

APPENDIX 1: South Oxfordshire adjacent local authorities strategy summaries

It is important to set the South Oxfordshire sports facilities assessment within the context of the wider regional sub-area. This is because the larger or more specialist sports facilities often draw users from a wide area. Some residents of South Oxfordshire may travel elsewhere to take part in their sport, whilst facilities in the district may draw users from over the borders. Both housing growth and proposals for changes to the sports facility network outside of the district therefore need to be considered.

Significant housing growth expected within each of the adjacent authorities so the sports facility demand/supply picture is rapidly evolving, and will need to be kept under review.

The relevant sports strategies of each of the authorities have been reviewed, and the key points are drawn out below.

Aylesbury Vale

The Assessment of Leisure and Cultural Facilities for Aylesbury Vale of 2012 considered the implications of the housing growth of 13,500 dwellings in the period up to 2031. The conclusions were:

Sport halls

One 6-court hall would be required in the Aylesbury area. “There is an indication here that sports hall space may be working close to capacity”, and specific unmet demand was identified from the largest badminton club in the district, and consultation feedback suggested a lack of ancillary hall/studio space.

Swimming pools

No additional swimming pool space is required.

AGPs

One AGP should be provided in the Aylesbury area.

Grass pitches

A further 10 football and 1 cricket pitch is required for Aylesbury, plus 3 football pitches and one cricket pitch for the Buckingham area. There is also a requirement for 1 additional football pitch in the Winslow area.

Other facilities required

Specific facility needs identified are:

8 x outdoor tennis courts for Aylesbury, and 3 x courts for Buckingham.
1 rink for indoor bowls in Aylesbury
Improvements to the existing athletics provision

Cherwell

Sports halls

An FPM Interim Report was published in April 2014 which was submitted as part of the local plan evidence base. The report considered the supply/demand balance in 2013 and forecast the expected changes up to 2031 using the forecast population but no change in the supply of facilities.

The increase in hall demand up to 2031 across the authority as a whole up to 2031 is estimated to be approximately 4 badminton court, largely because the aging population balances out the new demand from the new housing. The demand in Cherwell for sport hall space currently is of the same order but slightly above the demand in the adjacent authorities of South Oxfordshire and South Northamptonshire, and in each of the authorities the demand per 1000 population is expected to fall up to 2031.

The only places with any notable unmet demand currently are Banbury and Bicester, but this does not change up to 2031. The current satisfied demand is around 95% and but this may fall slightly to 93% by 2031. About 9% of the current satisfied demand is met outside the authority, and this is expected to rise slightly to 10% by 2031. Of this exported demand, about 2% is currently exported to South Northamptonshire and this may rise to about 3%.

About 15% of the use of the sports halls in Cherwell is imported from surrounding authorities, with about a third of these visits being from South Northamptonshire. On average the halls in Cherwell are running at about 70% full, with the Bicester Leisure Centre, Kidlington & Gosford Leisure Centre and Spiceball Leisure Centre running at 100% full. Of the schools sites Cooper School and North Oxfordshire Academy are running above the 80% capacity level whilst the other schools are running at less than 50% full.

No new facilities are specifically proposed, but the report notes that there may be justification for additional all space in Bicester.

Swimming pools

An FPM Interim Report for pools was also published in April 2014 which was submitted as part of the local plan evidence base. The report considered the supply/demand balance in 2013 and forecast the expected changes up to 2031 using the forecast population but no change in the supply of facilities. The forecast growth was for 13,552 dwellings.

The increase in swimming pool demand up to 2031 across the authority as a whole up to 2031 is estimated to be approximately 184 sq m, largely because the aging population balances out the new demand from the new housing. The demand in Cherwell for swimming pool space currently is of the same order but slightly above the demand in South Northamptonshire, and in both of the authorities the demand per 1000 population is expected to fall up to 2031.

The current satisfied demand is around 94% and but this may fall slightly to 93% by 2031. About 10% of the current satisfied demand is met outside the authority, and this is expected to rise slightly to 11% by 2031. Of this exported demand, almost all of it is to Oxford with very minimal amounts to South Northamptonshire. At the present time there is no lack of capacity in the Cherwell pools, but this becomes an issue by 2031 because of the location of the housing growth in relation to the network of pools.

