Part 2: Local Needs Assessment
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1. INTRODUCTION

This report examines identified local need for various types of open space, sports and recreation opportunity. It has drawn upon a range of survey and analytical techniques. The report details the community consultation and research process that has been undertaken as part of the study as well as the main findings. The extent of the research reflects the breadth and diversity of the study and a consequent need to engage with as wide a cross section of the community and stakeholders as possible.

Seven original questionnaire surveys were undertaken:

- A general household survey
- A survey of town and parish Councils
- Local groups and organisations’ questionnaire (including play and youth)
- Relevant sports’ national governing bodies
- Sports league secretaries
- Local Sports Clubs’ Questionnaires (pitch sports)
- Local Sports Clubs’ Questionnaires (other sports)

In addition to the above an extensive programme of stakeholder interviews and workshop/focus groups was undertaken.

The consultation process commenced with a workshop for all key stakeholders both internal to the District Council and through invitation to its external partners. External groups/organisations invited included:

- English Nature
- The Solent Forum
- Sport England
- The Manhood Peninsula Partnership
- South Downs National Park
- West Sussex County Council
- Neighbouring District Councils
- Chichester City Council
- The Bournes Community Forum
- The Lavant Forum
- Peninsular Community Forum
- The North East Valley Forum
- West Sussex NHS
- Voluntary and Community Action Chichester District
- University of Chichester
- Chichester College
- Portfolio holder for Leisure & Wellbeing
- Community Sports Network
- Friends of the Parks Groups
- LSP representative
- West Sussex Council for Voluntary Youth services

The main aims of the session were to give key stakeholders the opportunity to meet together (in addition to their individual consultations) and collectively consider:

- The overall “vision” and scope of the study
- Identifying key local issues and opportunities; strengths and weaknesses of current provision
- Thinking about priorities, linkages and cross-cutting issues
- Helping to identify sources of information and gaps in knowledge
- Identifying groups who would have an interest in the study to add to the list of stakeholders
The notes from this meeting are available in Appendix 1.

A consultation programme was also undertaken in relation to indoor sports facility needs. A summary of the consultation completed for this is also included.

The result of this consultation and other analyses will help amongst other things to inform the content of the recommended local standards. Crucially it has also helped the study to understand local people’s appreciation of open space and recreation facilities, and the values attached by the community to the various forms of open spaces and facilities. This appreciation will have clear implications for the way in which open spaces and sports facilities are treated and designated in the revised development plan.

At the end of each section there is a short summary of the key findings.
2. GENERAL COMMUNITY CONSULTATION

2.1 Household Survey

A questionnaire was sent out to a random selection of households across the study area. A total of 3,000 surveys were distributed (proportionately across all parishes within the study area - in relation to the number of households in the parish). 635 completed surveys were received (21%)\(^1\).

We received responses from across the study area as illustrated in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub Area</th>
<th>Number of responses</th>
<th>Response rate (as a % of surveys to the sub area)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chichester City</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Bournes</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East of Chichester</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manhood Peninsular</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North/East Hammer and Camelsdale</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The total number of people represented through the household survey was 1,503 and the average household size of the households was 2.4, similar to the national average and that of Chichester District as whole.

The age profile of the individual respondents completing the survey on behalf of their households tended to be older than the profile for Chichester District as a whole (40% being over 60 compared to 32% overall) with proportionally fewer respondents being younger adults. The proportion of respondents in the middle age bracket of 41-50 was similar (16% compared to 17% for the District as a whole). Nearly 30% of households had children (representing household views on behalf of 331 children and young people) and the number and ages of the children were comparable to the profile of the District as a whole as illustrated in the table below:

---

\(^1\) Broadly speaking this provides statistically significant findings at a 95% confidence level with a confidence interval of ± 3.5%
The full questionnaire is included in Appendix 1 and the following provides some of the key findings.

**Frequency of use - All residents**

Respondents were asked to state how often they visited or used each of the following types of open space, sport and recreation facilities within study area, and the results are shown on the chart below:

### Frequency of use - all households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Type</th>
<th>Frequency Distribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local recreation grounds or parks</td>
<td>0% 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's play areas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor facilities for teenagers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playing Fields for football, cricket, rugby etc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis/netball courts and bowling greens</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footpaths, bridleways, cyclepaths etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seaside, coast, beaches</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water recreation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country parks, local countryside, woodlands</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife areas/Nature reserves</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allotments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Churchyards and cemeteries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artificial turf pitches (‘astros’)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village/Community halls</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor swimming pools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor sports/leisure centres</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf courses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airfields</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public gathering places</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other open space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other outdoor sports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other indoor facilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen, it is the areas’ footpaths, bridleways, cyclepaths etc that are most commonly used by most households (over 80% at least monthly of which over 30% use them almost every day).

The seaside, coast and beaches as well as country parks/countryside and woodlands are also accessed at least monthly by over 70% of households. These spaces are also among those used by the largest numbers of households every day (over 10%).

Other spaces used on an almost daily basis by over 10% over households are local parks/recreation grounds and “other open spaces” e.g. grassed areas for dog-walking, informal games, picnics etc. In addition over 60% of respondents use local recreation grounds or parks at
least once a month. It is therefore the informal recreation opportunities that figure most prominently in respondents’ replies.

Playing fields, play areas, areas for water recreation and wildlife areas/nature reserves are also fairly frequently used but with fewer households (in the region of 30%) using them on a regular basis (at least monthly). This is not surprising given the more specific purposes of these facilities.

**Indoor Swimming Pools, Sports and Recreation Facilities**

The areas’ village/community halls are used regularly by significant numbers with 48% of households using them at least monthly. Indoor swimming pools are also used frequently by many residents as are the sports/leisure centres (40%).

In very broad terms it can be seen that informal open space use is very much more common and frequent than the use of formal sport or leisure facilities.

**Frequency, regularity and times of use - Users**

![Diagram showing frequency of use by users](imageURL)

---

2 The table simplifies the Categories to enable clear presentation. e.g. Other indoor facilities is short hand for specialist sports facilities such as indoor bowls and tennis centres. This is clear in the survey itself (see appendix 1).
It is interesting to look at the frequency with which users of facilities visit them as this is not immediately obvious from looking at the overall figures. This shows, for example, that over 40% of allotment users visit at least weekly (of which over 20% visit almost every day). Over 30% of users of grass playing fields and astro-turf pitches use them at least weekly (about 5% almost every day). Over 35% of users of golf courses play at least once a fortnight (of which 20% play weekly and 6% nearly every day).

In terms of indoor facilities the most frequently visited by users (at least weekly) are the leisure/sports centres (39% - of which 8% visit almost every day); and swimming pools (30% - of which 5% visit nearly every day).

**Quantity of open space, sport and recreation facilities**

Residents were asked if they needed more, the same or fewer of different types of open space and recreational facilities. Findings are illustrated in the chart below and will influence the “quantity” component of local standards.

The majority of residents who expressed an opinion think there is a need for more outdoor facilities for teenagers (58%). 49% thought that there were not enough footpaths, bridleways, cyclepaths etc. Following this, the other aspects where there was a significant view of there
being a shortfall were access to the beach/coast, wildlife/nature reserves, allotments, country parks/access to the countryside, and swimming pools (35% or over indicating a need for more of such facilities).

More than 10% of respondents thought there were more than enough golf courses, areas for outdoor sports, and artificial turf pitches to meet local need.

Quality of open space, sport and recreation facilities

Respondents were asked how they rated various types of facilities in the study area in terms of quality. The responses of those expressing an opinion on specific categories of facility are illustrated below:

All facilities are rated average or better by the majority of households.

Nearly half the households highlighted outdoor facilities for teenagers as being either poor or very poor and over 40% said the same in relation to specialist sports facilities (e.g. indoor tennis centres, indoor bowls, motorcycle scrambling). 35% thought that the quality of astro turf pitches in the study area was poor or very poor (our experience would lead us to believe that this is
likely to relate to people who wish to use such pitches for football as there are no 3G pitches in
the study area - the kind of artificial pitch best suited to football). Other facilities rated as poor
or very poor by significant numbers of households (over 15%) were tennis courts and indoor
swimming pools.

Facilities where the quality is rated good or very good by over 60% of households include
parks/recreation grounds (of which 14% rated them as very good), country
parks/countryside/woodlands and wildlife areas/nature reserves (of which around 15% rated
them very good). Over 50% rated access to beaches/cost/seaside, golf courses and children’s
play areas similarly.

The detailed findings regarding quality will be useful in relation to the determination of the
“quality” aspect of local standards.

**Access Issues (Geographical)**

An important component of this study is to develop and recommend a series of local standards
of provision for different types of open space, sport and recreation opportunity. The following
provides a means to gauge people’s willingness to travel to use different types of opportunity
(which might be by car, foot, bike, public transport etc). These results will feed into the
determination of the “access” element of local standards.
It can be seen that where households make use of the opportunities identified, the majority of users are prepared to travel more than 20 minutes to use some facilities such as wildlife areas, country parks, areas for specialist outdoor sports, the seaside/coast/beaches, golf courses and airfields.

In contrast, for significant numbers of residents, facilities need to be much more locally available before they will be used (for example, allotments, play areas, parks and village/community halls). For example:

- 57% of users would expect allotments to be within a 10 minute travel time, of which 28% would not wish to travel more than 5 minutes.
- 50% of users would expect play areas to be within a 10 minute travel time, of which 23% would not wish to travel more than 5 minutes.
• 44% of users would expect parks to be within a 10 minute travel time, of which 17% would not wish to travel more than 5 minutes.
• 38% of users would expect village/community halls to be within a 10 minute travel time, of which 14% would not wish to travel more than 5 minutes.

It is therefore clear that there is great variance in respondents’ apparent willingness to spend time travelling to different types of opportunity. In drawing up the “access” element of specific local standards for different kinds of open space/facility it is clearly very important to take careful note of all of these findings. This general pattern observed in the study area is very much in line with findings nationally.

An accompanying question asked what mode of transport respondents were likely to use to get to such opportunities (where they would use them).

Residents are more likely than not to drive to many facilities including specialist sports facilities, sports/leisure centres, swimming pools, airfields, wildlife areas/nature reserves and the seaside.

However, walking and cycling are the norm for facilities such as play areas, parks, foot/cyclepaths, allotments, outdoor teenage facilities, playing fields and village/community halls.
For a small but significant minority access by bus is important, particularly for teenage facilities, the seaside/coast, specialist sports facilities, airfields, swimming pools and wildlife areas/nature reserves.

It is not of course surprising that in broad terms walking is the predominant mode of travel to facilities such as local parks, children’s play areas, recreation grounds, and other informal recreation areas. In contrast, motorised transport is more common for larger and more specialised facilities such as leisure centres, golf courses, areas for outdoor pursuits, and nature reserves which are often some distance removed from many potential users. It is however of great importance when it comes to drawing up the access element of local standards in terms of whether access thresholds should be provided in terms of walking, cycling or drive times.

**Importance of Footpath/cycle access**

Residents were asked if they would cycle or walk further or more often if the quality of their journey by foot or bike to a nearby open space or facility was improved.

- 74% of residents confirmed that they would be prepared to walk/cycle further if the quality of the route was improved
- 73% said that if the quality of the route was improved they would make the journey more often.

This is a significant finding in terms of illustrating the potential benefit of ensuring good foot and cycle path access to facilities.

The detailed findings from this section will be used drawing up the access elements of relevant standards for different kinds of open space elsewhere in the study.

**Key Issues and priorities for improvement - parks and open spaces**

Residents were also asked what their priorities for improvement in provision were. Findings are illustrated on the table below:
The priority highlighted by the most households (by a significant margin) for potential improvement/new provision was for better footpaths, bridleways and cyclepaths; followed by access to the seaside/coast/beaches and outdoor facilities for teenagers.

Other notable priorities for improvement highlighted by significant numbers were country parks/countryside/woodlands, parks/recreation grounds and children’s play areas.

In relation to indoor facilities the priority highlighted by the largest number of households for new/improved provision was swimming pools.
2.2 Place Survey 2008

The government’s 2008 Place Survey was undertaken in all of England’s local authority areas and provided information on people’s perceptions of their locality and the local services they receive. This included investigating resident’s broad levels of satisfaction with local sports/leisure facilities and parks/open spaces. The results for Chichester are shown in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>% very or fairly happy with Sports/Leisure Facilities</th>
<th>Parks/ Open Spaces</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chichester</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Sussex</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This suggests that about 54% of residents in Chichester District are very or fairly happy with the Sports and Leisure Centres; less than West Sussex as a whole but more that the South East or England as a whole.

As regards Parks and open spaces about 80% are very or fairly happy with provision, a higher proportion than West Sussex as a whole, the South East and England.

