,000 population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allotments</td>
<td>The majority of the ward lies within the 800m allotment catchment area, although the east of the urban area does not. South Hornchurch does not contain any allotment provision, although the north west of the ward does lie within the catchment area for Bretons Farm. Rainham and Wennington contains the Melville Road allotment site, but the urban area in the north east of the ward is outside of a catchment area. Rainham and Wennington is under served in terms of the Borough’s allotment standard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amenity space</td>
<td>The South Havering sub area has a relatively large number of amenity spaces, however, the quality of the majority of these spaces was assessed to be low. The residential estate just north of central Rainham has few spaces that perform an amenity function.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Sub Area

#### Upminster

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Parks-Access</th>
<th>Existing Deficiencies</th>
<th>Measures to Address Deficiencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quantity</strong></td>
<td>Within the urban part of the sub area a very small area 500m east of Upminster station is inside the deficiency area for public parks. Most of the south east of Upminster ward is largely rural in character and is deficient in access to public parks. However, the significance of this deficiency is low given the low population. Only the Emerson Park ward within the sub area is below the quantitative standard of 1.84 ha of public parkland per 1,000 population.</td>
<td>No opportunities exist to introduce other open space uses to existing open spaces within the deficiency area. However, site no. 53 (Ashfield Gardens Allotments) does have the potential to be turned into a public park if it can be shown that the allotment is surplus to requirements. Alternatively, new development within the deficiency area may present an opportunity to provide new public park facilities in the future. Targeted improvements should be made to the quality of sites 52 (Cranham playing fields), 73 (Elliots Playing Field) and 288 (Windmill Field).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quality</strong></td>
<td>The Upminster sub area has 4 park spaces which fall short of the qualitative standard. These spaces are 52 (Cranham playing fields), 73 (Elliots Playing Field), 288 (Windmill Field) and 310 (Puddleduck Farm fisheries).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Children’s Play Provision

| The main areas of deficiency in this sub area are to the east of Upminster, to the south of Cranham and the majority of the Emerson Park ward. Emerson Park does not contain a single LEAP/NEAP. | There are a limited number of open spaces in the Emerson Park ward that have the potential to accommodate children’s play provision. Sites that may have the potential include Tyle Gardens (76), Elliots playing Field (73) and Prospect Road Fields (74). Enhancing the play area at Haynes Park to NPFA standards would also improve the area that is deficient in access to a LEAP or a NEAP within the Emerson Park ward. Even if these improvements were made, there would still be an area of deficiency in the centre of the ward. However, the significance of this deficiency may only be small due to the fact that this area is mainly comprised of properties with large back gardens that provide a certain kind of play provision for children, albeit within a private environment. Within Cranham, improving the supply of LEAPs / NEAPs in the first instance could be made by improving the existing provision of play areas at Cranham Playing Fields to NPFA standards. There may be limited |
opportunities to improve the supply of play provision to the south of the Cranham ward, due to the type of existing spaces that are found in the area. Although Upminster does have 4 LEAPs/NEAPs, the deficiency areas in this part of the ward could be reduced by the introduction of a play area at Cranham Marsh (ID 303). Parklands (ID 47) is another space with the potential to reduce the existing play area deficiency.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Natural/semi-natural greenspace</th>
<th>Large parts of the population centres of the sub area are deficient in natural greenspace provision between 2ha and 20ha. All wards within the sub area exceed the quantitative minimum standard of 1 ha of natural greenspace per 1,000 population.</th>
<th>Within the sub area natural greenspace areas less than 2ha in size should be enhanced to alleviate deficiencies in access. Existing areas of open space in the deficiency area could be diversified to incorporate an element of natural / semi natural greenspace.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quantity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allotments</td>
<td>Emerson Park does not contain any allotment gardening provision, and consequently falls below the overall standard for allotment provision in the Borough. However, the north of the ward does lie within the 800m catchment area for the Mac Donald Avenue allotment. Cranham has one small allotment site, and therefore also performs badly against the overall standard. The west of the ward is deficient in this type of open space provision.</td>
<td>Potential may exist to accommodate a multi-purpose allotment /outdoor class room within one of the school grounds located in the area of deficiency. Alternatively, there are a number of public parks and/or amenity areas in the deficiency area that could potentially be converted to allotment use (subject to demonstrated need and community consultation).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amenity Space</td>
<td>Both Upminster and Emerson Park wards have few amenity spaces but this is offset by relatively high levels of residences with back gardens. Central parts of the Cranham ward has few spaces which perform an amenity function and has a relatively large number of houses without back gardens.</td>
<td>Target improvements to existing spaces at sites 50 (Lexington Way) and 51 (Fleet close playsite).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Sub Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub Area</th>
<th>Existing Deficiencies</th>
<th>Measures to Address Deficiencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harold Hill and Harold Wood</td>
<td>A reasonably large part of the northeastern part of Harold Wood ward is further than 560m from a public park but no residential part of the sub area is outside of the 800m catchment area</td>
<td>Part of the deficiency area that covers the sub area contains other types of open space. To address this deficiency, there may be opportunities to diversify the use of existing spaces to accommodate functions associated with public parks. Site no.283 (Sunflower Way Flood Lagoon) is currently an amenity space which could be enhanced to incorporate some of the functions more commonly associated with public parks by improving access and embedding a range of informal recreation opportunities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All wards within the sub area are above the quantitative standard of 1.84 ha of public parkland per 1,000 population.</td>
<td>Targeted improvements should be made to the quality of sites 13 (Dorking Road playground), 14 (Montgomery Crescent), 62 (St Neots Road Park), 65 (Painsbrown Play Area), 70 (Gooshays Gardens), 81 (Keats Avenue play site), 88 (Farringdon Avenue) and 266 (Open Space north of Eastern Avenue).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Harold Hill sub area has 8 park spaces which fall short of the qualitative standard. These spaces are sites 13 (Dorking Road playground), 14 (Montgomery Crescent), 62 (St Neots Road Park), 65 (Painsbrown Play Area), 70 (Gooshays Gardens), 81 (Keats Avenue play site), 88 (Farringdon Avenue) and 266 (Open Space north of Eastern Avenue)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children’s Play Provision</td>
<td>Gooshays has some LEAP/NEAP provision, but is deficient in access terms in the east and the west of the ward. Some of these areas are covered by other types of play provision. The south of Heaton does not have any NPFA standard play areas, which is also the case regarding the west of Harold Wood.</td>
<td>Within Gooshays, upgrading the existing play provision within the ward to LEAP/NEAP standards would serve to reduce the deficiencies in the west of the ward. In particular, Gooshays Gardens and the swimming pool site (12) have the greatest potential for being upgraded. There is also a need to introduce a new LEAP or NEAP in the east of the ward, to reduce the deficiency area in this area. Within Heaton, the current deficiency area could be addressed by making improvements to the Housing Play sites in Heaton Avenue and at Tavistock Close/Launceston Close. Within Harold Wood, there may be potential to enhance Painsbrown Play Area to LEAP/NEAP standards. Addressing the deficiency areas in the west of the Borough requires a new LEAP/NEAP being constructed. Potential sites include Sunflower Way Flood Lagoon (ID 283) and an Amenity Area (ID 72).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Natural / semi natural greenspaces