About 18% of the used capacity of the swimming pools is imported from surrounding authorities, with about just under half coming from South Northamptonshire. On average the pools in Cherwell are running at about 70% full and this will around 75% full by 2031. The FPM estimates that the used capacity of the leisure centre pools at Bicester, Banbury (Spiceball) are operating at above the 80% benchmark rate considered as “full” by Sport England but there is some spare capacity at the Kidlington leisure centre. The other pools in the district, including school and commercial pools are running below the 80% capacity.

There are no facility specifically proposals in the report, and it is implied that additional provision is not a high priority.

Artificial grass pitches

An FPM Interim Report for artificial grass pitches was also published in April 2014 which was submitted as part of the local plan evidence base. The report considered the supply/demand balance in 2013 and forecast the expected changes up to 2031 using the forecast population but no change in the supply of facilities. The forecast growth was for 13,552 dwellings.

In 2013 the authority had 7 sand based/dressed pitches on 6 sites but no 3G or water-based pitches.

Very little increase in AGP demand is expected up to 2031 across the authority as a whole, largely because the aging population balances out the new demand from the new housing. The total demand is and remain equivalent to around 4.5 full size pitches and 96% of the demand is, and will continue to be “satisfied”.

About 25% of the current satisfied demand is met outside the authority, and this is expected to rise slightly to 27% by 2031. Of this exported demand, almost all of it is to Oxford. There is approximately a balance between the number of visits which are imported and the number which are exported from South Northamptonshire.

The FPM estimates that the used capacity of the existing AGPs in Cherwell are close to or above 90%, with one exception, the Dewey Sports Centre (Bloxham School).

There are no facility specifically proposals in the report, but the report suggests that resurfacing one or more hockey pitches to 3G should be a priority.

Other facilities

The PPG17 assessment audit and strategy for Open Space, Sport and Recreation dated 2006 has not yet been updated. This suggested that, by 2026 Cherwell would have an oversupply/ shortfall of:

- Health and fitness oversupply of 190 stations
- Indoor bowls shortfall of 2.95 rinks

Playing pitches

The Cherwell Playing Pitch Strategy is dated 2008. At that time the strategy suggested that there was no additional requirement for adult football pitches but there was a small need for mini and junior football pitches. Two additional cricket pitches were an identified need for the Rural South area of the authority. There was no additional requirement for rugby pitches.

Update April 2016

As the playing pitch strategy and indoor sports facilities strategy are now out of date, the authority is starting work on replacement strategies. This will also provide an opportunity to consider the implications of further housing growth.

The authority is in the process of introducing CIL but will be looking for the strategies to justify standards of provision for use in S106 negotiations.

Current proposals

Bicester Sports Village 2017

Phase 2 of the new sports facility being developed as part of the Bicester Kingsmere housing site. Will have grass pitches, 3G pitch and pavilion.

Bicester Indoor Sports Centre 2020

£5-6m expansion proposed but dependent on land negotiations of ex school playing field space north of site. Hall, fitness gym, 25m x 6 lane pool with moveable floor, studio space.

North West Bicester 2022

17 ha of space identified for outdoor sports facilities. Mix of provision to be determined.

Banbury

Improvements to Wood Green Leisure Centre, including small expansion of fitness gym. Potentially considering using winter cover for the outdoor pool (50m).

Possibly 2 x 3G full size pitches, on school academy sites, so no guarantee of delivery.

Banbury United being relocated from existing site (due to be developed) to site adjacent to Banbury RFC. Considering potential for joint use 3G stadium pitch.

Grass pitches – some to be provided, but only sufficient to meet needs of new housing.

Cherwell and S Northants likely to share services from June 2016.

Oxford City

Leisure and Wellbeing Strategy 2015-2020

The strategy concluded that there was spare capacity at most times in the leisure centres with the exception of Ferry Leisure Centre where there was limited capacity at peak time. This spare capacity was around 500,000 visits per annum across the centres, but this was mostly off-peak. The FPM assessment showed that there was sufficient pool space to meet all future demand up to 2025 and that a high proportion of residents are within a 20 minute walk of a pool. However the FPM assessment for sports halls found that there was a small under-supply of 4 courts, which would rise to 6 courts by 2025. This level of under-provision should be met through the development of other community facilities, such as schools.