2.3 Survey of local community and youth organisations

Surveys were sent to local community and youth organisations followed up with reminders. Twenty seven organisations responded as below:

- Bosham Association
- British Horse Society
- Chichester Cathedral
- Chichester Conservation Area Advisory Committee
- Chichester Conservation Volunteers
- Chichester Childrens and Family Centre
- Chichester Organic Gardening Society
- Chichester Society
- Chichester Ship Canal Trust
- East Broyle Residents Association
- Friends of Brandy Hole Copse
- Friends of Florence Park
- Friends of Priory Park
- Funtington & West Stoke Scouts
- Home-Start Chichester & District
- Library Service
- Manhood Wildlife and Heritage Group
- Orchard Street and Old Somerstown Area Residents Association
- Parklands Residents’ Association
- Ramblers Sussex Area
- Richmond Park Residents Association
- The Royal Society for the Protection of Birds
- Southern Gateway Residents’ Association
- Sports Dream
- Tangmere Action Group
- Tangmere Community Garden
- West Sussex Local Access Forum

Overall Findings

Quantity

Well over two thirds of the groups said they made direct use of local areas of open space or leisure facilities in various ways. Nearly two thirds said that they thought there were not enough of certain kinds of facilities and/or open space in their own area.
Comments from those who thought that there were not enough open spaces and/or leisure facilities are noted below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Facilities that are lacking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Bosham Association**               | • General open space.  
• Facilities for cricket tennis and football; football currently shares the village Recreation Ground with Bosham Primary School playspace and many other users. The Football Club needs its own space.  
• The Bosham Village Design Statement identifies the lack of general open space. (adopted CDC Dec 2011) |
| **British Horse Society**            | The public rights of way network for equestrians (and cyclists) is very fragmented, which means that vulnerable users have to use heavily trafficked and dangerous roads to link routes. Additional routes (bridleways and RBs), are needed as links to create a safe off-road network.                              |
| **Chichester Cathedral**             | A full sized athletics track.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
| **Chichester Conservation Volunteers** | This area has a rich natural environment but not enough of it is open and freely accessible to the public. In some parts public footpaths are not maintained and are overgrown.                                                                                                                                                                      |
| **Friends of Brandy Hole Copse (FBHC)** | Brandy Hole Copse is only a small (6.5 hectare) Local Nature Reserve. We would like to obtain funds from DEFRA and others in order to expand it into a larger ‘Nature Improvement Area’, which would link the South Downs National Park to the Chichester Harbour Conservancy, and westwards via the Kingley Vale Nature Reserve to the West Sussex/Hampshire border. |
| **Manhood Wildlife and Heritage Group** | Well managed open spaces which are linked up                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |
| **Orchard Street and Old Somerstown Area Residents Association** | There is some evidence of lack of sports pitches for rugby and football                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |
| **Parklands Residents’ Association (PRA)** | We are very pleased with the new play facilities for children on Sherborne Road - thank you! However, we feel that there is a need for some additional community facilities for all residents in the area and possibly some youth activities. We would also like to help with more tree planting. |
| **Southern Gateway Residents’ Association** | This is the last open space in our area, the only other one, the playing field of the former High School for Girls, was built over in 2002.                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |
| **Sports Dream**                     | The Town is seeking to work in partnership to maximise existing facilities but winter indoor sports facilities are fully used. Open spaces are ok provided private businesses like Bunn continue to make their space available for community use. There is need for quality of pitches and outdoor facilities to be improved. |
| **Tangmere Action Group**            | • With regards open spaces the development growth of the village has outgrown the open space facilities available  
• Sports pitches so that different sports do not share same ground. Equipped and open grass play spaces. Village Hall based indoor sports provision                                                                                                                                               |
| **Tangmere Community Garden**        | Open areas for children to play in near housing. Several young families have said that they were considering moving away from the village before the garden started as they felt too enclosed in their estate homes with little or no provision of open space to be in with the children. |
The children get used to the garden and then everyone is more confident about them playing on the airfield, close to the Garden.

### West Sussex Local Access Forum

The public rights of way network for equestrians and cyclists is very fragmented, which means that vulnerable users have to use heavily trafficked and dangerous roads to link routes. Additional routes (bridleways and RBs, or if dedicated routes cannot be secured permissive routes), are needed as links to create a safe off-road network.

### The Royal Society for the Protection of Birds

**Key question is leisure facilities for what use?** Not all activities are compatible, and some sites, e.g., nature reserves, protected areas, can be particularly sensitive to activities that give rise to disturbance of e.g., feeding/roosting/breeding birds, or erode/degrade important habitats.

### Library Service

More soft play areas and more active youth groups

### Funtington & West Stoke Cub Scouts

Facilities are expensive for families

### Chichester Nursery School, Children and Family Centre

More indoor facilities for young children and teenagers

### Home-Start Chichester & District

- There needs to be more affordable options.
- More spaces where youths feel able to relax in appropriate ways

### Quality and Access

The three most common factors believed to be important in relation to local open spaces and leisure facilities were:

- They are easy to get to for all members of the community
- There are good links - by footpaths and cycleways - to them and between them
- Facilities, equipment and grounds should be of high quality and well maintained

Other factors specifically highlighted as being important were:

- Adequate control of dogs and freedom from dog fouling
- Feeling safe and secure

There were also a number of specific factors highlighted as being of importance including:

- Facilities must be equally accessible to disabled and elderly members of the community.
- There needs to be sufficient protection from inappropriate development
- We need ‘un-organised’ space as well, wild places
- Vehicles, other than for essential maintenance purposes, should not be permitted to enter public open spaces. Car parking should be on the periphery only.
- There is no need for expensive facilities and equipment. Children will play with anything and if the community respect the area dog fouling etc will be dealt with.
- Sensitivities of wildlife sites to recreation pressures.
- Play and youth facilities should be age appropriate, considering how interest in leisure activities change as children get older. They should, where possible, cater for all ages.
- When children / youths are simply enjoying play in these areas they should not be shouted at by older members of the community when they are not actually doing any harm... just being children and playing
The groups’ overall views on the quality of open spaces across the study area as a whole are summarised in the table below. The green shading indicates where there is significant commonly held view that facilities are generally good, red shading indicating a significant common opinion that facilities are generally poor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>VERY GOOD</th>
<th>GOOD</th>
<th>AVERAGE</th>
<th>POOR</th>
<th>VERY POOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local recreation grounds or parks</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children’s play areas</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor facilities for teenagers (e.g. youth shelters, skate parks, BMX etc)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playing Fields for football, cricket, rugby</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis/netball courts and outdoor bowling greens</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footpaths, bridleways, cyclepaths, tow paths, disused railways etc.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to the seaside, coast, beaches</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to water recreation e.g. canals, marinas, lakes, ponds etc</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country parks, local countryside, woodlands</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife areas/Nature reserves</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allotments</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Churchyards and cemeteries</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artificial turf pitches (‘astros’) for hockey, football etc</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community/Village halls, Community centres, Church halls</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor swimming pools</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor sports/leisure centres</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf courses</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airfields</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public gathering places e.g. market squares, village greens, open air venues</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other open space e.g. grassed areas for dog-walking, informal games, picnics etc.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other outdoor sports e.g. motor cycle scrambling</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other indoor facilities such as tennis centres, bowls, ice rinks etc.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A significant number of groups highlight that outdoor teenage facilities, footpaths/bridleways, allotments and specialist sports facilities are poor.

Facilities commonly agreed to be good in terms of quality are local parks and play areas; access to the sea, water recreation and country parks, nature reserves etc; and indoor leisure centres and pools.
A series of open questions were also included to elicit comments across the whole range of open spaces and facilities. These detailed responses will be found in the appropriate sections later in the report.

2.4 Stakeholder Interviews

West Sussex NHS/PCT

We spoke to Sue Carmichael and Ross Maconachie from the local NHS/PCT. Our discussion focussed on highlighting potential barriers to local residents being more physically active, particularly in relation to access to open space, sport and recreation facilities. Points raise included:

- Research shows that residents in West Sussex are in general less physically active that the national average. This is detrimental to health and wellbeing.
- It is an adopted priority of the PCT to promote initiatives that aim to reduce sedentary lifestyles and increase physical activity amongst local residents.
- Lack of motivation is a big barrier to people being more physically active. Many people say they have no time to do more physical activity but in reality it is more the case that they do have the time but choose to do other things!
- Programme activity sessions so that people can be physically active within the everyday lifestyle e.g. at lunch times, on the way home from work etc.
- There is a need for better education on the importance and value of physical activity in terms of maintaining health and avoiding illness. It is not just a matter of doing exercise to lose weight.
- It is important that schools encourage physical activity and that children are provided with opportunities to take part in sport and physical activity in a way that is fun and enjoyable.
- GP referral schemes to sport and physical activity is a successful means of encouraging health exercise.
- Teenage girls - Need to think of facilities and activity that will encourage them to be physically active. Range of sports/physical activity offered in schools should be expanded e.g. dance, yoga, zumba, netball etc.
- Cost is a barrier to access for disadvantaged families - targeted subsidy schemes should be introduced.
- While largely affluent Chichester district does have pockets of deprivation e.g. parts of Chichester East, Tangmere, Petworth, East Wittering and Selsey. Such areas tend to have lower life expectancy and would benefit from targeted campaigns.
- Transport is another common barrier to access facilities and activity particularly in rural areas. This also adds cost which is itself another barrier.
- A common barrier is simply lack of awareness of what facilities and opportunities are available. Good publicity and communications are essential.
- For older people and those living alone social isolation is another barrier. It is much easier to maintain physical activity if you take part with a friend. Support workers can try to make links between people so that people are not on their own when visiting a facility or taking part in an activity. Building social networks is important.
• Make it easy to take exercise in parks etc. Create adult “play areas” and free outdoor gym type equipment within parks (could be adjacent to play areas for parents/grandparents.
• Walking is a great form of active recreation - improve access to footpaths etc; provide publicity and information; develop a programme of health walks; replace stiles with kissing gates; keep rights of way clear etc.
• Outdoor play for children and teenagers is important - probably a more vital aspect than formal sports (many children are not interested in sport). Provide good facilities and opportunities for adventurous and “wild” play.
• Promote voluntary conservation work, gardening, allotments etc as forms of healthy physical activity.
• Cycling - provide a good and safe network so that cycling can be encouraged as a form of transport as well as for recreation. There are many good cycleways already e.g. Salterns Way, but the network could still be improved, particularly in Chichester central area. Make sure access to cycle paths etc is also wheelchair friendly.
• Travellers and gypsies are a difficult group to access as regards health and wellbeing advice etc. See PCT report.
• East European migrants - many are low paid and work long hours leaving relatively little time for additional physical activity. Cost is also a barrier. Clearly as regards publicity language can also be a barrier.

Inclusion - Some Issues

As noted by the NHS consultees, some sectors of the population face particular issues regarding access to public services including open space, sport and leisure opportunities. For Chichester we have considered three main aspects:

• Access by disabled people
• Access by minority ethnic groups - for Chichester the main sectors to be considered are the emerging communities of East European extraction and travellers/gypsies
• Children and Young people (these issues are covered specifically later in the report in section six below).

A) Access by Disabled people

A number of disabled people from households that received the general household questionnaire contacted the District Council direct with a concern that they faced particular difficulties as regards access to open space, sport, and recreation and that such issues should not be overlooked when planning for future development. The household survey asked whether any members of the household were limited in activity by illness or disability and nearly 24% reported that at least one member of their household faced issues in this respect. It is clearly of great importance that efforts are made to reduce barriers to access for disabled people wherever possible.

Chichester Access Group

We discussed disabled access issues in relation to sport, open spaces, and leisure with Glynis Spencer who is the Chairperson of the local Access (for disabled) group. The District Council
planning system now uses the Access Group as a consultee as regards planning applications and in general Glynis commented that she thought this has been a great success. The access group has been able to highlight many problems e.g. with developers access and design statements and they have been able to suggest improvements that have been adopted.

Some key points raised in our discussion are noted below:

- The key principle the Access group advise is that when planning facilities and activities every reasonable step should be taken to enable everyone to take part e.g. when planning for wheelchair access you are also enabling access for young parents with buggies, older people, those who are less physically able etc.
- It is important that disability is understood to cover a wide range of conditions and capacities. It is not just a matter of thinking of wheelchair access (but this important of course).
- It is important that with any new development or refurbishment that disability issues are thought through and planned for at the very outset. If this is done properly there is very little additional cost involved.
- The best way of achieving success in terms of disabled access on new developments etc is to have disabled people involved e.g. through the Access groups at early master planning stage. This can avoid real problems later as regards being challenged on failure to fully take into account the DDA.
- Within parks and public open space one key factor is to ensure that an appropriate surface is provided on internal paths. Gravel is often a poor choice re wheelchair access, but crushed and rolled stone is fine - better than tarmac as a good choice of colour can fit well within the local environment.
- Parks and public open space - there needs to be appropriately surfaced paths within the open space to the various park facilities but also from the car park or street to the park itself.
- Play areas - as above there need to be good access into the park then to the play space itself. Equipment within the play area needs to have sufficient space within it for children in wheelchairs to manoeuvre so that they can be close to able bodied friends who are playing. As far as possible equipment provided should be usable by both able and disabled children e.g. a marked well surfaced slalom track, marked giant snakes and ladders etc. Safer surfacing should be fairly firm as far as is possible e.g. don’t extend the very soft safer surfacing beyond where it is absolutely necessary.
- An outdoor gym for older and less fit people is a good idea as regards providing gentle and easily accessible exercise opportunities.
- Good and accurate information is important that clearly defines level of access at sites. Sometimes a countryside site is claimed to be accessible for wheelchairs but all it means is the car park is accessible. Publicity and information should be as precise as possible.
- Signage on site should be clear in terms of visually impaired people e.g. good contrast between lettering and background; use easily understood symbols and visual diagrams; big, clear fonts; writing raised from the background so that the letters can be felt etc.
- Obvious but often overlooked on countryside sites - avoid steps and wherever possible supply well surfaced paths. The gradient is crucial in terms of wheelchair access and steps can often be avoided simply by using a zigzag type route down a hill. A classic
Some architects sometimes seem a bit resistant to design incorporating disability access features from an aesthetic angle but in reality if such issues are thought through at the outset the solutions can be as artistically pleasing as any other.

There is a lack of swimming facilities, north of the Downs. For many disabled people swimming is an excellent form of physical activity - perhaps the only kind that can be undertaken safely and regularly.