Much of the western parts of Harold Hill, north of Gidea Park station, are deficient in natural open space between 2 and 20 ha.

All wards within the sub area exceed the quantitative minimum standard of 1 ha of natural greenspace per 1,000 population.

It would be difficult to introduce any new natural/semi natural greenspace areas over 2ha within the residential area of Harold Wood. However, existing areas of open space in the deficiency area could be diversified to incorporate an element of natural/semi natural greenspace.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Allotments</th>
<th>This sub area contains a total of 4 allotments. Each of the 3 wards is under-provided based on the 2016 standard for Havering allotment provision. The central and western urban areas in the Gooshays ward are outside of the 1 allotment catchment area. The east of Hacton is deficient in access to an allotment sites, as is the west of the Harold Wood ward.</th>
<th>Potential may exist to accommodate a multi-purpose allotment /outdoor class room within one of the school grounds located in the area of deficiency. Alternatively, there are a number of public parks and/or amenity areas in the deficiency area that could potentially be converted to allotment use (subject to demonstrated need and community consultation).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amenity space</td>
<td>The sub area generally has a large quantity of amenity greenspace due to the fact that the area was developed as a planned settlement. Nevertheless, the amenity greenspace in the area generally suffers from a lack of investment and is poorly maintained. A number of amenity /small open spaces are therefore currently not fulfilling their potential role.</td>
<td>Targeted enhancements to the open spaces that have been identified as having a high value, but are poor in terms of their overall quality.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MEETING DEFICIENCIES IN QUALITY

10.57 Deficiencies in the quality and value of spaces were identified in Chapter 7. Possible measures to enhance the quality and value of spaces to the community should be pursued within the parks strategy on a site by site basis. The prioritisation of sites for improvement should be guided by their position in the Quality-Value quadrant identified in Chapter 7, their position within the Green Network (refer to Figure 10.3) including whether sites can alleviate deficiencies or lie within an area of open space need and whether the site can accommodate change or improvement.

10.58 Improvements themselves may include the simple upgrading, improvement, replacement or enhancement of existing facilities or aspects of park quality. However, within some open spaces a more comprehensive approach may be required which may include re-focusing the role of all or part of the open space in order to better meet local needs. Open space improvements should be considered within the context of future management needs and requirements. Embedding revenue generating activities within open spaces and maximising the involvement of the community and voluntary sector provide opportunities to maximise the presence of the open space within the community and make sustainable long term management of the site achievable.