The 2015 strategy confirmed the investment needs identified by the 2012 strategy, including: £3m investment into the sports pavilions; £500,000 into tennis courts and MUGAs, and; investment into the Horspath Athletics Ground in advance of the London 2017 World Athletics Championships.

Other specific investment priorities which were identified include: improve Ferry and Barton Leisure Centres, and develop a gym attached to Oxford Spires Academy.

Playing pitch and outdoor sports strategy 2012-2026

This strategy covers grass and artificial pitches and also tennis courts, athletics tracks, bowling greens, golf courses and MUGAs.

In relation to grass pitches, the following changes to the pitch facilities were noted:

- The development of a 3G pitch at The Community Arena, Court Place Farm, Marston.
- The development of a 3G pitch plus hockey surface pitch at the Oxford Academy school

- The potential for a small-sided football facility, with the preferred site of either Sandy Lane or Rose Hill.
- The development of Barton Pavilion.

The football assessment showed that there was some spare capacity in the provision of senior pitches with secure community use. The main issues for seniors was the quality of the ancillary facilities and pitch quality. There is a deficiency in youth and mini football provision, most acutely in the north east and south east areas of the city. Although there is some spare capacity in the senior pitch provision, even if this was remarked to the mini and junior sizes, there is no spare capacity overall in the amount of playing field space available which is in secure community use. The recommendations included attempting to secure more pitch space into community use and the over-marking of pitches at the mini and youth levels.

The rugby assessment concluded that there was a deficiency of rugby pitches in secure community use in the city, as the only pitches available for hire with secure use are the Horspath Sports Ground and 2 pitches at Oxford Academy. The site at North Hinksey in the Vale of White Horse caters for a high number of displaced players. The main recommendation is that rugby club use on none secure sites should be formalised and made secure.

The cricket assessment identified that there was a clear need for additional pitch space with secure community use and there is also need to improve the ancillary facilities. The quality of the pitches varies, but the 2nd pitch at Horspath is identified as not meeting the OCA league requirements, and the recommendation is that it should be improved. All pitches should be retained including the sites at Oxford University Press Sports Ground and Lincoln College Sports Ground identified as potential locations for housing.

There is one Gaelic football club in the city, playing at Horspath Sports Ground. The pitch is used about 15 times a year. The club did not identify any issues with the accessibility or quality of the pitch.

For artificial grass pitches, the use by hockey and the sport is strong, but new pitches are not required for this sport. For football, the recent new 3G pitches may have met the demand, but this would need to be kept under review. The priorities for investment were the resurfacing of the Oxford Brooks University pitch, and the East Oxford small size pitch.

Baseball

There are two sites used for baseball; Horspath Sports Ground and Rover Sports and Social Club. The facilities are adequate but an opportunity was identified to improve the Horspath site with some funding from the NGB.

Outdoor bowls

There are 8 bowls clubs in the city with 10 greens. The conclusions were that there is sufficient supply of bowls greens in the city, now and in the future, but the network should be kept under review.

Tennis courts outdoor

There are 5 clubs in the city and 240 courts, of which about 25% are owned by the City Council, of which about 2/5ths are grass with the others tarmac. The conclusions were that there were sufficient tennis courts now and for the future, but that some sites needed improvement.

Athletics tracks

There are two athletics facilities; Oxford University Athletics track and Horspath Sports Ground in South Oxfordshire. The conclusions were that the facility provision was sufficient and the primary recommendation was the resurfacing of the Horspath track and the exploration of alternative management arrangements.

Golf

There is one golf club in the city but there are a number of courses around the city. The recommendations were to retain the existing golf course and to explore “extreme golf” at leisure centres.

MUGA

The MUGAs included in the assessment are those which are used to deliver the Street Sports programme and also the open access sites. The distribution of MUGAs across the city is good with the exception of the east side. The recommendations were that a site should be developed in the east and that there needed to be a maintenance programme to ensure the quality is maintained. A further recommendation was that parks and green spaces should be considered for green gyms or fitness trails.