There is also a deficit of hydro therapy provision. Should a new pool be considered, it would be a good idea to include a hydrotherapy pool as well. It would be well supported as, at the moment, to use the nearest NHS facility (which you have to pay for) is based on a 12 week session, after which you go on a waiting list and wait, usually also for twelve weeks, before starting another twelve week hydro block again. This continues throughout the year and people would pay to go more than once a week, every week, if they had the option!

When developing sports facilities it is not just a matter of planning for physical access to the building; the ongoing programming is key. It should be varied with many sports on offer - not just the traditional football, tennis, badminton etc. For example, archery is a great sport for wheelchair users yet there is not a lot of provision. Wheelchair rugby is also a great sport - make sure the hall can be used for sports like this! Tai Chi is a very accessible form of exercise. There needs to be more choices for exercise and physical activity.

Cost can be barrier as many disabled people are not well off. Clear publicity is also important so that prices are transparent. This is not always so e.g. on the Westgate LC web-site the prices page says that there are concessions for registered disabled and senior citizens but when you go the swimming prices page the concessionary prices are not shown!

Many disabled people face social isolation which is a barrier to access; support services building social networks are important.

Access to the sea is important e.g. a wheelchair accessible Wheelyboat at Selsey has been launched to provide disabled people with independent access to the water. However it is still not that easy to actually get to the boat from the car park - there are steps to be tackled!

Access to some of the older community and village halls can be difficult. This should be addressed when any refurbishments or improvements are planned and costs for this should be added to the budget when looking for funding. Again it would be sensible at an early stage to seek advice from the Access group in terms of design etc e.g. one village hall thought it necessary to provide an additional separate disabled toilet when in fact it was cheaper to provide a small suite of toilets which were accessible to everyone!

B) Access to leisure by minority ethnic groups

Chichester has a relatively low minority ethnic population (less that 4%) and the largest groups the District Council is aware of that within this sector are East European migrants and travellers/gypsies. There are no community groups as such in Chichester who could be consulted
for specific views and we have therefore looked at different options to provide a view of likely exclusion issues these group could face.

David Hyland, the District Council’s Senior Community Engagement Officer confirmed that “the small numbers of residents from minority ethnicities tend to be single families or individuals without the cohesion of an emerging or established community that you might see elsewhere. In terms of numbers East European migrant workers have been identified as more numerous and sharing broadly similar issues (certainly in terms of barriers to accessing services for example) - but those that are staying seem focussed on greater integration (developing language, putting children through schools etc) and there is no indication that they wish to be considered differently on ethnic grounds”.

He also added that “travellers are an important consideration - the District doesn’t have a significant resident population and our experience with transient families is probably no greater than neighbouring authorities. The identification of travellers as an identified group is most relevant to us in relation to our role as the Housing and Planning authority. It’s probably the group that is at most risk of discrimination as regards policy or activity and therefore one we need to be more considerate of as a result”.

**Travellers/Gypsies**

We spoke to Sheila O’Shea of the West Sussex traveller education service who had contact with both children/young people from the travellers’ community as well as their families. We discussed the kind of barriers faced by gypsies and travellers, particularly children and young people, in relation to access to sport, recreation, open space etc.

Some key barriers highlighted were:

- **Finance** - many families could not afford fees for sports and leisure centres and travel costs associated with visits; similarly access to after school provision and play activity is restricted.
- **Social exclusion** - many traveller families feel excluded from the wider community and this makes it less likely for them to take up opportunities.
- **Families sometimes face racism and bullying which also means they can be reluctant to take up leisure opportunities outside of their community.**
- **Many traveller families tend to be isolated from the wider community and this in itself limits the likelihood of them being able to take up opportunities. They are likely to be based geographically in locations from which it is difficult to get to facilities and opportunities. There may not be any facilities or opportunities that are accessible!**
- **There is also a degree of “self-exclusion”. The experience of many travellers and gypsies over generations has led to a perception that they are not all that welcome in “mainstream” society. Influence from older travellers/gypsies sometimes leads to their children and young people adopting the same attitude. There is a low expectation of being able to access services of any kind from public bodies and this includes sport and leisure.**
- **Travellers may be a bit suspicious of leisure/sports projects run by public bodies such as local authorities as a result of bad experiences from other local authority departments e.g. enforcement officers.**
Some positive examples of inclusion and progression in sport though:

- A young traveller student from West Sussex, Terry Green, with the support of school and parents had great success in golf up to national level.
- Chichester College - Brinsbury College campus - has quite a high intake of travellers and has had great success in terms of inclusion in boxing (which is a traditional sport for travellers)

Some suggestions for easing access barriers:

- Outreach sports activities to travellers at their own site can be successful but only if the approach is right in the first place. In this respect Sheila suggested that the County Council’s traveller field officers can help make introductions etc. The field officers may also be able to make the families aware of what opportunities are on offer more generally.
- Subsidised fees to leisure facilities and sport/recreation opportunities; low price/free activity opportunities.
- Offer sport and recreation opportunities that are popular and traditional to travellers e.g. boxing. Find out what particular sports and leisure opportunities are wanted.
- Use of the Common Assessment Framework. This is a multi-agency approach of providing support for children and young people. One means of support and funding to a child/family could be enable traveller children and their families to access sport and recreation, after school clubs, play opportunities etc.
- Develop effective methods of ensuring travellers are made aware of facilities and leisure opportunities - ensure publicity and PR gets to them. Make use of publications and communications that travellers use e.g. Traveller Times.

East European Migrants

There was no obvious access point to secure views relating to East European migrants in the study area. However there have been a number of research projects undertaken looking at issues regarding access to leisure by East European migrants. Findings from two of these are provided in the box below:

### The experiences of Central and East European migrants in the UK

(University of Oxford and the Sussex Centre for Migration Research, University of Sussex - Published by the Joseph Rowntree Foundation - 2008)

The research explores the experiences beyond the workplace of migrants from East and Central Europe working in low-wage occupations in the UK. The report draws on a survey and interviews with over 600 migrants. It explores their access to information and to English classes, their accommodation, leisure time, social relationships and long-term intentions about staying in the UK.

Some of the main findings are noted below:

“The majority of the migrants spent most of their time with recent and settled migrants from their own country of origin and with migrants from other countries. The migrants’ social networks were influenced by those with whom they worked, lived and studied - in many cases, other migrants. For

---

3 I referred to a traveller outreach project that I had heard about from Stuart Kingsley (Youth Services). I confirmed I would pass on this advice to him.
some it was, nevertheless, an intensely multicultural experience, albeit that it often did not involve many British people.

While half to two thirds of the migrants spent some of their leisure time with British people one in four, after living in the UK for more than two years, still spent no leisure time at all with British people. In-depth interviews suggested that this was not from choice but either because their paths did not cross or because migrants perceived British people as polite but distant and not interested in forming friendships. Only a minority, and here more women than men, were confident that British people were interested in making friends. Contact with British people did increase over time and was more extensive, as one would expect, among those with good English.

There is emerging evidence of public awareness of prejudice against East European migrants. Less than half of the migrants we surveyed felt that British people treated them as an equal - once again, length of stay in the UK and proficiency in English having a positive correlation with perceptions of equal treatment, whereas gender was not a factor. Migrants who were EU nationals were more likely to feel treated as an equal than those who were not - but it was still a minority who felt that way. The migrants did not interpret their treatment as discrimination but described frustration at ignorance about their countries and the negative stereotypes some British people expressed.

Some of the migrants in turn expressed negative attitudes towards Britain's ethnic minorities, some suggesting that it was a surprise to find that Britain was a multicultural country. Occasional tensions with other migrants reflected historical tensions in their countries of origin or perceived competition with new arrivals from their own country of origin as well as elsewhere for jobs in the UK”.

As regards leisure activity some of the key findings were:
- One in three migrants had used a library.
- Half had gone to a concert, museum or gallery,
- Just over a third had used sports facilities
- More than four fifths had been to pubs or clubs.
- The proportion of farm workers using leisure facilities was lower than in other sectors, although some employers facilitated leisure trips.
- Au pairs spent little leisure time with their host family.
- Patterns of uptake of leisure opportunities did not change significantly over time until migrants had been in the UK for more than four years

Sport and Emerging Communities (Sporting Equals in partnership with Syzygy Leisure and Culturelinks Alliance -2008)

The research explored England’s changing demographic profile and identifies key factors affecting participation in sport. The report highlights the findings of the research and makes recommendations to sports providers as to how participation in sport may be increased with regard to new and emerging communities.

Key findings for consideration

Many East Europeans are passionate about sport. As well as football, sports that are particularly popular include:
- Czech Republic - basketball, tennis, volleyball, rowing, swimming and table tennis
- Estonia - basketball, ice hockey
- Hungary - water polo, ice hockey, equestrian sports
- Latvia - basketball, ice hockey and athletics
- Lithuania - basketball, athletics, cycling, orienteering and tennis
- Poland - speedway, volleyball, handball and athletics
- Slovakia - ice hockey, volleyball, basketball, handball and tennis
- Slovenia - skiing, climbing, canoeing, volleyball and basketball
While football is a well established and popular sport in England, there is a real opportunity to enhance provision of sports such as volleyball and handball which do not have such a strong participation base. In many instances there may be no provision for the sport in any particular locality, and new clubs may be established.

There is considerable work to be done to bridge the gap between community groups and the County Sports Partnerships, Governing Bodies and Local Authorities to ensure that everyone benefits.

It needs to be recognised that the initial priority for many of the new migrants to this country will be to establish a base through employment, housing and education before they can spare the time and energy for sport. Many migrants do not anticipate remaining in England for as long as they have, and therefore may have deliberately sought out sporting activities. Promotion within these communities needs to be undertaken to ensure their reengagement.

This promotion should be carried out through local community groups, and also through the wide variety of specialist language newspapers and online forum. It may be necessary to do this in alternative languages to English. However, because of the shift pattern that many workers are involved in careful planning may be needed.

Consideration also needs to be given to childcare, which although not a problem which is unique to the emerging communities, is a real issue compounded by a lack of support and family structures which might provide alternative childcare arrangements. The issue of childcare is also compounded by shift work, which means that partners may not be available for example in the evening as they are working.

Many migrant workers are working in low paid jobs. Many will also be sending money back to their home country, and therefore money to take part in sport may be in short supply. Few of the people that were interviewed had heard of the passport to leisure schemes, and therefore were not taking advantage of the opportunities for lower cost sport even if they were eligible.

Due to the high influx of eastern Europeans into England, a number of local authorities have appointed community workers with an east European background to engage with their local communities. These have helped to establish Community Forums and work to assimilate the new arrivals into English culture and life. They provide a great opportunity to act as a conduit for sports clubs to promote their programmes and activities. Examples of this are in Southampton, Peterborough and Arun where there are specific Polish community workers employed to engage with local arrivals.

The report’s main conclusions and recommendations:

- There is an excellent opportunity to develop existing sports which are low profile in England through the integration of new players and coaches who have arrived from the A8 countries
- Efforts need to be made to create links between existing and new community organisations which are delivering sport outside of existing sporting structures.
- Production of information in languages other than English will allow easier access to information by recent migrants from the A8 countries
- There are many new language publications and websites which are excellent means of publicising activities to new people
- Passport to leisure schemes need to be promoted to ensure that low paid workers are able to afford to take part in sport
- Consideration needs to be given to the fact that many recent migrants are shift workers which results in an inability to participate in sport on a regular basis, this is compounded by the lack of childcare availability or affordability.
- The prevalence of shift work, low income and lack of childcare facilities are substantial deterrents to participation in sports.
2.5 Community and Village Halls

This section considers consultation findings in relation to Village and Community Halls. Sports and Leisure facilities are covered in Section 5.

The District Council have an extensive data-base of community and village halls which is updated annually. This includes an assessment of the condition of the hall as well as any local plans/aspirations for improvements. This will no doubt prove to be a valuable tool later in the study process.

We met with David Hyland, the Council’s Senior Community Engagement Officer whose role covers various aspects including youth engagement, liaison with the voluntary and community sector, and community/village halls. It includes liaison with planning in relation to community needs for indoor community facilities, S106 agreements etc. The main focus of our discussions related to community facilities in particular Community/Village halls. Issues raised are noted below:

- There are in the order of 300 community buildings in the District nearly all of which are in community ownership/management.
- There is a fairly good distribution of halls across the District but the quality and adequacy of the facilities to meet local need is very varied. Many need small extensions and improvements re access etc.
- There are a number of gaps in provision, for example, Tangmere where further growth is anticipated yet there has been a deficiency of halls for a number of years. There is only one hall and it is not sufficient to meet local need. There is a clear need and demand for an additional community building. Any such hall should be complete rather than compete with the current hall, perhaps have some kind of “specialism” different from the current hall.
- There is a problem in a number of areas of development occurring in small “parcels” none in itself justifying a new community building, but cumulatively a need is generated. Some system is needed to accommodate this kind of gradual development.
- Wherever feasible master planning is important looking at development in a holistic longer term fashion in terms of the needs for community buildings, open spaces, play provision and all associated infrastructure.
- When planning for new community buildings it is vital to think through, at an early stage the sustainability and local term revenue implications for management and maintenance. This can include innovative and creative planning such as joint private/public use e.g. pub/post office/office/shop/community building in a variety of combinations or a public/community building e.g. library/council office/community building type combination.
- Current District council practice/precedence (not defined policy as such) is to ensure developer contributions are spent on-site or very locally rather than to accumulate in a fund to be spent in relation to a strategic plan (as is sometimes done in other local authority areas. This now seems to fit well with the present government’s localism and Big Society agendas. It would be good to have clear policy on such matters though.
- The New Park development in Chichester is a good example of planned development supported by S106 agreements etc. Sport England were also involved.
• A particularly good example of planned development and provision of community facilities, open space etc is the current development at Graylingwell. This involved establishing a Community Development Trust and through master planning a combination of community buildings/spaces, heritage conservation projects (Water Tower and Graylingwell Chapel), and employment space. All this will be in community ownership under the trust and the income earning elements will be able to support the maintenance and management of the community space elements. The development has also ensured good provision of public open space, outdoor sports provision etc.