10.59 Where open spaces do not have a positive identity or an established role, the toolkit of possible themes identified below could be employed to re-focus the role of spaces or parts of spaces. The ideas below represent suggestions for the Council to foster community discussion of the range of possibilities and do not represent solutions in themselves without appreciation of the context and issues associated with individual spaces.

- Improved community focus (amphitheatres, outdoor dining, picnic and barbeque areas, shelters and temporary structures, spaces for festivals and events);
- Outdoor cultural venue including spaces for consumption (cinema in the park, art exhibitions, sculpture trails and public art, music and performance areas, outdoor reading room) and artistic production (spaces for inspiration/contemplation, views/vistas, landscapes etc);
- Outdoor gym (enhancement of health benefits, sports facilities, trim trails);
- Spaces for relaxation (Varied landscapes and possibly indoor facilities including sauna, spa etc.);
- Wireless Park – (Provision of wireless internet access in order to provide “inspirational/outdoor workspace” particularly within Country and District Parks
and spaces close to town centres. Technology can also be used to deliver historical/environmental/nature conservation interpretation;

- “Green beach” - pleasure spaces surrounding water space (i.e lake, paddling pool/lido, fountain/water feature). Should include spaces for relaxation, sport and recreation and appropriate vegetation;

- Spaces for education (adult learning, improved interpretation, spaces for teaching cycle proficiency);

- The “extreme” park to meet the needs of older children and teenagers not well provided for within existing spaces (skateboard ramps, artificial grass skiing/long boarding slope, mountain bike trails/multi-function cycling facility, designated paths for in-line skating, outdoor climbing wall, outdoor karting/motor sports).

- Blurring the boundaries between different open space types to maximise use and shared management responsibility (e.g a jointly provided allotment garden, community garden and outdoor classroom);

- Enabling open spaces for evening and night-time use (lighting strategy, floodlighting, embedding evening attractions);

- Consideration of spaces/facilities in the air/below ground (viewing platforms, tree walk, earth sheltered structures for changing provision etc.).

10.60 In addition to these ideas within a wide range of spaces there will be a need to embed spaces for nature, for dogs and for play.

**MAINTAINING AN ADEQUATE SUPPLY OF OPEN SPACE**

10.61 PPG 17 Planning for Open Space Provision identifies the criteria to be used to protect open spaces which are of high value to a local community. It also identifies the criteria to determine whether a space which is surplus to requirements and can be considered for alternative uses.

10.62 Paragraph 10 of PPG17 identifies that “existing open space, sport and recreation buildings and land should not be built on unless an assessment has been undertaken which has clearly shown that open space or the buildings and land to be ‘surplus to requirements. For open space, surplus to requirements should include consideration of all the functions that open space can perform”.

10.63 PPG 17 recognises that not all open space, sport and recreational land and buildings are of equal merit and some may be available for alternative use. However, it is necessary for developers will need to consult the local community and demonstrate
that their proposals are widely supported by them. In summary to determine whether an open space can be considered for alternative uses:

- A robust open space assessment needs to show that the space is not needed to meet local open space requirements;
- The open space is not required to meet an identified deficiency in another type of open space; and
- Consultation with the local community needs to be carried out. The onus is on the developer to demonstrate that there is widespread community support for their proposals.

10.64 Proposals for alternative non open space uses at established playing field sites would need to be considered in relation to current Sport England guidelines relating to the development of playing fields. The Council would be required to consult Sport England on all planning applications relating to the development of playing fields greater than 0.2ha.

10.65 As with other development proposals alternative uses would need to be considered in relation to the provisions of the Development Plan and other material considerations.

Partial disposal and Land exchanges

10.66 Paragraph 12 of PPG 17 recognises that development of open spaces may provide an opportunity for local authorities to remedy deficiencies in provision where there is an identified surplus in one type of open space and a deficiency in another type. Planning conditions and obligations can be used to secure part of the development site for the type of provision which is in deficit.

10.67 Development also may provide the opportunity to exchange the use of one site for another to substitute for ant loss of open space, sport or recreational facility. PPG17 identifies that the new land and facilities should be at least as accessible to current and potential new users at least be equivalent in terms of size, usefulness, attractiveness and quality.

Development within open spaces

10.68 Paragraph 16 of PPG 17 identifies that the recreational quality of open spaces can be eroded by insensitive development or incremental loss of the site. In considering planning applications either within, or adjoining open space PPG 17 recommends that local authorities should weigh any benefits offered to the community against the
loss of open space that will occur. In considering planning applications Local authorities should:

(i) Avoid any erosion of recreational function and maintain or enhance the character of spaces;

(ii) Ensure open spaces do not suffer from increased overlooking, traffic flows or other encroachment;

(iii) Protect and enhance those parts of the rights of way network that might benefit open space; and

(iv) Consider the impact of any development on biodiversity and nature conservation.

AREAS WITH PROVISION ABOVE MINIMUM OPEN SPACE STANDARDS

10.69 The open space assessment has identified in broad terms parts of the Borough where the minimum standards of open space provision have been met in order to identify areas where provision may exist which is surplus to requirements. In order to identify whether a space was surplus to requirements the following tests were used consistent with the requirements of PPG17.