Netball

Netball is primarily played on school sites but non-school include John Radcliffe Hospital and Court Place Farm where 6 courts have been recently provided. The capacity problems identified by the netball clubs were anticipated to be alleviated by the new provision.

- The development of 6 netball courts at The Community Arena, Court Place Farm, Marston.

Reading Borough Council

The university campus in Reading has a number of facilities, and has some degree of community use.

The authority does not have a current published built facilities strategy but is in the process of producing an Indoor Facilities Strategy.

At the end of November 2015, Reading Borough Council decided to move towards the long term replacement of the Central Pool. This would be likely to take 4-5 years before the new pool would be opened, and it was decided that a 25 m (number of lanes to be confirmed) pool plus learner pool would be provided at Rivermead Leisure Centre as a demountable facility during the period of closure of the Central Pool. The Central Pool currently has a 25m x 6 lane pool, plus diving pool, plus two learner pools. There will therefore be a significant reduction in the amount of available water space in Reading. As Rivermead is already estimated to be at 71% used capacity, there will be a significant shortfall in water space in Reading.

In the longer term the Council would also look to replacing the Palmer Park pool and potentially provide a competition pool.

The implications for swimmers are that using Reading pools will be much less attractive or difficult to access because of demand, and the number of swimmers coming to the pools in South Oxfordshire seem likely to increase.

The committee report of November 2015 also refers to a draft report recommendation for the development of a 5 court sports hall, but no location has yet been identified.

West Berkshire

This authority does not have up to date strategies for indoor or outdoor sports facilities, or for playing pitches. There are no specific proposals or assessments relevant to South Oxfordshire. The Infrastructure Development Plan includes:

- Necessary infrastructure: improvements to sports pitch provision both authority wide, and within the Newbury/Thatcham Spatial area
- Preferred infrastructure: “various schemes to provide and/or extend community facilities”.

Wokingham

The latest strategy is the Open Space, Sports and Recreation Strategy of November 2013. This was based on the PPG17 Open Space, Sport and Recreation Audit Update of February 2012. The audit work of 2012 had the following relevant findings:

- There is sufficient sports hall capacity now in the district, and this will continue up to 2026. Only Woodford Park Leisure Centre close to Reading is operating close to full
- The smaller activity halls have generally seen declining demand. Some have marked out badminton courts. No additional facilities are proposed.
- None of the swimming pools in Wokingham is currently operating at 70% used capacity or more, and both public pools and commercial sector pools are needed to meet the demand. No additional facilities are proposed.
- There is more than sufficient health and fitness provision than is needed for the community, now and up to 2026.
- There is one site for indoor bowls, to the south of Reading. This is effectively inaccessible to residents in S Oxfordshire.
- For football, there is a significant deficit of junior and mini pitches and the demand for mini soccer is expected to increase in the period up to 2026.
- For cricket there are a number of sites which are being overplayed and the sport is expected to have an increased number of boys and men's teams by 2026, which will make this deficit worse, particularly in the south east of the borough.
- For rugby, most of the provision (clubs) are in the north of the Borough, with Reading RFC and Redingensians in the area plus Reading University. There is currently some unmet demand in this area, and the deficit of pitch space will worsen with the increased population and any increase in participation.
- The provision for hockey is approximately in balance with demand but the membership at Reading and Wokingham hockey clubs has been increasing. Reading Hockey Club would like a further 2 AGPs. Further hockey surface AGPs are therefore needed to meet future demand.
- For outdoor bowls there is sufficient current provision and club membership has remained static and have some spare capacity. No additional provision is therefore identified as being required.
- Golf did not require any additional facilities.
- Outdoor tennis provision includes 8 club sites, some of which have seen increasing membership. Crowthorne and Berkshire County are seeking additional courts.
- There are no athletics tracks in the borough and Palmer Park at Reading is the closest, which is home of Reading Athletics Club. This club was hoping to establish a satellite club in Wokingham for sports hall athletics.
- Most netball in the borough is played at school sites and most is played outdoors due to a lack of appropriate and bookable indoor facilities. There is a central venue, 9 courts at Cantley Park. No new facilities are recommended.