• Another current development in which masterplanning is at the fore is at Shopwyke Lakes. This includes proposals, for example, for the relocation of a Church that could also accommodate community use. In such cases however it is vital to legally secure full community use of the community space and this can be quite a difficult task.

• Schools provide another opportunity for community use of facilities but local experience has not always been good in terms of securing ongoing reliable community access. If schools are to be the providers of community use facilities it is vital to secure legally binding agreements along with adequate financial support to cover management and maintenance.

• It is important to ensure that constitutional issues are addressed as regards management and responsibilities for guaranteeing community access to buildings. For example, a private members club may have good community space but to secure public funding for improvements etc. it is essential that its constitution guarantees ongoing open community access to such space.

• The Bracklesham Barn Community Centre is an interesting model. It is currently being managed and operated by Chichester District Council, but in the long term is the intention that the Centre be managed by the community of Bracklesham, through the Bracklesham Bay Community Association. In such cases it is important to ensure an agreement which provides a clear strategy and timeframe for how and when such a transfer of responsibility will occur.

Specific comments from community and youth organisations regarding village/community halls are noted below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bosham Association</td>
<td>The Village Hall caters for - short tennis, table tennis, and other activities which are all heavily subscribed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chichester Organic Gardening Society</td>
<td>Boxgrove has excellent new village hall; Lavant has a much-used village hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manhood Wildlife and Heritage Group</td>
<td>Some village halls could do with upgrading and refurbishing. There are some gaps in provision of sports facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parklands Residents’ Association (PRA)</td>
<td>• We would like additional community facilities now the local pub has gone. An application for a community café has been submitted for one of the vacant shops at the Ridgeway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• I’m sure that there is also need in the rural areas for community facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports Dream</td>
<td>All present indoor facilities are fully utilised.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Tangmere Action Group

- Not enough Village Halls large enough for indoor sports facilities (e.g. badminton, short mat bowls and for keep fit/martial arts classes big enough to ensure financial viability).
- People have to go into Chichester for indoor sports - our only community building is totally inadequate for any sport e.g badminton

| Tangmere Community Garden | We have a village hall which is expensive to use, and no church hall, which would add a great new facility in the village. |

#### 2.6 General Community - Key Findings

**Use of open space and sports/leisure facilities**

- It is the areas’ footpaths, bridleways, cyclepaths etc that are most commonly used (at least monthly) by most households (over 80%). The seaside, coast and beaches as well as country parks/countryside and woodlands are also accessed at least monthly by over 70% of households.
- These spaces are also among those used by the largest numbers of households almost every day (over 10%). Other spaces used on an almost daily basis by over 10% over households are local parks/recreation grounds and “other open spaces” e.g. grassed areas for dog-walking, informal games, picnics etc. In addition over 60% of respondents use local recreation grounds or parks at least once a month.
- Playing fields, play areas, areas for water recreation and wildlife areas/nature reserves are also fairly frequently used but with fewer households (in the region of 30%) using them on a regular basis (at least monthly). This is not surprising given the more specific purposes of these facilities.
- The areas’ village/community halls are used regularly by significant numbers with 48% of households using them at least monthly. Indoor swimming pools are also used frequently by many residents as are the sports/leisure centres (40%).
- In very broad terms it can be seen that “informal” open space use is very much more common and frequent than the use of formal sport or leisure facilities.

**Quantity**

- A majority of residents think there is a need for more outdoor facilities for teenagers (58%).
- 49% thought that there were not enough footpaths, bridleways, cyclepaths etc.
- Other elements where there was a significant view of there being a shortfall were access to the beach/coast, wildlife/nature reserves, allotments, country parks/access to the countryside, and swimming pools (35% or over indicating a need for more).
- More than 10% of respondents thought there were more than enough golf courses, areas for outdoor sports, and artificial turf pitches to meet local need.
- The quantity of facilities otherwise was thought to be at least adequate by most residents

**Quality**

- All facilities are rated average or better by the majority of households.
- Facilities where the quality is rated good or very good by over 60% of households include parks/recreation grounds, country parks/countryside/woodlands and wildlife areas/nature reserves. Over 50% rated access to beaches/cost/seaside, golf courses and children’s play areas similarly.
- 49% highlighted outdoor facilities for teenagers as being poor or very poor, and over 40% said the same in relation to specialist sports facilities (e.g. indoor tennis centres, indoor bowls, motorcycle scrambling).
• 35% thought that the quality of astro turf pitches in the study area was poor or very poor
• Other facilities rated as poor or very poor by significant numbers of households (over 15%) were tennis courts and indoor swimming pools.

Access
• The majority of users are prepared to travel more than 20 minutes to use facilities such as wildlife areas, country parks, areas for specialist outdoor sports, the seaside/coast/beaches, golf courses and airfields.
• For significant numbers of residents, facilities need to be much more locally available before they will be used (for example, parks, play areas and allotments). More than 40% would not wish to travel more than ten minutes to access such facilities. 38% of households would expect a village/community hall to be within a ten minute travel time for them to make use of it.
• Some facilities need to be even more accessible to maximise use. More than 15% would not expect to travel more than 5 minutes to use local allotments, play areas, parks and footpaths.
• There is great variance in respondents’ apparent willingness to spend time travelling to different types of opportunity. In drawing up the “access” element of specific local standards for different kinds of open space/facility it is clearly very important to take careful note of all of these findings. This general pattern observed in the study area is very much in line with findings nationally.
• Residents are more likely than not to drive to many facilities including specialist sports facilities, sports/leisure centres, swimming pools, airfields, wildlife areas/nature reserves and the seaside.
• Walking and cycling are the norm for facilities such as play areas, parks, foot/cyclepaths, allotments, outdoor teenage facilities, playing fields and village/community halls.
• For a small but significant minority access by bus is important, particularly for teenage facilities, the seaside/coast, specialist sports facilities, airfields, swimming pools and wildlife areas/nature reserves.

Priorities and other issues
• The priority highlighted by the most households for potential improvement/new provision was for better footpaths, bridleways and cyclepaths; followed by access to the seaside/coast/beaches and outdoor facilities for teenagers.
• Other notable priorities for improvement highlighted by significant numbers were country parks/countryside/ woodlands, parks/recreation grounds and children’s play areas.
• In relation to indoor facilities the priority highlighted by the largest number of households for new/improved provision was swimming pools.
• The issues and concerns of the rural areas of the study area are often quite different from those of the main towns and service centres. This will need to be addressed when considering the development of local standards.
• Provision of and access to open space, sport and recreation opportunities is regarded by the local NHS as an extremely important factor in terms of maintaining health and wellbeing for local residents.
• Some sectors of the community face particular barriers to access and in the study area three such are particularly important to consider: disabled people; children and young people; and the small minority ethnic community groups (particularly East European immigrants and travellers/gypsies). Our consultation and research has identified a number of approaches that might help ease access for these sectors.
3. TOWN AND PARISH COUNCILS

Within the study area there are 34 town and parish councils. We met face to face with the Town Clerk of Chichester City Council and sent surveys to the other Councils. We sent up to two reminders to chase responses as needed. 24 parishes returned completed surveys (73%).

Some parishes did not return a survey form (Eartham Parish Meeting, East Wittering, Ebernoe, Petworth, Southbourne, Stoughton, West Itchenor, West Thorney, Plaistow & Ilford and Lynchmere). Of these Petworth, Southborne and Stoughton have parish plans and where we have been able to secure copies we have extracted relevant information.

The survey covered issues relating to the quantity, quality and accessibility of various types of open space, sport and recreation facilities. There was also an opportunity for the councils to highlight any priorities they might have for new or improved provision.

3.1 General Overview

Some broad findings from the survey were that:

- Over 76% of the councils were directly responsible for the management of various local facilities
- 74% reported that there was a need for additional or improved open space, play and recreation facilities within their Town or Parish
- Of the parishes expressing an opinion 50% thought that there was scope for greater community use of local school sports facilities
- The sector of the community most commonly identified as being poorly served in relation to their needs were young people/teenagers.

The general findings from the Parish Council surveys in terms of quantity and quality are summarised on the table beginning on the next page. Detailed findings for each individual parish in relation to each aspect of quantity and quality can be found in the associated Excel spreadsheet.
| Town/Parish Council | Not Enough Football Pitches | Not Enough Cricket Pitches | Not Enough Rugby Pitches | Poor Quality Playing Pitches | Not Enough Tennis/Netball Mugas | Poor Quality Tennis/Netball Mugas | Not Enough Bowling Greens/Short-Mat Bowls | Poor Quality/Inadequate Changing Facilities | Not Enough Informal Open Space | Not Enough Children's Play Areas | Poor Quality Children's Play Areas | Not Enough Areas For Teenagers | Shortage Of Indoor Halls Suitable For Sport | Shortage Of Footpaths/Bridleways/Cycleways | Shortage of Wildlife Areas |
|---------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Apuldram            |                             |                             |                         |                             |                               |                               |                                 |                                 |                                 |                                 |                                 |                                 |                                 |                                 |
| Birdham             | X                           | X                           | X                       | X                           | X                             | X                             | X                               | X                               |                                 |                                 |                                 |                                 |                                 |                                 |
| Bosham              | X                           |                             | X                       |                             |                               |                               |                                 |                                 |                                 |                                 |                                 |                                 |                                 |                                 |
| Boxgrove            |                             |                             |                         |                             |                               |                               |                                 |                                 |                                 |                                 |                                 |                                 |                                 |                                 |
| Chidham and Hambrook| X                           | X                           | X                       | X                           | X                             | X                             |                                 | X                               |                                 |                                 |                                 |                                 |                                 |                                 |
| Donnington          |                             |                             |                         |                             |                               |                               |                                 |                                 |                                 |                                 |                                 |                                 |                                 |                                 |
| Earnley             |                             |                             |                         |                             |                               |                               |                                 |                                 |                                 |                                 |                                 |                                 |                                 |                                 |
| Fishbourne          |                             |                             |                         |                             |                               |                               |                                 |                                 |                                 | X                               |                                 |                                 |                                 |                                 |
| Funtington          |                             |                             |                         | X                           | X                             | X                             |                                 |                                 |                                 |                                 |                                 |                                 |                                 |                                 |
| Hunston             |                             |                             |                         |                             |                               |                               |                                 |                                 |                                 | X                               |                                 |                                 |                                 |                                 |
| Kirdford            | X                           |                             | X                       |                             |                               |                                 | X                               |                                 |                                 |                                 |                                 |                                 |                                 |                                 |
| Lavant              |                             | X                           |                         | X                           | X                             | X                             |                                 | X                               |                                 |                                 |                                 |                                 |                                 |                                 |
| Lodsworth           |                             |                             |                         |                             |                               |                               |                                 |                                 |                                 |                                 |                                 |                                 |                                 |                                 |
| Loxwood             |                             | X                           | X                       | X                           | X                             | X                             | X                               | X                               |                                 |                                 |                                 |                                 |                                 |                                 |
| Northchapel         |                             |                             |                         |                             |                               |                               |                                 |                                 |                                 |                                 |                                 |                                 |                                 |                                 |
| North Mundham       |                             |                             |                         |                             |                               |                               |                                 |                                 |                                 | X                               |                                 |                                 |                                 |                                 |
| Oving               |                             |                             |                         |                             |                               |                               |                                 |                                 |                                 |                                 | X                               |                                 |                                 |                                 |
| Selsey              | X                           | X                           | X                       | X                           |                               | X                             |                                 | X                               |                                 |                                 |                                 |                                 |                                 |                                 |
| Sidlesham           |                             |                             |                         |                             |                               |                               |                                 |                                 |                                 |                                 |                                 |                                 |                                 |                                 |
| Tangmere            |                             |                             |                         |                             |                               |                               |                                 |                                 |                                 |                                 |                                 |                                 |                                 |                                 |
Chichester Open Space Study                                      Part 2 – Needs Assessment

The table covers issues of quantity and quality for a range of facilities. It shows that the areas of most common concern are that;

- A shortage of MUGAs/tennis/netball courts
- There not being enough areas for teenagers to use
- There not being enough football and rugby pitches
- Changing facilities and pavilions being inadequate and/or of poor quality.

The key factors most commonly identified as important re local open space, sport, and recreation facilities were:

- They should be safe and secure for those using them
- They should be easy to get to for all members of the community
- They should be clean and free from litter and graffiti
- Equipment and grounds should be of high quality and well maintained

Factors least commonly highlighted as being of particular importance were those relating to signposting, on-site supervision and the provision of shelters.

3.2 Parish specific issues

Chichester City Council

As the City Council includes by far the largest population in the study area (around 24,000) we met face to face with Rodney Duggua, the Council Clerk.

Rodney noted that the Council is responsible for the management of allotments and a number of disused burial grounds, but in the main it is the District Council that manages the majority of the open space within the city. The City Council also own and manage the Buttermarket. This is now a successful asset to the city following refurbishment.