(i) Is the space located within an area of the Borough which experiences an open space deficiency for any type of open space provision either in terms of the quantity or accessibility of provision;

(ii) Does the space have the potential to meet any identified deficiency considering its location, size and character;

(iii) Is the open space or its facilities of high quality, or of particular value to the community and merits protection despite minimum standards of provision having been met;

10.70 Open space which fulfil either criteria (i) and (ii) or criteria (iii) may represent spaces which are surplus to requirements if it can be demonstrated that there is widespread community support for alternative use.

10.71 In order to identify parts of the Borough which meet the criteria a sieving process was undertaken considering each criteria in turn.
Tests (i) and (ii) Is the space required to meet a deficiency?

10.72 Deficiencies were identified in accordance with the open space standards defined within the assessment (refer to Chapter 9). Those wards where minimum standards of provision have been met in terms of quantity were identified as this may indicate that the space may not be required to meet existing or future needs. These are identified in Table 10.3. A minus figure indicates that a ward is deficient in a type of open space in terms of ha per 1000 population. Amenity space provision has been considered based on a qualitative assessment of needs and opportunities. Amenity spaces under 0.4ha have not been included in the study.

Table 10.3 – Provision of open space by ward above open space standard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>Public Parks</th>
<th>Natural Greenspace</th>
<th>Playing Pitches</th>
<th>Allotments</th>
<th>Amenity Space Need</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brooklands</td>
<td>-0.35</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cranham</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elm Park</td>
<td>11.31</td>
<td>9.99</td>
<td>5.68</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emerson Park</td>
<td>-1.46</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gooshays</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>10.85</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hacton</td>
<td>-0.86</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.74</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harold Wood</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>8.04</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Havering Park</td>
<td>12.16</td>
<td>19.11</td>
<td>7.89</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heaton</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hylands</td>
<td>-0.69</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mawney</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.36</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pettits</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rainham and Wennington</td>
<td>-0.79</td>
<td>56.02</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romford Town</td>
<td>-1.44</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td>-0.74</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Hornchurch</td>
<td>-0.81</td>
<td>10.88</td>
<td>-0.74</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Squirrel's Heath</td>
<td>-0.74</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Andrews</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upminster</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>27.88</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10.73 In terms of Public Parks, there are 7 wards that have a provision of this type of open space above the quantity standard. These are Elm Park, Gooshays, Harold Wood and Havering Park, Heaton, St Andrews and Upminster. With regards to Natural Greenspace, only Mawney and Romford Town have a quantitative deficiency. Looking at the provision of playing pitches, most wards have a level of provision above the standard with only 4 wards with a quantitative deficiency, however most wards only have a small quantity of provision above the standard. With regards to
allotment provision, only Brooklands and St Andrews have a quantity of provision over the standard.

10.74 Within these wards spaces for the surplus categories of open space were identified if loss of these spaces would not create or exacerbate a deficiency. Spaces within wards with provision above the minimum standards which had the potential to address an access deficiency in a neighbouring ward were also discounted from consideration.

10.75 It was then necessary to determine whether the sites not required to meet the open space quantity standard have the potential to address a deficiency in another type of open space. For example, if a playing field is not required to meet the needs of the community in terms of access or quantity requirements, but is situated in an area of public park deficiency, then the space may be required to meet the needs of this public park deficiency. The assessment of potential was based upon the location of the site, the current open space use and character of the site and whether it was of sufficient size to alleviate the deficiency. The assessment of potential scope for change was also considered which was undertaken as part of the site appraisal process.

**Test (iii) Is the space of high quality or of particular value to the community?**

10.76 The final test was to identify whether spaces which fulfilled criteria (i) & (ii) represent spaces of high quality or represent spaces which are of particular value to the community.

10.77 This filter used for this test was the quality assessment undertaken as part of the site appraisals (described in Chapter 6) and the assessment of value described in Chapter 7. Those sites which scored above the Havering average in terms of their quality or value score were discounted from the assessment as they should be safeguarded from development.

10.78 The spreadsheet identifying the open spaces which have the potential to be surplus to requirements under these criteria are identified in Appendix F.

10.79 This sieving process has identified the following 5 sites which appear surplus to fulfil the ‘surplus to requirements’ definition identified in PPG 17. Although community aspirations for these spaces are not known:

- Site 290 – Open Space North of Colchester Road
- Site 149 – Havering Lake and Bridge
• Site 191 – Fredrick Road Scrubland

• Site 033 - Avelon Road Open Space

• Site 115 – Fairkytes Avenue / Centre

10.80 The sieving process has only been applied to open spaces identified and assessed during the site visits. For other open spaces, sport and recreation buildings and facilities which did not meet the size criteria for inclusion in the study such as small amenity spaces it would be necessary to apply a similar evaluation process.