- There are 8 MUGAs at 5 sites across the borough, all owned and maintained by Wokingham BC. Just under half are floodlit and there appears to be demand for more floodlighting. There was a need for an additional MUGA at Chalfont Park.

New facilities to cater for the anticipated growth include:

- North Wokingham – dual use of hall and MUGA facilities at Matthewsgreen Farm primary school, and extension of Cantley Park (4.5 ha)
- South Wokingham – 10 ha of playing pitches to be provided either as dual use facility or development of new sports hub. Sports hall to be delivered either as part of the sports hub or as separate community building.
- South of M4 Strategic Development Location – 10 ha to be delivered as sports hub.
- Arborfield Strategic Land Development – 14 ha of old MOD land,

The assessment behind this strategy, the Open Space, Sport and Recreation Facilities Assessment and Standards (2010-2012) indicated that the borough had a small surplus of senior football pitches but a significant under supply of junior and mini football pitches. The Council is therefore developing three sports hubs as strategic sports pitch sites, each of which is proposed to have both a 3G artificial pitch (full size or small size) and grass pitches. The strategy in 2013 did not identify any specific sites for these new hubs with the exception of the extension of Cantley Park.

Wycombe District

The Wycombe Sports Facilities Strategy 2015-2020 reviews the current provision of facilities and forecasts forwards the needs up to 2033. The findings were:

- There is a current surplus of water space and this will continue up to 2033. Most cross-border travel will be out of the district to the Stoke Mandeville site in Aylesbury.
- There is a current shortfall of 16.5 badminton courts and this situation will worsen up to 2033, with a shortfall of 22 courts. There are three planned additional facilities on school sites, and there is likely to be some significant export of participants to a number of sites, particularly in Aylesbury Vale.
- There is a slight over provision of health and fitness stations and this will turn into a small shortfall by 2033. No additional facilities are required as there is sufficient provision in the adjacent authority areas.
- There is a current shortfall of 6 rinks for indoor bowls and this will increase slightly up to 8 rinks by 2033.
- Squash has a current shortfall of 6 courts and this will rise to 8 by 2033. However the facility at Beaconfield may meet some of this demand.
- For adult football there is a small surplus of provision which is sufficient to meet future demand.

- For youth football there are deficiencies across the district with the exception of the Stokenchurch area and 9 additional pitches are required.
- Many areas of the district have deficiencies in mini football but no extra pitches are required as this need can be accommodated within the existing spare capacity.
- There is a slight deficit currently for cricket and a further pitch is required by 2026.
- For rugby there is an approximate balance in supply and demand, and this will continue up to 2026.
- There is a current shortage of three 3G pitches and this will increase to 4 by 2026.
- The demand for outdoor bowls is currently in balance with supply but an additional green will be required by 2033.
- There is a current deficit of 3 outdoor tennis courts and there will be a need for 19 additional courts by 2033.
- There is currently sufficient provision of MUGAs but there will be a need for 2 additional sites by 2033.

APPENDIX 2: Facility capacity assessment methodology

Facility type	Sources of information / standard modelling	Issues	Proposed methodology for capacity assessment
Sports halls 3+ badminton court size	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Individual facility throughput information provided by facility operator • FPM throughput estimate from Sport England • Active Places Power • Site visits • Web survey returns • NGB facility strategies and local priorities • Club consultation results • Club membership numbers and trends 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information from operators rarely compatible with Sport England FPM parameters so not comparable. • Information not available from commercial operators. • Booking (number of hours) may be available for schools, but no estimate of the number of users. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where compatible throughput information is available, compare FPM figures with actual. • Where throughput information not available: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • identify number of hours actually used in peak period. • identify hours officially “open” to community use. • calculate used capacity as % of hours open. • take into account nature of site/management: e.g. leisure centre, commercial site, school own management. • Take into account whether there is pay and play access or is club bookings only. • Comparison of both overall capacity and ability to meet club and NGB requirements for both training and events. • Assumptions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ usage pattern follows Sport England FPM model ○ commercial facilities are viable and therefore deemed to be used to full capacity