Some of the key Issues for the City Council are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Town/Parish Council</th>
<th>Not Enough Football Pitches</th>
<th>Not Enough Cricket Pitches</th>
<th>Not Enough Rugby Pitches</th>
<th>Poor Quality Playing Pitches</th>
<th>Not Enough Tennis/Netball/Mugas</th>
<th>Not Enough Tennis/Netball/Mugas</th>
<th>Poor Quality Tennis/Netball/Mugas</th>
<th>Not Enough Bowling Greens/Short-Mat</th>
<th>Poor Quality Inadequate Changing Facilities</th>
<th>Not Enough Informal Open Space</th>
<th>Not Enough Children's Play Areas</th>
<th>Not Enough Areas For Teenagers</th>
<th>Shortage Of Indoor Halls Suitable For Sport</th>
<th>Shortage Of Footpaths/Bridleways</th>
<th>Shortage Of Wildlife Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Westbourne</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westhampnett</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Wittering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisborough Green</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• There is insufficient provision of allotment plots - there is a long waiting list for the more popular sites.

• The Council are not intending to develop an overall neighbourhood plan but they do plan to undertake a review and update of their town plan - compile an up to date list of key community assets and consult residents, local groups etc provide a priority plan for improvements.

• The City Council has a medium/long term aspiration to take over the management of Priory Park from the District Council. Discussions are ongoing on this front. The City Council would wish the park to be brought up to an acceptable standard before it takes over responsibility.

• The Council note the potential for significant residential development over future years and believe it is of utmost importance to achieve high quality developments with all the necessary infrastructure provided to accommodate growth e.g. schools, community facilities, traffic management, adequate green space and play areas etc.

• The City is currently in negotiation to take over management of Henty field (next to Central CoE Junior School) from the County Council on a 25 year lease. The intention would be to maintain it as public open space. Prior to taking on this responsibility they need to clarify a number of access and boundary responsibility issues.

• The Council are concerned about the potential loss of green space within the City Council area due to development. They are keen to see various important areas of green space protected and maintained as such rather than developed for residential or retail use for example:
  o Green area to the north west of the city (adjacent to Whitehouse Farm).
  o Green space to the South South East (Old Park Farm)
  o Daffodil Fields (just north of the city council boundary)

• Rodney emphasised the importance of master planning and good consultation to ensure developments are well planned in relation to public green space and community facilities. Two examples of good practice mentioned were “Zero C” (former Roussillon Barracks) and Graylingwell.

• There was some confusion from the general public about who is responsible for what in relation to green space etc (between the City, District and County Councils). Efforts should be made to clarify this with good publicity and guidance. Each authority needs to take care to signpost the public to the correct responsible body. The Council were interested in taking on an overall responsibility for a number of local licensing functions.

• Some important parks/green space were highlighted e.g. Priory Park, Bishops Castle Park and Brandy Hole Copse. It is very important to keep these well and other key parks/green space well maintained. There are also important areas of de facto access to green space e.g. at Westgate College fields.

• A current priority is for improvements at Priory Park - specifically there is a need to relocate the pavilion.

• Active sports clubs within the city include the Cricket and Hockey Club and the Tennis and Squash Club.

• Overall the view was that there were sufficient parks, play areas and green space within the City and the key issues were holding on to these and improving and maintaining quality and access.
• Further improvement of facilities at Whyke is a priority – refurbishment of younger children’s play area and community centre.
• Footpaths and cycleways are important to the Council e.g. the City Tree Trail and the City Walls Walk. There was a need/potential to improve cycle networks and potential to make the city more cycle friendly. Routes across the city central area are poor.
• Pedestrian Access to the various parks is thought to be fine e.g. Priory Park, Oakland Park, Jubilee Park. Parking is not always good but given the good access by foot this is not a real problem.
• Provision of indoor sports and leisure centres, pools etc is adequate but thinking strategically perhaps thought should be given to the potential for a regional facility e.g. a dry ski slope (nearest is at Southampton).
• It is important to remember that not all of Chichester is affluent. There are a number of areas that face social deprivation issues e.g. Swanfield.
• There is a need and demand for a boxing facility within the city.
• The athletics/running track at the University should be completed (currently it is only a “J” type shape facility i.e. straight and one bend).
• Community centres - the New Park Centre is well used and an excellent facility. The Assembly Rooms are also well used. In addition there are a number of church halls etc. Overall the city is quite well provided for but there is a need for a new community centre for the Wyke estate.
• Other important facilities for the City Council are the Festival Theatre and the Chichester Planetarium

Parish Council Issues and Aspirations

The detailed parish responses relating to quantity and quality of the various elements summarised in the table in 4.1 can be found in the associated Excel spreadsheet.

As part of the survey we also asked an open question “what new or improved recreational opportunities do you think would benefit your town/parish?” in order to provide an opportunity to identify key aspirations. Individual responses are shown in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish Council</th>
<th>Potential new or improved facilities for sport, recreation and open space</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apuldram Parish Meeting</td>
<td>Unknown at this time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birdham Parish Council</td>
<td>• Improved children’s play area that could be used by a wider age range than currently provided plus additional facilities to encourage adults e.g. tennis courts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Our football pitch requires drainage facilities, changing rooms and showers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosham Parish Council</td>
<td>We require a football pitch. The present recreation ground is prohibitive because of its dual purpose and size. The team has been promoted twice but unable to play in the higher divisions as stands and lighting cannot be provided due to neighbours and space.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chidham and Hambrook</td>
<td>An outside sport area for the parish is required. This should ideally be multi-use and not be exclusively for one group/team i.e. Having a cricket pitch would be good but would need to offer facilities to non-cricket players in order to be inclusive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village</td>
<td>Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishbourne</td>
<td>We are close to all the facilities in Chichester/SDNP so we are well catered for and scope is limited.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funtington</td>
<td>Provision of a larger open space.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunston</td>
<td>There is a need to improve the hard court area on the playing field. The Parish Council is also considering the addition of some outdoor gym equipment and a street snooker wall on the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirdford</td>
<td>Improved pavilion facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lavant</td>
<td>Skate Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lodsworth</td>
<td>None - although there is a current project for a croquet lawn to be laid at the recreation ground adjacent to the tennis court and village hall. This will be managed by the Lodsworth Croquet club.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loxwood</td>
<td>BMW/Skateboard tracks, Rugby coaching and playing facilities, Tennis and Table tennis facilities, Handball and Netball facilities, All-weather soccer and cricket pitches for the young.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northchapel</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Mundham</td>
<td>Improvements to the Pavilion and provision of equipment for older children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selsey Town</td>
<td>Football and Cricket Clubs have old clubhouses and hoped to build a new joint pavilion which could also be used by the community but funding has prevented this (planning permission already granted). During a Town Council survey in 2008 some of the recurring requests included a skating rink, 10 pin bowling, squash courts, crazy golf, windsurfing school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tangmere</td>
<td>Significant shortfall in facilities for existing population limits sport and recreational opportunities within village, resulting in increased vehicle trips to alternative sites. The following is required to cater for the requirements of the existing population: Indoor sports hall, LEAP/LAP facilities for East of village, Additional sports field with changing rooms and car parking, Change in layout and expansion of existing Village Centre changing rooms to cater for simultaneous Field and MUGA team sports use, Improved drainage of existing sports field (no known renovation of land drainage since 1960’s except piecemeal installation of soakaways around Village Centre which is sited at downhill end of field).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westhampnett</td>
<td>Outdoor play areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Wittering</td>
<td>Bowling green and rugby pitch</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

4 Tangmere PC provided an extremely thorough and detailed response to the survey particularly in relation to poorly served groups and gaps in provision - refer to their individual survey response for details
Parish Councils - other issues

Finally, the survey also provided the opportunity to raise any other issues or to make other points. The table below provides individual responses made:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish Council</th>
<th>Other Issues and Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apuldram Parish Meeting</td>
<td>Apuldram is a very small community consisting of primarily wealthy people with access to their main interest, sailing and boats, on their doorstep. I am not aware of any requirements of other sporting or recreational facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boxgrove Parish Council</td>
<td>Boxgrove’s open spaces suffer with anti-social riding of small unlicensed motorcycles by youngsters (12yrs and above). Despite efforts by police and PCSO’s this continues. Otherwise the areas are well maintained and well used.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Chidham and Hambrook         | • In general, the Chichester area has a good standard of facilities and clubs, unfortunately the public transport links from our community into Chichester are poor. Local facilities are a great addition to any community. 
• An open space needs to be inclusive for all members of the community, not just those who are members of a particular club. |
| Fishbourne Parish Council    | There has been far too much housing development.                                                                                                                                                                            |
| Lavant Parish Council        | Lavant House Stables are currently confined by the A286 to one side of the road. A safe crossing would provide safe access to bridlepaths to the East.                                                                            |
| Loxwood                      | Loxwood suffered for many years from having a largely passive Parish Council that sought and obtained little funding from CDC or WSCC to update and expand the recreational facilities, especially for young people and others without the means of travel safely and autonomously to other communities. In many ways Loxwood was the forgotten Parish in Chichester District. |
| Northchapel Parish Council   | Given the size and nature of Northchapel, it is thought that generally there are plenty of facilities available for such a small rural community.                                                                               |
| Tangmere Parish Council      | Issues the study should cover include:
• Impact of incremental development producing shortfalls in facilities. Means of mitigation and addressing existing shortfalls.
• Maintenance responsibility of equipped play areas (Local Authority, Registered Providers or private estate management entities) hence long term sustainability.
• Minimum design and quantity of equipment in play areas.
• Number and quality of Private sports grounds.
• Quality and maintenance responsibility of sports pitches on Public Recreation fields. Incl whether drainage affects availability/quality.
• Comparison of sports pitch sizes and changing facilities with governing body/Sport England standards.
• Dual use sports pitch areas (e.g. overlapping and whether separate practice areas available within sites). Issue here is limitation of availability for each sport and conflicting maintenance regimes.
• Proximity of Children’s play areas and roads to sports pitches. Issue here is danger of balls being hit into these areas. |
| West Wittering Parish Council| Any provision or development should enhance the rural nature of the area.                                                                                                                                                   |
3.3 City, Town and Parish Councils - Key Findings

**Quantity**

- 74% of parishes thought that there was a need for additional or improved open space, play and recreation facilities within the City, Town or Parish
- Many parishes report a shortage of MUGAs/tennis/netball courts
- A large number of parishes are concerned about a lack of areas for teenagers to use
- A significant number of parishes report a lack of football and rugby pitches in relation to local demand
- The City Council specifically highlights a need for more allotment plots

**Quality**

- As regards quality the key factors most commonly identified as important re local open space, sport, and recreation facilities were that they should be clean and free from litter and graffiti and equipment and grounds should be of a high quality and well maintained.
- Dog fouling of open spaces and play areas is seen as a significant problem.
- Many parishes highlighted the importance of ensuring facilities should be safe and secure for those using them
- Factors least commonly highlighted as being of particular importance were those relating to signposting, on-site supervision and the provision of shelters.

**Access**

- As regards access it was highlighted that it is of great importance that facilities should be easy to get to for all members of the community
- The rural nature of much of the study area and related transport difficulties means that as much as possible needs to be provided locally or that opportunities are made available to access city and town facilities and activities more readily.

**Other Issues**

- Over 76% of the councils were directly responsible for the management of various local facilities
- The City Council is by far the largest local Council in the study area and it is crucial importance that they are actively involved in the development of the Local Development Framework.
- The individual parishes are very different in relation to size, demographics, geography, needs and demand/aspirations. It is very important that local standards take this into account.
- 50% of parish respondees thought that there was scope for greater community use of local school sports facilities
- The sector of the community most commonly identified as being poorly served in relation to their needs are young people/teenagers.
- Many local Councils are concerned about the potential loss of green space within their area due to development and the potential impact of such on local facilities. Community infrastructure needs to be improved to meet new development.
- In many rural parishes the landscape quality of the area and the availability of open space ‘on the doorstep’ leads to a different approach towards the function of open space; as a result open space provision is often considered to be adequate in such parishes.
4. SPORTS AND LEISURE

This section contains feedback from Sport England and the governing bodies of pitch sports (football, cricket, rugby union and hockey as well as tennis). It incorporates findings from three surveys (community organisations, pitch and non-pitch sports clubs). As regards indoor facilities it includes feedback from key facility managers. It also includes information gained from the sports related stakeholder meetings. The section summarises some of the general themes and issues from this research.

4.1 Stakeholder Interviews

Sport England

We spoke to Katy Walker from Sport England who is the Principle Planning Manager for the South of England. Chichester is one of the local authorities for which she has responsibility.

Katy mentioned that as regards planning issues Chichester was one of the “quieter” local authorities within her brief and no specific key issues for sports and planning within the district immediately came to mind. Kate confirmed that she would check back over recent years to see if there were any historic cases that we should be aware of (none were subsequently sent).

She highlighted the availability of various Sport England tools and data, specifically Active People, Active Places, Market Segmentation, and the Facility Planning model. She recommended that we make full use of these at appropriate times in the study process.

Katy emphasised the importance of consulting with the relevant national governing bodies of sport. This should include the regional facility officers as well as local (county-wide) development officers. Key sports were Football, Cricket, Rugby, Hockey and Tennis. She also supported the idea of a clubs survey. She offered to contact the NGB officers herself in addition to our direct contact which should help ensure a good response. Kate also advised that we ask the NGB officers for any info/advice they have relating to quality assessments of facilities.

Sport England are keen to help with the process wherever possible and offered to supply various documents and information including a “Fit for purpose assessment” checklist relating to playing fields and pitches; information on the local supply and demand for various kinds of facility e.g. synthetic turf pitches (hockey and football).

Kate highlighted what she observed to be limitations of the study in relation to a detailed assessment of supply and demand due to the exclusion of the technical assessment of the recommended Sport England playing pitch model e.g. team counts, team generation rates etc. She suggested that this would be likely to have an impact upon the legitimacy of any derivation of local standards for individual sports’ playing pitch provision. She pointed out that the lack of a technical playing pitch study was likely to result in Sport England objections to any planning applications where playing pitches are potentially lost to development.