10.81 In addition the scope of the assessment did not consider potential opportunities to develop part of existing open space sites for development or to consider potential land exchanges which may be possible to rationalise or enhance provision. Such opportunities should be considered against the requirements of PPG17 described above on a case by case basis.

**Widespread community support**

10.82 To inform the decision of whether it is appropriate to develop an open space site for an alternative use it is also necessary to establish whether there is also widespread community support for the proposal through public consultation.

10.83 The programme of consultation undertaken as part of this assessment was conducted at the Borough level and cannot be used to identify public perceptions relating to individual sites. However, the findings of the residents survey can help to gauge the perceptions of the community with regards to overall levels of open space provision, and contribution to local quality of life.

**Satisfaction**

10.84 All respondents were asked how satisfied they are with existing levels of open space provision in their area, shown in Table 10.4 below.
Table 10.4 – Using the following scale, How satisfied are you with levels of open space provision in your area?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Users</th>
<th>Non-Users</th>
<th>South Havering</th>
<th>Hornchurch</th>
<th>Upminster, Cranham and Emerson Park</th>
<th>Central (Romford)</th>
<th>North Romford</th>
<th>North &amp; Harold Wood</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Satisfied</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very dissatisfied</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base (all respondents)</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>758</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total satisfied: 68% 75% 45% 84% 77% 68% 41% 35% 76%
Total dissatisfied: 14% 15% 12% 24% 13% 6% 14% 11% 10%
10.85 Perceptions of local provision of open space are generally very positive, with 68% of all respondents being either very satisfied or satisfied. Only 14% of the sample were dissatisfied or very dissatisfied with the provision of open spaces in their local area. Satisfaction with open space provision is higher amongst users of open space compared to non-users.

10.86 The satisfaction of open space to the quality of life in the Borough varies by sub area. Perceptions of the contribution open spaces make to the quality of life in the Borough are lowest in the most heavily built up parts of the Borough, and highest in the sub areas closest to the urban fringe, where the provision of open space is greatest. Whereas 77% of residents living in Hornchurch perceive that open space contributes either a lot, or a little, to their quality of life, only 34% of those living in North Romford do.

Quality of Life

10.87 All respondents were given a fixed scale and asked how much they feel that the open spaces in their locality contribute to their quality of life (see Table 10.5).
Table 10.5 – How much do you feel that the open spaces in your neighbourhood affect your quality of life?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Users</th>
<th>Non-Users</th>
<th>South Havering</th>
<th>Hornchurch</th>
<th>Emerson Park</th>
<th>Central (Romford)</th>
<th>North Romford</th>
<th>Harold Hill &amp; Harold Wood</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contribute a lot</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribute a little</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither contribute nor under perform</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under perform</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under perform a lot</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base (all respondents)</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>758</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>101%</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total contribute a lot/a little</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total under perform/a lot</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10.88 Most residents identified the positive contribution that open spaces make to the overall quality of life in the Borough, 75% of respondents believing that they either contribute a lot, or contribute a little to their quality of life. Only 7% of respondents believe that the local open spaces 'under perform a little', or under perform in their role. The perceptions of users regarding this issue are more positive than non-users.

10.89 The contribution of open space to the quality of life in the Borough varies by sub area. Residents are least positive in the most heavily built up parts of the Borough, and highest in the sub areas closest to the urban fringe. Whereas 85% of residents living in Harold Hill and Harold Wood perceive that open space contributes either a lot, or a little, to their quality of life, only 42% of those living in North Romford do.

10.90 Whilst these sub area findings provide a guide to local public perceptions more targeted local consultation through postal questionnaires, meetings etc would be required to identify community perceptions relating to an individual development proposal.
11. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

11.1 The Havering Open Space Study and the accompanying database and GIS mapping provide a comprehensive assessment of the supply and demand for open space which includes:

- An analysis of current open space provision;
- A typology of open spaces relevant to Havering;
- A classification of public open spaces;
- The identification of deficiencies in provision in terms of access to public open space;
- The qualitative distribution of public open space including the range and condition of facilities;
- The value of individual open spaces reflecting the wider contribution that open spaces make to the community and to the quality of life;
- The identification of deficiencies in provision in terms of access to natural greenspace and nature conservation;
- An understanding of the relative importance of open space as a cultural heritage resource, potential threats to historic open spaces and opportunities for their protection and enhancement;
- Opportunities to protect and enhance the Green Network;
- The contribution that non public open spaces make to addressing open space deficiencies;
- An assessment of the supply and demand of playing fields.

11.2 The results will:

- Inform the review of the Local Development Framework;
- Provide the Council with adequate planning guidance and open space standards;
• Assist the Council in identifying needs for new open spaces and outdoor sports facilities;

• Inform the future management of open spaces and playing pitches including the identification of opportunities to enhance and reconfigure open space provision;

• Enable the Council to identify priorities for future investment and provide a rationale to secure external funding for the improvement and additional provision of facilities particularly via developer contributions.