Facility type	Sources of information / standard modelling	Issues	Proposed methodology for capacity assessment
Swimming pools	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Individual facility throughput information provided by facility operator • FPM throughput estimate from Sport England • Active Places Power • Site visits • Web survey returns • NGB facility strategies and local priorities • Club consultation results • Club membership numbers and trends 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information from operators rarely compatible with Sport England FPM parameters so not comparable. • Information not available from commercial operators. • Booking (number of hours) may be available for schools, but no estimate of the number of users. • Hotel pools and spa pools are not generally open for pay and play. • Most school and college facilities have restrictive club-only booking policies • FPM uses minimum pool size of 160 sq m where facility is open for community use 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where compatible throughput information is available, compare FPM figures with actual. • Include only those pools which meet the FPM criteria • Where throughput information not available, for individual facilities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ identify number of hours actually used in peak period. ○ identify hours officially “open” to community use. ○ calculate used capacity as % of hours open. ○ take into account nature of site/management: e.g. leisure centre, commercial site, school own management • Comparison of both overall capacity and ability to meet club and NGB requirements for both training and events. • Assumptions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ usage pattern follows Sport England FPM model ○ commercial facilities are viable and therefore deemed to be used to full capacity ○ spa pools and hotel pools excluded where these do not meet FPM criteria

Facility type	Sources of information / standard modelling	Issues	Proposed methodology for capacity assessment
Fitness facilities including fitness stations and studio spaces	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Active Places Power • Web base research • Phone meeting • Site visit 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At best, information available is based on the number of stations / studio rooms. Number and mix of gym equipment varies over time • Generally, no throughput information available or membership numbers provided • Quality of facilities vary widely e.g.: school/college facilities, commercial low cost gyms, commercial high cost gyms, leisure centres with GP referral schemes. • Commercial gyms are highly market sensitive, so will close or open as the local demand dictates • The leisure centre gyms at peak time are in direct competition with the similar facilities in the commercial sector, so can be considered on the same basis. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assume all gyms are used at peak time to a level which is at capacity, including weighting for comfort factor. • Assume all gyms are financially-self sustaining. • Therefore increase number of stations and studios in direct response to changes in demand.

Facility type	Sources of information / standard modelling	Issues	Proposed methodology for capacity assessment
Athletics tracks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Active Places Power (location and size) • Site visit • NGB facility strategies and priorities • Club consultation results • Club membership numbers and trends • Events schedule • Certification grade of track 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited number of facilities • Usually club managed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NGB advice on number and quality of tracks required in area. • Club membership and trends, and event needs. • Comparison of supply with demand.
Indoor bowls centres	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Active Places Power (location and size) • Site visit • NGB facility strategies and priorities • Club consultation results • Club membership numbers and trends • Consultation with site manager 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited number of facilities • Varied facility size • Often club managed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NGB/County bowls association advice on need for indoor bowls in area. • Club membership numbers and trends, and event needs. • Comparison of supply with demand.

Facility type	Sources of information / standard modelling	Issues	Proposed methodology for capacity assessment
Indoor tennis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Active Places Power (location and size) • NGB facility strategies and priorities, including need for indoor tennis in area • Club consultation results • Club membership numbers and trends • Site visit • Consultation with site manager • Booking information in relation to individual sites (where available) showing use at peak time. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited number of facilities • Variable facility size and type • Variety of management 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LTA advise that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 80% usage of indoor court time at the peak period is what could be considered “full”. ○ An outdoor club with 200 members would be sufficiently large to consider the development of indoor courts. <p>Assessment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review stated club/NGBs demand/needs/aspirations against availability and quality of existing facilities • Compare current and estimated future demand against facility supply (based on LTA usage advice) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assumption: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Commercial facilities running at capacity, inclusive of “comfort factor”