Kate would appreciate being given the opportunity to provide feedback on a draft of the study prior to any formal progress through the Council’s democratic process.
Chichester District Council - Sport and Leisure

We met with Jane Hotchkiss the Assistant Director for Leisure and Wellbeing. Issues raised in discussion are noted below (individual sports related views can be found within the relevant sections below):

- Important that the study fits within a strategic framework e.g. consider the Cultural Strategy
- Need to check whether the brief covers museums and heritage. If not this needs to be highlighted as a requirement of a future study.
- The economic value of sport and leisure should be explicitly highlighted.
- Needs relating to more informal recreation should not be overlooked, for example
  - Water Sports - there is growing interest in Kite surfing and access to the beach and coast for such activity is important
  - Inland water recreation e.g. canoeing and kayaking - the canals are important and access and facilities relating to such need to be considered.
  - Lakes and their potential for developing rowing as a sporting activity. The Chichester Water Sports Centre is the main centre for water activities on the south coast: windsurfing, wakeboarding; kayaking and water skiing are all on offer.
- There is a need for 3G pitches in the District - none at all currently.
- There is a need for an ATP at Bourne Community College and there are opportunities for improved community access to the leisure centre.
- Overall a previous study had highlighted a shortage of indoor swimming pool space across the District.
- The current 33m pool at Westgate ideally should be replaced with a 25m pool plus a learner pool.
- Lakeside Holiday Park has a small pool but is only accessible to the public out of the main holiday season.
- There is a need for an athletics track in the District with full community use. Chichester running club is very strong and is working with the University toward a new facility (currently there is only a “J” type track).
- There are no regional “strategic” sports facilities currently within the District and it is important that this is not overlooked from a planning point of view. Perhaps a land allocation should be built in for such - e.g, a velodrome, ice skating rink or indoor ski centre. The study should be aspirational and consider the potential for a role in relation to pathways for elite provision.
- The Graylingwell Development will be providing additional sports pitches - football. Site not really suitable for Cricket pitch though.
- There is a major new community and leisure centre being opened soon at Midhurst. Facilities will include:
  - a four-court sports hall;
  - a multi-purpose community hall;
  - a dance studio;
  - a 70 station fitness suite;
  - two squash courts;
o a health suite, with a sauna, steam room, beauty therapy and physiotherapy rooms;
o a library;
o a registrar and well-being room,
o a café and function area; and activity / meeting rooms.

- While the above facility will be outside of the study area its impact will need to be taken into account in terms of mapping etc.
- Cycle routes and networks generally good e.g. Centurian Way - but not through central city area.
- There is significant interest in the District for road cycling and there is potential need for a track cycling facility (a potential site in Tangmere was mentioned).
- There is very limited provision of wheeled sports facilities - one skatepark in Chichester (Westgate). There are small half pipe facilities at Midhurst and Tangmere. There is no dedicated official facility for BMX. There are informal BMX features in Brandy Hole Woods (rider created!). There is demand but insufficient provision.
- Mountain boarding (like snowboarding but on wheels) - there is a centre at Haredown run by a local farmer. It also has skateboard jumps etc.
- There is potential for a “Go Ape” type facility (high ropes course) but this would probably be best located within the national park.
- MUGAs - there is provision at Sherborne, Whyke, Tangmere, Summersdale and Bracklesham. There are insufficient MUGAs across the district and the study should aim to set a local standard for future provision.
- Overall there is still a shortage overall of teenage play provision, adventurous and challenging play etc.
- Indoor sports halls - within the city there is adequate provision but there is an opportunity to provide greater community access to halls run by the University, College and Schools.
- Provision of indoor halls in Selsey is reasonable.
- Archery - there is a strong club based at Oaklands Park but there target area is not ideal and they would like to relocate to a more suitable site.

We also spoke to Sarah Peyman who is the Council’s Sport & Leisure Development Manager and some of the key points raised in discussions are noted below:

**General**

Sarah thought that overall there is probably enough public open space within the district to cater for the current population but how it is used needs attention and careful analysis; also the population is growing. The quality of open space and associated facilities is very varied though.

In Chichester it is not always clear to the general public who owns and manages various of the recreational facilities and public open spaces e.g. District Council, City Council, Country Council and housing associations.

Sarah’s specific comments regarding individual sports can be found in the appropriate sections below.
Parks and Gardens
- Overall there is very good provision of parks and green spaces in Chichester City. Broadly speaking access is good, but with little car parking e.g. Priory Park. The best access is by foot and cycle though.
- Some of the parks have active Friends/volunteer Groups - Brandy Hole Copse, East Beach Pond (Selsey), Bishops Palace Gardens, Florence Park and Priory Park.
- There are various plans for refurbishment and improvements at Priory Park and the city council is interested in taking over responsibility in the longer term.
- A draft open spaces study was undertaken a few years ago which may provide some useful information.
- There is an outline parks improvement programme that can be secured from the Parks section of Sport and Leisure services.

Play and Youth Facilities
- There is a need for more and better play facilities across the district, particularly for older children. A lot of play areas are of poor quality when looked at in relation to the design recommendations from Play England.
- A refurbished play area for Whyke oval is an immediate priory. The current play area for younger children is very poor (facilities for teenagers were improved recently).
- There is District Play Strategy (just out of date) that should be looked at. An updated district-wide play audit was also completed in the last year or two.

Other Open Space issues
- Access to the beach and coast and associated services are important to cover within the study. There are 14 miles of coast within the district. Important coastal/beach areas include West Wittering, Selsey, and East Wittering.
- Water sports both sea and inland should also be covered.
- The District has a large number of trees to manage and maintain - over 9,000 trees to look after!
- There is a need for a full all weather athletics track. A project is underway at the University to remedy this, but it will be important to secure full community access. The Chichester Running Club is very strong and active,

Indoor facilities
- A leisure facilities strategy was completed which, though out of date, may provide some useful information.
- Pools - probably overall there is too little “water space”. Chichester itself is OK (Westgate) but other parts of the District have poor access (particularly in the north). There is a seasonally available pool (winter) at a holiday camp in Selsey. There is some provision of pools at private schools but these are not generally accessible by the general public.
- Overall there are probably enough sports halls but not all are always accessible for community use e.g. at schools, college and university
- There is an expressed need and demand for a dedicated facility for boxing.
- The New Park centre is a trust-run multi-use facility that is a great asset to the city.
4.2 Pitch Sports and Tennis

4.2.1 Football

A) The National Governing Body - Sussex County Football Association

We received the following information from the Sussex County Football Association via the County Development Manager Kevin Tharme.

**General**

- As the NGB we govern football across the whole county of Sussex including our two professional clubs
- In the Chichester District we have 2 Adult leagues: West Sussex Football League (Saturday), Chichester & West Sussex Sunday Football League and 1 Youth league Arun & Chichester Youth Football League (Sunday)
- We also have the Sussex County League (Adult male) and Sussex County Women and Girls Leagues covering teams in the district
- These leagues have been consulted and their feedback has been incorporated below

**Trends & Demand**

Kevin provided the most recent annual Football Participation Report documents which he suggested would be useful to feed into the study at an appropriate point. The key points he highlighted are noted below:

- At the moment we are seeing a decline in Adult 11 v 11 football but an increase in demand for Youth football pitches
- This will be further highlighted when The FA Youth Development Review is implemented commencing season 2013/14
- This will see demand for different size pitches and goalposts across all age groups U7 - U18 (Documents have been sent to LA reps)
- Most important facilities are; Kingsham Primary School, North Mundham Playing Fields, Six Villages Sports Centre, Olivers Meadow, Aldingbourne, Whyke Oval and Priory Park (Youth)

**Issues**

- A number of Youth teams playing on pitches with no changing facilities and this is not acceptable in this day and age, particularly within women & girls football
- There appears to be a lack of floodlit AGP training facilities which would affect clubs at all ages
- Some clubs struggle to obtain pitches, most of which are school pitches. There are a limited number of Mini-Soccer pitches available (Youth)
- When hit by bad weather the only accessible AGP area available for training is at Chichester College which is already heavily used (Youth)
• With the implementation of The FA Youth Development Review which will see the mandatory introduction of 9 v 9 football, at U11 & U12 in 2013/14, more pitches and goalposts, of the required sizes, will need to be provided to enable young players to develop into the game accordingly
• The lack of floodlit AGP facilities impacts on training and participation opportunities.
• More changing facilities on sites are also required, particularly for Youth

Potential Improvements

• Chichester College and Oaklands Park - both sites could be utilised better. Kingsham School (High School) has good sized playing fields that could help provide extra facilities. (Youth)
• More pitches and training venues to be made available with changing rooms.

Good Practice

• There is a good example with University of Chichester and Chichester College both working in association with Chichester City FC to provide playing opportunities at senior football level. The Uni/College also works with the local youth clubs
• The Sussex CFA are working with the University to introduce a FA Futsal Fives League with an expected start date in October 2012

Additional Comments

From my experience the district is well served by Chichester District Council and they are very supportive in respect of football.

However, this does not mean we should not be working closer together to make sure that facilities are upgraded/improved to make sure that football is an attractive option in terms of pitches and facilities provided in turn bringing more people into the game. This could well include some players who have stopped and those that are attracted to the “small sided” game that has grown in popularity and stature over the past few years.

I think that there needs to be better links with “private” providers such as Schools, Colleges and Leisure Centres who have facilities that may not being used to the full capacity and thus enhancing closer community links.

B) League Secretaries

We had an individual response from Bob Rashbrook the secretary for the Sussex County Women and Girls Football league.

Introduction

• We provide female football for our Member Clubs from Under 10 to Adults levels
• The Competition at this time as 46 member clubs that make up 86 teams playing in 13 divisions
• Surprisingly we have no clubs participating from the Chichester area
Trends & Demand

- From being the fastest growing sport a few years ago this is not the case at the present time
- It was envisaged that the Olympics would generate more interest but it hasn’t
- Overall though demand is decreasing

Issues

- All ages are poorly served for girls and women’s football in the Chichester area

Additional Comments

We did have a number of teams from Chichester City Ladies/Girls FC a number of years ago but apart from an enquiry towards the end of last season we have no teams. When asking why the club never followed up the query they said there was a lack of interest.

C) Chichester District Council - Sports and Leisure

- Chichester City FC has adult (men’s and women’s) teams plus an active junior section. The Chichester City Colts are also a busy and active club.
- The club report that they are very near capacity in finding sufficient pitches to meet demand.
- There are two new football pitches planned as part of the Graylingwell development.
- There is a need for football pitch and changing room improvements at Oakland Park.
- Overall the quality of pitches is very variable with some very poor e.g. drainage issues.
- There are no 3G artificial turf pitches for football use.

D) Club responses

We also received direct responses from four football clubs: Hunston Community, Loxwood, Petworth and Fernhurst Recreation Ground Trust. Some general points from their responses are provided below:

- Three of the four clubs reported that they had enough pitches to accommodate pitches, but Loxwood said they did not. However three of the four clubs said there were not enough pitches available for training.
- Three of the four clubs were happy about the quality of their main pitch (though Hunston FC reported that their pitch was only “average”). Two clubs were not happy about the quality of changing facilities (Hunston and Loxwood)
- All four clubs reported fielding at least the same number of teams as last season, with two (Loxwood and Fernhurst reporting an increase).
- Three of the four clubs had plans to increase their membership and two intended to field more teams in the future (Loxwood and Fernhurst). Hunston, Loxwood and Fernhurst were planning to expand or refurbish facilities.
- The main barriers to club development were a shortage of AGPs for training; and a shortage of coaches and volunteers.
The detail of the club responses can be found in the full Excel Consultation Spreadsheet and a summary is also available in the appendices (Sports Clubs consultation profile).

We also gave clubs an open opportunity to provide additional comments as noted below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Club</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fernhurst Recreation Ground Trust FC</td>
<td>Our key drive as an organisation and community is and will be to get the all ages and genders involved in the sports, coaching and running of sport. We expect that to be as big a problem as getting the facilities sorted out.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E) Summary

- Overall there appears to be a decline in Adult 11 v 11 football but an increase in demand for Youth football pitches.
- There is a need for more pitches in some parts of the study area to accommodate club needs for both training and fixtures.
- There is a particular shortage of mini-soccer pitches.
- There are no 3G pitches in the study area and provision of such should be seen as a priority.
- Overall the quality of pitches is very variable with some very poor e.g. drainage issues.
- Some sites still suffer from a lack of or poor quality changing facilities e.g. Oaklands Park.
- There is potential to develop girls’ and women’s participation in football - this is quite low currently.
- The implementation of The FA Youth Development Revue will see the mandatory introduction of 9 v 9 football, at U11 & U12 in 2013/14, more pitches and goalposts, of the required sizes, will need to be provided to enable young players to participate.

4.2.2 Cricket

A) The National Governing Body - English Cricket Board

We received the following information from the Sussex County Cricket Board via the Cricket Development Manager, Steve Feazey.