11.3 Volume 1 of the study includes an assessment of the quantity, quality and value of parks and open spaces in Havering and identifies whether provision is meeting local needs. It develops local standards and measures to address deficiencies in open space provision. The findings from the resident’s consultation have informed the preparation of this report.

11.4 An assessment of needs for playing pitches and indoor sports facilities in the Borough have also been an element of this study (Volume 2). This includes all outdoor pitch sports, other outdoor sports and indoor sports facilities.

11.5 This chapter brings together the conclusions and recommendations from each of the separate elements of the study. The recommended standards for provision are summarised in Table 9.1.

POLICY FRAMEWORK

11.6 This study is consistent with planning guidance and other supporting strategies at the national, regional and local level and takes into account new government thinking on sustainable development and the role that green space plays in the quality of life of residents.

11.7 It recognises that most open space, with good planning and management, can perform multiple functions and provide a variety of benefits which cut across the Council’s strategic priorities. An Open Space Study is vital to bring all those who are responsible and have an interest together with a common purpose and a shared understanding of what can be done to enhance and maintain green space for the future.

11.8 The review of the Havering LDF should update policies relating to open space, sport and recreation needs in the Borough to reflect the approach to open space provision identified in this report.
OPEN SPACE NEEDS AND PRIORITIES

11.9 The identification of local needs and priorities has taken account of the findings of the Residents Survey and other consultation under taken by the council in relation to parks and open spaces.

11.10 Open space needs and priorities are varied across the Borough. Differences in population density, % flats & terraced dwellings, child densities and indices of deprivation generally correspond to those areas where large scale housing developments exist, such as public housing estates.

(i) Areas of medium and high population density (gross residential densities >50 dwellings/hectare) and/or wards with a high proportion of dwellings which are terraced or are flats (refer to Figure 3.2) should be prioritised for improvements to the provision of small local parks, local parks, children’s play areas amenity greenspaces and allotments where there is an identified deficiency in either the quantity or access.

(ii) The range and quality of open space provision within these open spaces should also reflect the increased range of functions which these spaces are required to fulfil which would normally be performed by back gardens. Such functions include children’s play, informal games, sitting out/relaxation, picnics/outside dining, gardening and family/community gatherings.

11.11 The reason for prioritising these areas is due to lower than average access to private gardens within these areas and the overall density of development which means that there tend to be fewer amenity spaces, natural and semi-natural areas including urban trees particularly within the areas of highest density.

(iii) The highest densities are in the north and south of Havering (north of Mawney and Gooshays) and to the south in Rainham and Wennington (refer to Figure 3.3). These wards should be prioritised for improvement where there are inadequate opportunities for children’s play for all age groups (refer to Chapter 5).

(iv) Nationally, around 9% of the population are not in good health (refer to Figure 3.4). Havering contains relatively large pockets of the population that are not in good health, especially within the Heaton ward. Within all areas of the Borough open spaces should provide formal and informal opportunities for physical activity and a range of environments which provide spaces for relaxation and stress relief.
11.12 Where such opportunities do not exist new formal and informal opportunities for physical activity should be embedded within communities in order to encourage increased rates of physical activity. Within all communities there should be spaces for relaxation either within existing parks or within linear open spaces. Both of these roles can potentially contribute towards preventing ill health.

(v) The poorest areas in terms of the deprivation index are in located the centre of the Borough. Cranham has the highest (i.e. worst) rank of deprivation. Given this context it is imperative that open spaces do not under perform in their potential role in regenerating communities through:

- Providing environments which are attractive green and safe;
- Providing green lungs to assist in improving air quality;
- Establishing a sense of place and wellbeing and improving the image and identity of communities and;
- Providing a range of opportunities for sport and recreation.

11.13 Such improvements should be instrumental in enhancing local quality of life.

**APPROACH TO PLANNING OPEN SPACE PROVISION**

11.14 It is considered that using the parks hierarchy concept is the most appropriate means of planning open space in Havering. This study has used this approach to address the issues identified in PPG17. The hierarchy of open space has been amended and the typology of open space expanded to reflect the roles of different open space types, and the variations in accessibility and usage patterns between principal settlements and other parts of the Borough.

**ASSESSMENT OF SUPPLY**

11.15 Havering has a relatively high quantity of public park provision for an outer London Borough, with some 3.18ha of public parks per 1000 population, although the distribution of public park provision varies significantly between wards.

11.16 Those areas of the Borough which are deficient in public open space are illustrated on Figure 5.5. Measures to extend the existing catchments of existing parks will need to be considered in order to reduce deficiencies in access. Measures will be different for each park but could include creating more park gates, ‘greening’ of routes and better signposting.
11.17 This study has identified provision for children’s play in Havering. 42.6% of the children’s play areas do not meet all of the criteria set by NPFA for a LEAP or NEAP. 39 open spaces have play areas which fully fulfil the criteria associated with a LEAP and only spaces fully meet the NEAP criteria. 29 open spaces with ‘Other children’s play provision’ fulfil some of the criteria for a LEAP and could be classified as such if minor improvements were made to the play space. There are also 19 housing play areas in the Borough that may have the potential for improvements.