Squash	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Active Places Power (location and size) • Site visit • NGB facility strategies and priorities • Club consultation results • Club membership numbers and trends • Consultation with site manager • Booking information in relation to individual sites (where available) showing use at peak time. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited number of facilities • Variable facility size and type • Variety of management 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Compare current and estimated future demand against facility supply • Review stated club/NGBs demand/needs/aspirations against availability and quality of existing facilities • Assumption: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Commercial facilities running at capacity, inclusive of “comfort factor”
Specialist facilities; e.g. gymnastics centres	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site visit • NGB facility strategies and local priorities • Club consultation results • Club membership numbers and trends • Consultation with site manager • Booking information (if available) in relation to individual sites showing use at peak time. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited number of facilities • Variable facility size and type • Variety of management 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review stated club/NGBs demand/needs/aspirations against availability and quality of existing facilities

Facility type	Sources of information / standard modelling	Issues	Proposed methodology for capacity assessment
Outdoor tennis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site visit • NGB comments and participation information • LTA club membership numbers • LTA club utilisation report (selected clubs only) • Club consultation • Consultation with site manager/parishes • Booking information (if available) in relation to individual sites showing use at peak time. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Variable facility size and type from multi-court with floodlights to single court with no lights • Variable surface: macadam, grass, clay, artificial grass • Variety of management • Some sites has key holder use or open access • Lack of usage information for many facilities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Peak use of outdoor courts is evenings and weekends, but primarily in summer, May-August. • LTA advise that a club site maximum capacity for courts, based on average club programming is: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Floodlit courts; 60 members per court ○ Non-floodlit courts; 40 members per court • Assessment: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Consider dedicated tennis courts only (not those also marked out for other sports, which will be treated as multi-use games area). ○ For club sites where membership information is available, calculate number of members per court. Compare to LTA capacity figure per court (both floodlit and not) ○ Where a club has done an LTA utilisation assessment use this result ○ For parks sites review booking information and assess capacity used at peak time. ○ For other outdoor tennis sites with open access or similar, assume maximum use at 20% of peak time of May-August.

Facility type	Sources of information / standard modelling	Issues	Proposed methodology for capacity assessment
Multi use games areas (MUGAs) on managed/closed sites e.g. schools	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site visit • NGB comments and participation information for relevant sports (primarily netball and football) • Club consultation • Consultation with site manager/parishes • Club membership numbers and trends • Booking information (if available) in relation to individual sites showing use at peak time. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Variable facility size and type from multi-court with floodlights to single court with no lights • Variety of management but primarily education • Some sites has key holder use or open access • Lack of usage information for most facilities 	<p>Criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exclude sites without floodlights • Exclude sites with no or very limited community use <p>Assessment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review stated club/NGBs demand/needs/aspirations against availability and quality of existing facilities. • Identify those sites with spare capacity and those without.
Outdoor bowls	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site visit • NGB facility strategies and local priorities • NGB estimate of maximum individual rink/green capacity • Club consultation results • Club membership numbers and trends • Consultation with site manager if not club • Booking information (if available/appropriate) in relation to individual sites 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited number of facilities • Slightly variable facility size and type but competitive sites all good quality and 6 rink size • Variety of management but mostly club controlled 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For club sites where membership information is available, calculate number of members per rink/green. Compare to County Bowls estimate of maximum use per rink/green. • Identify those sites with spare capacity and those without. • Calculate future demand for bowls based on population aged 60+ of sub area. • Compare forecast numbers to calculated spare capacity.

Peak period

	Weekday	Saturday	Sunday	Total number of hours
From FPM				
Halls	17.00 – 22.00	09.30 – 17.00	09.00 – 14.30 17.00 – 19.30	40.5
Pools	12.00 - 13.30 16.00 – 22.00	09.00 – 16.00	09.00 – 16.30	52
AGPs large	17.00 – 21.00 Mon-Thurs 17.00 – 19.00 Fri	09.00 – 17.00	09.00 – 17.00	34
Other				
Fitness facilities	16.00 – 22.00			30
Indoor bowls	No specific peak			
Indoor tennis	17.00 – 22.00	09.00 – 22.00	09.00 – 22.00	51
Squash	18.00 – 21.00	09.00 – 14.00	09.00 – 14.00	25
Multi-use games area (closed sites)	17.30 – 21.00	09.00 – 14.00	n/a	23.5
Outdoor tennis club sites Macadam and artificial grass courts Floodlit	16.00 – 21.00 (April-September only)	09.00 – 14.00 (April-September only)	09.00 – 14.00 (April-September only)	35 (April-September only)
Outdoor tennis open/pay and play sites All surface types Not floodlit	16.00 – 21.00 (May-August only)	10.00 – 17.00 (May-August only)	10.00 – 14.00 (May-August only)	36 (May-August only)
Outdoor bowls	No specific peak			