Introduction

- There are two 2 adult outdoor leagues with clubs within the study area - the West Invitational Cricket League (feeder league) and Sussex Cricket League.
- There are also Junior cricket leagues from softball u10s to u18s hardball
- There are in the order of 10 - 15 clubs with junior sections
- There are also some indoor softball and hardball leagues

Trends & Demand

- Opportunities to play cricket are increasing due to an improved club structure and school links.
- Demand is increasing year on year.
- More could be done to enable better access in the more deprived areas and plans are in place to address this.
Most important facilities for cricket development are Chichester University, Chichester High School for Boys and Selsey Academy

**Issues**

- Travellers access to grounds - this disrupted last season and caused damage to West Wittering and Bosham grounds
- Limited access at Chichester Priory Park
- Lack of good quality indoor practice facilities in the area
- Lack of quality facilities available for clubs to hire
- Clubs can only use a couple of facilities that are fit for purpose which results in clubs fighting over priority booking times

**Potential Improvements**

- Chichester Priory Park - more access and new pavilion to serve the community sports clubs
- Indoor facilities - improved lighting, improved indoor nets and mat storage

**B) League Secretaries**

We had an individual response from Peter Butter, the secretary to the Sussex Cricket League. His main comments are noted below.

**Introduction**

- The SCL has 40 member clubs with teams formed into eight divisions
- The clubs in or around Chichester District are Chichester Priory Park (Premier Division), Stirlands (located at Birdham), Pagham, and Bognor (all Division 3 - West)

**Trends & Demand**

- Club membership is pretty static. All clubs maintain robust junior sections (this as a condition of their membership of the SCL)
- Demand from juniors is rising - otherwise more or less even

**Issues**

- Progression depends (as in most Leagues) on the collective abilities of team members. Individual progression is dependent on ability - but the potential is unlimited
- Chichester Priory Park CC occupies a ground where matches may be disrupted, and facilities damaged, by itinerant and unruly youths. Better stewardship seems to be the answer. This is a common problem with grounds that are part and parcel of publicly owned recreational facilities

**C) CDC Sports and Leisure**

- Overall across the district there are probably enough cricket pitches but quality is an issue at various grounds.
• Provision at Oaklands Park is inadequate (overlaps with Rugby) and there is a need to relocate.
• Priory Park has reasonable Cricket facilities but there is a need for a new pavilion (Cricket Club is active in pursuing this).
• The Cricket Club at Priory Park need a new and relocated pavilion.

D) Club responses

We also received direct responses from six cricket clubs: Bosham, Chichester Priory Park, Stirlands, Tangmere, Westbourne and Fernhurst Recreation Ground Trust. Some general points from their responses are provided below:

• Three clubs reported having enough pitches to meet fixture demands but three (Bosham, Chichester PP and Stirlands) reported an insufficiency of pitches. Five clubs reported a shortfall in training pitches (only Tangmere reported having enough).
• Bosham reported that pitch quality was poor and Tangmere and Westbourne said that their pitches were no better than average. The remainder were satisfied with the quality of pitches.
• Bosham and Chichester PP rated their pavilion/changing facilities as poor. Tangmere and Westbourne also reported that their facilities were below average.
• All the clubs reported that they were fielding the same number of teams as the last season.
• All six clubs reported plans to increase members and Bosham, Chichester PP, Stirlands and Fernhurst all intended to field more teams.
• All the clubs had plans to expand and/or refurbish facilities.
• The main barriers to club development were a lack of funding and a shortage of volunteers. Other common factors were a lack of/poor quality changing facilities and a shortage of coaches.

The detail of their responses can be found in the full Excel Consultation Spreadsheet and a summary is also available in the appendices (Sports Clubs Consultation Profile).

We also gave the clubs an open opportunity to provide additional comments as noted below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Club</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bosham</td>
<td>The questions have been answered in the context of Bosham CC developing a new cricket ground in the village. There is currently no pavilion and therefore no changing facilities or toilets etc. The field is in a usable state as a cricket pitch but the lack of facilities is a huge constraint on their current use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chichester Priory Park</td>
<td>CPPCC is always in conflict with our league, if we are relegated, we may struggle to be promoted again, as we have the following issues, lack of car parking, clubhouse facilities, vandalism, interference/interruptions from ‘locals’ during games.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tangmere</td>
<td>Ground owned by Parish Council, cricket facilities maintained by Tangmere CC. Square has 9 pitches which is sufficient for limited league and friendly match usage. Distance to recreation field edges exceed ECB minimum adult boundary requirements therefore sufficient room all round for general public to walk round outside of field of play. Infrequent incidents of balls being hit into gardens of adjacent houses. Pitches low and slow arising from multiple root break due inconsistent maintenance since RAF ceased use in late 1960’s. Deep aeration limited by</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
existence of flints within 75mm of surface. Only realistic remedy is to dig out and replace. Square could be extended Westwards.

Drainage issue is that surface water runoff from upslope area drains over square due poor surrounding ground levels hence limiting availability and playing surface quality as well as complicating maintenance; can be resolved with land drainage and surface level re-profiling.

Training net now 8 years old and batting end will require professional refurbishment within next 4 years. Bowling end mat to be renewed by Tangmere CC. Need second lane to allow for simultaneous adult/junior/bowling machine training.

Overlap of football pitch and cricket outfield limits match usage as seasons overlap in Apr, Aug and Sept, complicates maintenance regimes and results in conflicting training requirements. Wear due football significantly degrades standard of Cricket outfield in pitch overlap area and where football training occurs.

Village Centre Car Parking layout and capacity insufficient for simultaneous use of existing Village Centre internal and Recreation Field facilities.

Village Centre changing room area (69m2) insufficient to cater for simultaneous field sport and MUGA use and current layout does not permit segregation of mixed age group/gender/officials use. Change in layout and expansion of existing Village Centre changing rooms required to cater for simultaneous Field and MUGA team sports use.

Cost of hiring facilities. TCC maintains at its cost the cricket facilities. However it has to hire the Changing rooms etc at £43 per weekend match and £24 per evening match (FY2012/13 prices). Where other club’s have hired ground for a weekend match, they are charged £80 for use of pitch and changing rooms etc.

Westbourne
WCC is a traditional village cricket club. Pavilion facilities have been up-graded but the building is un sound. Junior cricket has lapsed with the absence of volunteers to run it. In the absence of Juniors a cricket net has fallen out of use through lack of maintenance. The cricket field has drainage problems and home games generally can’t start before mid May.

Fernhurst
The cricket club are in the process of launching an appeal for the money necessary to build new cricket nets at a cost of some £45,000. We have just laid a new football pitch; use will start in Aug 2013. 3 new tennis courts have been built and the pavilion refurbish in the past 3 years

E) Summary

- Demand is increasing year on year and opportunities to play cricket are also increasing due to an improved club structure and good school links.
- Overall across the district there are probably enough cricket pitches but quality is an issue at various grounds (in particular pavilions and changing facilities). There is a shortage in some areas though.
- There is a shortage of quality facilities available for clubs to hire as well as a lack of good quality indoor practice facilities.
- The main barriers to club development are a lack of funding and a shortage of volunteers. Other common factors were a lack of/poor quality changing facilities and a shortage of coaches.
- Top priorities for improvement include more access and new pavilion to serve the community sports clubs at Chichester Priory Park and for indoor facilities - improved
lighting, improved indoor nets and mat storage. Also, provision at Oaklands Park is inadequate (overlaps with Rugby) and there is a need to relocate.

4.2.3 Rugby Union

A) The National Governing Body - The Rugby Football Union.

We received the following information and feedback from the RFU via the Rugby Development Officer, Malcolm Chumbley.

Introduction

- Chichester host one Rugby Club with 4 Men’s teams, junior teams at all age groups Under 7 through to Under 18 and a Girls Teams
- With the RFU support, the club provides coaches and referees to the local community and support the programme in local schools and colleges

Trends & Demand

- Rugby has seen a recent growth in participation (Sport England Active Survey) this is reflected in Chichester with participation numbers at Chichester RFC increasing, particularly within the women’s & girls sections
- With the build up to hosting the next Rugby World Cup underway, this trend is set to continue beyond 2015 and is a major feature of the RFU strategic plan over the next 5 years
- All rugby activity and participation is increasing. In addition to the traditional 15 side contact game, 7’s is growing, boosted by the inclusion in the 2016 Olympics
- Touch rugby is growing as a standalone sport as well as social participation
- The rugby pitches at Oaklands Park provide the playing opportunity for the Club, the University Students and local Schools competing in the numerous festivals and competitions hosted by the club.

Issues

- All elements of the community are supported by the RFU and the local club, the provision for opportunities to participate is only limited by the capacity of Chichester RFC being already met
- An additional playing area would alleviate the demand on each pitch allowing for improved maintenance and the maintenance of a better quality pitch throughout the season. It will also help the Rugby Club on a Sunday when in excess of 500 Mini & Juniors are participating and places the club at full capacity (and sometimes beyond)
- Regulations for holding League fixtures requires the home club to provide a barrier or partition from the playing area and areas occupied by spectators. Some clubs achieve this by erecting a semi-permanent barrier or fencing for the duration of the match. The Rugby Club have requested this and have been prevented in doing so
- Supporting the statement above regarding capacity. Chichester Rugby Club, through their strong links to the community and local schools and colleges has a thriving junior section,
to the extent of not be able to accept any additional new joiners. This is down solely to space available. The club have requested the consideration of a 4th Pitch on their Top level of Oaklands and the relocation of the Cricket Square

- Parking is a reported problem for the Rugby Club facilities especially with participation growing

**Improvements**

- Floodlit 3G surface facilities would greatly enhance the opportunities available to all. In others areas of Sussex a partnership between Rugby and Football has achieved the creation of multi-use 3G pitch. Shared by local rugby & Football clubs, and hired to 5-a-side agencies, and offered to local school during curriculum time

**Additional Comments**

The local club pays rent which over the past five years has risen from £600 in 2007 to £6,600 currently. In addition the club are required to pay £3000, to hire the pitches it uses. This places a huge strain on the clubs and the additional finances required can only come from club membership subscriptions being raised. With the interest in all sport rising and the growth in participation in Rugby Union on the increase we would like to continue to support and encourage new people into our game, the clubs are forced to raise its membership subscriptions and potentially put off people taking up the sport.

**B) CDC Sports and Leisure**

- Chichester Rugby Club is very active with a large number of teams including junior and youth teams. They play at Oaklands Park where they have a club house. The park has 4 rugby pitches. There is some overlap with use by Cricket Club and ideally facilities for cricket should be relocated.
- The Rugby Club need better pitches and facilities.

**C) Club response**

We also received a direct response from Chichester Rugby Union Football Club. Some general points from their return are provided below:

- The club report insufficient pitches for both fixtures and training.
- They rate the quality of their main pitch and changing facilities as good
- The club fielded the same number of teams as last season
- They have plans to increase members and to expand and refurbish their facilities
- Barriers to club development are:
  - Shortage of senior pitches
  - Shortage of junior pitches
  - Shortage of AGPs for fixtures and training
  - Shortage of indoor training pitches
  - Cost of hiring/using pitches

Further detail of their response can be found in the full Excel Consultation Spreadsheet and a summary is also available in the appendices (Sports Clubs Consultation Profile).
D) Summary

- Rugby has seen a recent growth in participation and this is reflected in Chichester with participation numbers at Chichester RFC increasing, particularly within the women’s & girls sections.
- There are insufficient pitches to meet both fixtures and training and the lack of pitches is restricting growth. Chichester RFC has a thriving junior section, to the extent of not be able to accept any additional new joiners. The club need a 4th Pitch on their top level of Oaklands and would like to see the relocation of the Cricket Square.
- The quality of facilities is regarded as good.
- Regulations for holding League fixtures requires the home club to provide a barrier or partition from the playing area and areas occupied by spectators. Some clubs achieve this by erecting a semi-permanent barrier or fencing for the duration of the match. Chichester RFC needs a similar arrangement.
- A top priority is a 3G floodlit pitch which could be shared with football

4.2.4 Hockey

A) The National Governing Body - Hockey England

We received the following information and feedback from the England hockey via the Relationship Manager, Joanna Irving.

Introduction

Chichester Priory Park Hockey Club has:
- 9 men’s teams including 2 Veterans and 2 Development teams
- 4 Ladies teams including 1 Veterans
- Adult teams in Sussex, South region leagues
- 5 Junior teams U8 - U14. U12 and U14 Boys leagues

Chichester Centurions Hockey Club has
- 1 Ladies team playing in Division 1 of the Sussex league

Trends & Demand

- Chichester Priory Park HC are growing, and looking to add 1 Men’s team and U14 Girls league team in the next year
- Chichester Centurions HC is looking to recruit new women players
- Demand is increasing, especially post Olympics
- Struggle with 14+ age group particularly
- Most important facilities are the artificial grass pitches - sand based or sand dressed not 3G

Issues

- Schools hockey is poorly served
- Condition of AGPs. Ageing pitches mean there is a little capacity for more games
• Pitch availability means only one pitch is available for training for Chichester Priory Park HC
• Floodlights are being corroded by seagulls
• Inadequate pitch side facilities
• Main Clubhouse is in the City centre, 2 miles from the pitch with no parking

**Improvements**

• AGPs used by Chichester Priory Park Hockey Club: one is getting very tired and another requires serious maintenance
• Floodlights at Chichester Priory Park need urgent improvements
• A clubhouse next to a pitch is the priority for our Chichester Priory Park Hockey Club, having no clubhouse next to a pitch makes logistics tricky, especially since there is very limited changing facilities at main pitch
• Share maintenance/resources with Chichester College and Chichester University
• Progression takes the form of further combining resources of the Clubs, University and College to create a ‘Team Chichester’

**B) League Secretaries**

We had an individual response from Barry Holmes, the secretary to the Sussex Men’s Open Hockey League. His main comments are noted below.