11.18 The assessment identifies the areas deficient in access to formally provided children’s play provision but also identifies other publicly accessible open spaces which may have the potential to incorporate dedicated children’s play facilities and help reduce the deficiencies.

QUALITY OF SUPPLY

11.19 Open space policy has previously been primarily concerned with the quantity and distribution of open space. This study updates this information but also considers the range and condition of facilities within open spaces and the quality of those facilities compared with the Green Flag standard. Chapter 6 identifies that the majority of open spaces are classified as having a good or very good quality and range of facilities. The overall findings of the resident’s survey are consistent with this assessment.

11.20 A strategy for improving the range and condition of facilities within public parks should be developed to take into account:

- The unique character of these parks and the potential to incorporate further facilities;
- Whether there is a deficiency in the provision of open space in the area;
- The proximity of other parks which may have an oversupply of certain facilities;
- Recommendations from the Sports Assessment;
- Recommendations to enhance the Green Network; and
- Local social conditions.

Proposed Standard for Provision of Public Parks

11.21 Taking into account of 2016 population projections, this study recommends that existing levels of Metropolitan Park provision are maintained. For other types of public parks a quantity standard of **1.84 ha of public parks per 1,000 population** is
required to meet the needs of the Borough which reflects an increase in provision of 10ha.

11.22 The following access standards are recommended for inclusion within the forthcoming Local Development Framework.

- All residents within the Borough should have access to a Metropolitan Park within 3200m from home;
- All residents within the Borough should have access to a District Park within 1200m from home;
- All residents within the Borough should have access to a Local Park / Small Local Park or Pocket Park within 800m from home.
- All residents within the Borough should have access to a public park as defined by the parks hierarchy defined in Table 4.1 within 800m from home.

11.23 Public parks within the Borough should be of good or very good quality and provide the range of facilities associated with their respective tier of the parks hierarchy. Those public parks identified within Chapter 6 and 7 which either under perform in terms of their value to the local community or their condition should be improved consistent with the guidelines identified. Open spaces identified within Chapter 10 for improvement should be prioritised.

11.24 Children’s play provision should be of adequate quality and provide the range of facilities associated with the size of the facility. The Council's guidance and guidelines set out within the NPFA 6 acre Standard (2001) should be used to assess levels of adequacy in terms of the range and quality of provision.

**VALUE OF OPEN SPACE**

11.25 The value placed on open space is multi-functional and relates to a range of roles. Each open space will have a different mix of values to each individual user.

11.26 The study has shown that many of the open spaces surveyed are being used by schools and communities as an educational resource and location for social events.

11.27 The network of open spaces also provide a valuable ecological resource. There are areas of the Borough which are deficient in accessible natural or semi-natural greenspace provision. Chapter 10 identifies open spaces which could possibly
address this deficiency subject to new management regimes which adopt some of the landscaping and habitat creation measures identified.

11.28 Around 27.9% of open spaces were identified as being below the Havering average in terms of the quality and value. 86 spaces within the Borough (27.3%) were identified as representing open spaces of high quality and of high value to the community. Many of the high quality low value spaces represent mono-functional open spaces which only contribute to the community in a limited way, such as amenity spaces. Within areas of identified deficiency (in terms of quantity, quality or access) it is important that such spaces do not under perform in terms of their potential value and multi-functionality and are improved to fulfil their potential

Proposed Standard for Provision of Natural Greenspace

11.29 The proposed standard for provision of natural greenspace is **1.0ha per 1,000 population.** The natural greenspaces should be capable of being designated as a site of ecologically value according to the GLA assessment criteria. The Borough as a whole will meet this target in 2016. However, the distribution of natural greenspace is heavily skewed towards the south and east of the Borough and so some more central wards (identified in figure 7.7) will fall short of this target.

11.30 The following access standards are recommended for inclusion within the forthcoming Local Development Framework:

- All residents within the Borough should have access to a natural or semi-natural greenspace of at least 2ha in size within 300m of home;
- All residents within the Borough should have access to a natural or semi-natural greenspace of at least 20ha in size within 2km of home;
- All residents within the Borough should have access to a natural or semi-natural greenspace of at least 100ha in size within 5km of home;

ASSESSING ALLOTMENT NEEDS

11.31 The revised PPG17 states that in preparing development plans, local authorities should undertake an assessment of the likely demand for allotments and their existing allotment provision, and prepare policies which aim to meet the needs in their area.
Proposed Standard for Provision of Allotments

11.32 The recommended standard of allotment provision to meet needs up to 2016 is **0.18ha per 1,000 population**. Allotment provision should be increased by up to 9.21 ha to meet these needs.