Source for facilities not addressed by FPM:

- Web research on Northamptonshire plus other sites in England of commercial facilities and leisure centres peak/off peak times, shown by different hire charges and time limits for off-peak use of facilities.
- NGB views: tennis, bowls
- Indoor tennis: definition of peak time from White Horse Leisure and Tennis Centre, Abingdon, Oxfordshire

APPENDIX 3: Sport England sports halls design guidance note extract

(Extract from Sport England Design Guidance Note on Sports Hall Design and Layouts, 2012)

Overview of numbers of courts* / levels of play for nominal hall sizes						
Sport and level of play category**	4 Court hall (34.5 x 20.0 x 7.5 m)	5 Court hall (40.6 x 21.35 x 7.5 m)	8 Court hall (40.0 x 34.5 x 8.3 m)	10 Court hall (40.6 x 42.7 x 9.0 m)	12 Court hall (60.0 x 34.5 x 9.0 m)	15 Court hall (64.05 x 40.6 x 9.0 m)
General notes:						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unless noted otherwise all sizes include for team / officials zones but DO NOT include for any spectator provision. • The number of courts noted for each hall size does not take into account the additional option of inclusion of 'Show Court' overlays. 						
Badminton (with 1 dividing net per 4 or 5 court module)						
International ¹	4 ²⁺³	4 ²	8 ²	8	12	12
Premier ¹	4 ²	5 ²	8 ²	10	12	15
Club ¹	4	5	8	10	12	15
Community ¹	4	5	8	10	12	15
Basketball						
International	-	-	1	1	2	2
Premier	-	-	1	1	2	2
Club	1	1	2	2	3	3
Community ⁴	1	1	2	2	3	3
Reduced court size ⁵	2	2	4	4	6	6
Cricket practice / Indoor cricket						
Community ⁶	4	4	8	8	12	12
Gymnastics						
International	-	-	-	O	P	P
Premier	P	P	1	1/2P	1/3P	1/3P
Club	P	1	1	1/2P	1/3P	1/3P
Community	1	1	2	2	3	3
Five-a-side football / Futsal						
International	-	-	P	P	1	1
Premier	P	P	1	1	3	3
Club	1	1	2	2	3	3
Community	1	1	2	2	3	3
Handball						
International	-	-	-	1	1	1
Premier	-	1	1	2	1	3
Club	-	1	1	2	1	3
Community	1	1	2	2	3	3
Indoor hockey						
International	-	-	-	1	1	1
Premier	-	P	P	1	1	1
Club	-	P	P	1	1	1
Community	1 Unihoc	1 Unihoc	1 Unihoc	2	1	2
Korfball						
International	-	-	-	-	1	1
Premier	-	-	1	1	1	2
Club	-	-	1	1	1	2
Community	1	1	2	2	3	3
Netball						
International ^{7/8}	0	0	1	1	1	1
Premier	0	1 ⁹	1	2 ⁹	1	3 ¹⁰
Club	1 ¹¹	1 ⁹	2 ¹⁰	2 ⁹	3 ¹¹	3 ¹⁰
Community	1	1	2	2	3	3
Sports hall athletics						
International	-	-	-	P	1P	1P
Premier	P	P	2P	2P	3P	3P
Club	P	P	2P	2P	3P	3P
Community	P	P	2P	2P	3P	3P
Volleyball						
International	0	0	1	1	2	2
Premier	1	1	2	2	3	3
Club	1	1	2	2	3	3
Community ⁴	1	1	2	2	3	3
Training courts ⁴	2P	2P	4P	4P	6P	6P

* Indicative court numbers are an update of the previous revision and should be checked against the space requirements for the individual sports to be accommodated.

** See Appendix 4 of 'Developing the Right Sports Hall' for guidance on the level of play category for each sport.

*** P = Below space standard for competition play recommended by the governing body, but suitable for practice and training.