11.33 The following access standard is recommended for inclusion within the forthcoming Local Development Framework.

- All households should have access to an allotment garden within 800m of home.

11.34 Allotment sites should be of adequate quality and support the needs of the local community. Allotment sites which under perform in terms of their value to the local community consistent with the criteria relating to the role of sites identified in Chapter 8 should be improved. Those sites identified within Chapter 10 should be prioritised.

11.35 Given that allotment sites do not have to be particularly large, allotment provision could be associated with new development in the City. Scope may exist within underserved areas to bring forward allotment land through diversification of existing open spaces such as playing fields and development of allotments on infill sites. Within other local authorities, school sites have proved good locations where there is sufficient space available as funding can be sought to develop allotments jointly as outdoor classrooms for curriculum use and as a community resource. Opportunities for bringing forward new allotment sites should be investigated within wards where there are the highest levels of latent demand and open space need.

11.36 At those allotment sites where there is unlikely to be demand even taking account of latent and potential demand then opportunities exist to diversify areas of underutilised plots or disused allotment land for other open space and nature conservation uses. If there is no existing or potential need for any other open space uses then it may be appropriate to consider other possible land uses.

PLAYING PITCH ASSESSMENT

11.37 It was established that 99 open spaces within the Borough (31.3%) had an established active or reserve playing field function. To provide an in depth assessment of local playing pitch needs, an assessment following the stages of the Sport England Playing Pitch Model was undertaken. This approach uses surveys of actual demand to assess the number of pitches required to meet local needs. The conclusions and recommendations are included in Chapter 11 of Volume 2.
11.38 Playing pitch needs taking account of future population projections were identified. Taking account of existing provision and demand, latent demand and the scale of the strategic reserve the following additional pitches are likely to be required to meet playing pitch needs up to 2016:

- 20 Junior football pitches; and
- 2 Artificial Turf Pitches.

**Proposed Standard for Provision of Playing Pitches**

11.39 The proposed playing pitch standard to meet needs up to 2016 is **0.74ha per 1,000 population**. There are 29 junior pitches not in secure community use which could be brought forward to meet latent demand in the short-medium term.

11.40 It is recommended that the Council prepares a playing pitch strategy and action plan in order to identify solutions to the quantitative and qualitative deficiencies identified within the playing pitch assessment.

11.41 Volume 2 identifies pitch management issues and sport specific recommendations to inform a playing pitch strategy.

**POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS**

**Development Control Decisions**

11.42 The Study provides comprehensive information on each open space surveyed to allow an informed assessment of the impact of development proposals on the value of individual open spaces. Development control decisions should have regard to the analysis undertaken on current levels of provision, the identified deficiencies and the quality and value of the open spaces within or surrounding a development site.

11.43 Proposals for new housing development should be accompanied by proposals to improve open space provision. The nature of such improvements should reflect the additional open space needs generated as a result of the proposed development. Recommended standards for open space provision are summarised in Table 9.1.

11.44 If the proposed development is located within an identified area of deficiency for public park, children’s play, playing pitch, natural greenspace or allotment provision, it will be necessary for additional sites to be brought into the relevant open space use. The developer will be required to make a contribution towards the provision of the open space. It may be appropriate for such provision to be incorporated within the curtilage of the development. Alternatively a contribution to off-site provision may be appropriate.
11.45 If the proposed development is not located within an area which is deficient in either quantity or access to open space provision, then consideration will be given to any deficiency in open space quality or value. The developer will be required to make a contribution towards the enhancement of the quality of open space provision including the range facilities and their condition.

11.46 A framework to guide developer contributions should be prepared to provide a rationale for calculating the contributions associated with individual development proposals.

**Enhancement of Open Spaces**

11.47 This study has identified criteria for assessing the quality and value of each open space surveyed. It is recommended that the Open Space Strategy focuses on improving those public spaces which are underperforming in line with the guidelines and suggested opportunities for improvement.

11.48 The study has also identified how existing deficiencies in open space quantity, quality and access may be addressed on a sub area basis to better meet local needs.

11.49 The “green network” approach for the Borough summarises existing provision, needs and local deficiencies and provides a diagnostic tool for identifying priorities for open space and rights of way improvements on a spatial basis. The network can be used to inform and to develop an open space strategy for the Borough and assist the Council in realising its vision for parks and open spaces.

11.50 The identification of a green network also provides a basis to consolidate the existing green network within the Borough and look at ways of providing further linkages between presently remote sites.

**AREAS WITH PROVISION ABOVE MINIMUM STANDARDS**

11.51 The study considers provision within areas where the minimum standards of open space provision and evaluates whether the sites are likely to represent sites surplus to requirements.

**NEXT STAGE**

11.52 The open space standards proposed within the study should be used to formulate planning policies within the forthcoming Local Development Framework.

11.53 The results of this study and the open space consultation should also inform the preparation of an Open Space and Playing Pitch Strategy. These strategies will
include action plans to identify timescales, relevant stakeholders and potential funding sources.