**Introduction**

• Chichester Hockey Club has 2 teams in the Sussex Open League.
• A number of teams play in Hampshire and South Leagues
• University of Chichester has 1 Team in the Sussex Open League

**Trends & Demand**

• Interest in Hockey appears to be increasing with addition of University team to the League and the increasing strength of those teams
• Demand is increasing in numbers and quality

**Issues**

• I have had no complaints from Chichester teams regarding accommodation of matches - it may be that the present facilities are adequate to meet present and some further expansion of demand
• Whenever I have umpired or played in Chichester - there has been no issues on access or exit

**Improvements**

• As with all hockey facilities - there is an issue of replacement of ageing all weather (often sand based astro) with pitches suitable for League Hockey. The tendency to introduce all weather pitches suitable for multi-sports, which are inappropriate for high level hockey
**Good Practice**

- The work of Chichester Hockey Club in promoting the sport in all age groups from juniors through to veterans and all playing standards, Chichester are a leading club in the South of England

**Additional Comments**

Hockey remains a minority sport, requiring specific outdoor facilities of a minimum quality. If Chichester wish to remain at the forefront of the sports development in the South of England then it is essential to maintain a minimum level of these facilities within the community. I hope this remains possible.

**C) CDC Sports and Leisure**

- There are 3 STPs in Chichester suitable for hockey (the High School, the College and the University). They are well used. There is one Hockey club and there are enough pitches to meet demand. Some of the STPs are also used for football.

**D) Summary**

- Demand is increasing. Chichester Priory Park HC are growing, and looking to add 1 Men’s team and U14 Girls league team in the next year. Chichester Centurions HC is looking to recruit new women players.
- There are enough pitches but the quality of pitches and facilities is deemed to be poor (playing surfaces tired and in need of maintenance).
- The NGB report that schools hockey is poorly served.
- Priorities include urgent improvements of floodlights at Chichester Priory Park HC and a clubhouse next to the pitch.
- The NGB suggests that progression could take the form of further combining resources of the Clubs, University and College to create a ‘Team Chichester’

**4.2.5 Tennis**

**A) The National Governing Body - The Lawn Tennis Association**

We received the following information and feedback from the LTA via the Tennis Development Officer, Liz Bartlett.

**Introduction**

- In Chichester we have one predominant club, Chichester Racquets and Fitness Club (CR&FC), with a number of smaller clubs, some of which are registered to us
- Chichester R&FC offers a comprehensive programme for players of all ages and abilities and is a focus club for our support in the area
- The most important facility is Chichester R&FC and potentially the Council courts adjacent to this
**Trends & Demand**
- Club membership at CR&FC has increased over the past year showing there is latent demand for the sport in the area
- Demand is increasing

**Issues**
- No sectors necessarily poorly served but there are identified areas within the Sport England segments identifying latent demand and so there are areas to develop in Chichester
- Matches and training is managed okay currently but additional space at CR&FC may be needed in future as the club sets out its plans moving forwards to cope with the demand
- CR&FC offers a quality run facility with full access but as said as the club develops further access to sufficient court time may become an issue
- There is under use of the council tennis courts next to the club

**Improvements**
- The LTA is keen to work with Local Authorities to maximise the best use of public tennis courts. We have examples of successful and profitable models in other areas and would be very keen to explore this with CR&FC club and the Council to increase the number of people playing tennis on the courts adjacent to the club

**Good Practice**
- CR&FC has carried out a large number of facility developments over the past year to build the club into a quality centre offering good facilities and programmes for Chichester and the surrounding area

**Additional Comments**

We would welcome the opportunity to have discussions over support we can offer to the Council to maximise the use of the public courts in the district to ensure we meet the latent demand in the area by getting more people participating in tennis and ensuring the courts operate profitable programmes.

**B) CDC Sports and Leisure**

- Chichester District Council tennis facilities operate all year round at Oaklands Park. There are seven public hard courts, three with floodlighting. The Chichester Racquets & Fitness Club control the operational management of these facilities. These are also available on a pay and play basis. There is potential for greater use.
- Tennis courts are also available in various parishes across the district.
- Tennis - limited provision of publically accessible courts. There are many schools with tennis courts but little community access and the quality of school courts is very variable - many are poor. The High School does have some community use but courts are poor quality.
C) Club responses

We also received a direct response from Chichester Racquets & Fitness Club. Some general points from their return are provided below:

- Membership has increased over recent years and they now have a membership of over 1700
- They have good links with local schools
- They rate the quality of their main facility as very good and changing facilities as good.
- The main factors preventing club development are a shortage of indoor facilities, insufficient changing facilities and a lack of funding.

We also gave the clubs an open opportunity to provide additional comments as noted below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Club</th>
<th>Issues/Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Chichester Racquets & Fitness Club | Potential Improvements we would like to make: Indoor tennis facilities, additional glass back squash court with viewing gallery, extension to gym, storage for studio to expand activities, extend and improve Men’s changing room. All future projects are currently under discussion prior to decisions being made and funding being explored. Permanent covered tennis courts will enable us not only to play all year round but to also host LTA events; additional glass back squash court will increase participation and enable us to host more ESR events; a gym extension will increase participation in fitness programmes, additional storage space will enable us to expand our classes and run additional activities; increased membership numbers have put additional strain on the Men’s changing room which is in need of extension and refurbishment. Looking at provision for tennis more generally:  
  - Public tennis courts which we manage and use need to be maintained to a good standard - they are currently overdue for repainting.  
  - Permanent covered tennis courts  
  - Floodlighting to all public tennis courts  

The Club currently works in close partnership with CDC regarding management of the public tennis courts which we would wish to continue and develop. If there are any plans for CDC to relinquish these courts then the Club would be very interested in taking them on.

Further detail of their response can be found in the full Excel Consultation Spreadsheet and a summary is also available In Appendix X (Sports Clubs Consultation Profile).

D) Summary

- In the study area there is one predominant club, Chichester Racquets and Fitness Club (CR&FC), with a number of smaller clubs.
- Membership and demand for tennis is growing, particularly at CR&FC. They report that the quality of facilities is good.
- There is limited provision of publically accessible courts but currently sufficient to meet club fixtures and training.
- There are many schools with tennis courts but little community access and the quality of school courts is very variable - many are poor. Tennis courts are also available in various parishes across the district (also of variable quality).
Priorities include maintaining public tennis courts to a good standard, provision of a facility with permanent covered tennis courts and floodlighting to more public tennis courts. The LTA is keen to work with the Council to maximise the best use of public tennis courts.

4.3 Other Sports

Eleven questionnaires were returned from other sports clubs:

- Chichester Bowling club
- Chichester Bridge Club
- Chichester Canoe Club
- Chichester Fencing Club
- Chichester Youth Adventure Trust
- Selsey Carpet Bowls Club
- Selsey Zen Judo Club
- Southbourne Gymnastics Club
- West Wittering Croquet Club
- Westgate Casuals Squash Club
- Chichester Falcons Softball Club

The full detail of information received from the individual clubs is available as an excel spreadsheet. Some general findings are noted below:

- Membership levels range from over 275 (Southbourne Gymnastics Club) to smaller clubs such as Judo and Softball who have 20-50 members.
- Four of the clubs who responded have specific youth sections; six have a Clubmark or similar quality accreditation and two are working towards it.
- Seven clubs report an increasing membership base with only one club reporting a decline over recent years (Judo).
- A majority of the clubs have or have tried to have links with schools with varying degrees of success and would like to develop those links further. Most see that engagement with schools is fundamental to developing and growing their sport.
- The main barriers preventing further expansion of club activities were: a shortage of good quality indoor facilities; a lack of, or poor quality, changing facilities; a shortage of playing members and a shortage of volunteers to run/coach teams and/or administer the club.

We asked the club to rate various aspects of the main venue they use and the table below provides a general summary of the responses:
The table indicates that the majority of clubs are fairly happy with most aspects of their main venue. The most common aspects that are rated as poor or very poor at some venues are facilities for the disabled and car parking.

We asked the clubs to identify improvements that they would like to see at their main venue. The aspirations of those that responded to this opportunity are shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Club</th>
<th>Venue</th>
<th>Potential Improvements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chichester Bowling Club</td>
<td>The bowls pavilion inside Priory Park</td>
<td>The sports pavilion itself was built in the 1930s and is in real need of being replaced. It is not adequate for our needs. The County have expressed their desire to play games at our green, but cannot do so due to the lack of facilities compared to other clubs in Sussex.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chichester Canoe Club</td>
<td>The CYWCC sheds by the canal on the grounds of the Boys High school Chichester</td>
<td>Proper road access to the sheds. Proper changing rooms, toilets and Showering facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Wittering Croquet Club</td>
<td>Millennium Field, Elms Lane, West Wittering</td>
<td>Just spent a lot of money refurbishing the courts, we are awaiting further work this autumn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chichester Falcons Softball Club</td>
<td>Oaklands Park, southern section</td>
<td>Some areas of the field are boggy and unplayable but it’s not a big problem for us</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We also asked what new sports and recreation facilities and/or improvements to existing facilities and resources would you most like to see within the study area. The suggestions put forward are provided below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Club</th>
<th>Suggestions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chichester Bowling Club</td>
<td>• New bowls pavilion for ourselves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The ability to park a limited number of cars in Priory Park. Visitors complain that the nearest they can park is the Festival Theatre and bowls gear is quite heavy to transport, There is potential space behind the current toilet block for a small parking facility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• New cricket pavilion/changing facilities (this might free up their old facilities for us).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chichester Canoe Club</td>
<td>• A man made White Water Centre like the Nene WWC or Cardiff WWC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Improved access to local rivers e.g. the Arun (easier getting in/out points, better parking)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chichester Fencing Club</td>
<td>Affordable sports hall space for more training and competitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selsey Carpet Bowls Club</td>
<td>Promotion of more carpet bowls clubs in the area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westgate Casuals Squash Club</td>
<td>Additional squash courts at Westgate Leisure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finally, there was also an opportunity for adding additional comments:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Club</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chichester Bowling Club</td>
<td>Funding has been approved for developments to the park, but this has all gone very quiet given the current economic climate. We would like to know if this is something the Council is seriously looking at, or just paying lip service to!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chichester Canoe Club</td>
<td>We have a mutual agreement whereby CCC and CYWCC each share our boats and equipment and CCC provide coaching to the youth on a Weds night in exchange for storing our equipment in one of the sheds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chichester Falcons</td>
<td>• It’s very hard to book indoor facilities due to high costs and clashes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
with non-sporting activities, e.g. children’s parties.  
• It would be good if local sports teams could be somehow subsidised  
for renting, for example, the Westgate Centre, so that local sports  
teams get preference over children’s parties for using the sports  
hall. We would make a lot of bookings at the Westgate Centre in the  
winter if we could only get a free slot in there!  
• It would be good if we didn’t have to pay to use the adjacent car  
park having already paid to rent the field.  
• Chichester DC has been very helpful in getting us underway as a new  
team. In particular, Claire Hurst has put in a lot of time to help me  
with bookings etc. We are very grateful for that!

Summary

- Membership levels range from over 275 (Southbourne Gymnastics Club) to smaller clubs  
such as Judo and Softball who have 20- 50 members.  
- Most clubs report an increasing membership base over the last three years with only one  
club reporting a decline.  
- A majority of the clubs have or have tried to have links with schools with varying degrees  
of success and would like to develop those links further. Most see that engagement with  
schools is fundamental to developing and growing their sport.  
- The main barriers preventing further expansion of club activities were: a shortage of good  
quality indoor facilities; a lack of, or poor quality, changing facilities; a shortage of  
playing members and a shortage of volunteers to run/coach teams and/or administer the  
club  
- The majority of clubs are fairly happy with most aspects of their main venue. The most  
common aspects that are rated as poor or very poor at some venues are facilities for the  
disabled and car parking.

4.4 Community Organisation Survey

This survey provided views specifically related to sports and indoor leisure facilities as noted  
below. In terms of the quality of various kinds of sports and indoor leisure facilities the general  
views expressed are summarised in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Type</th>
<th>VERY GOOD</th>
<th>GOOD</th>
<th>AVERAGE</th>
<th>POOR</th>
<th>VERY POOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Playing Fields for football, cricket, rugby</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis/netball courts and outdoor bowling greens</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artificial turf pitches ('astros') for hockey, football etc</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor swimming pools</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor sports/leisure centres</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community/Village halls, Community centres, Church halls</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf courses</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other <strong>outdoor</strong> sports e.g. motor cycle scrambling</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other <strong>indoor</strong> facilities such as tennis centres, bowls, ice rinks etc.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The majority of groups think that generally speaking the study areas’ indoor pools and sports/leisure centres are of good quality. The quality of golf courses is also thought to be high by those expressing an opinion. In contrast facilities for outdoor sports such as motor-cycle scrambling are deemed to be poor by the majority.

Playing fields for pitch sports and Village/Community Halls are thought to be of at least average quality by the majority of groups. Opinion on other facilities is more variable.

Specific comments from the organisations relating to sports and indoor leisure facilities are highlighted in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category and Comments</th>
<th>Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Playing Fields, Tennis Courts, Bowling Greens</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chichester lacks a full size athletics track with facilities for athletics events. There is a very strong running and athletics community in Chichester and the surrounding area but training has to be held at the Mountbatten Track in Portsmouth. This makes athletics unavailable to those who can’t afford or don’t have the ability to travel.</td>
<td>Chichester Cathedral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need more, other than school supervised fields</td>
<td>Chichester Ship Canal Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have praise for this provision and do not believe we need more pitches. The only missing facility is indoor bowls - those interested have to fo to Bognor</td>
<td>Friends of Florence Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are apparently insufficient playing fields for rugby and football.</td>
<td>Orchard Street and Old Somerstown Area Residents Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherborne Road playing field is a great resource but is usually only fully used for football in season and is not always mown often enough for youth teams to play on safely. The pavilion is otherwise unused and is beginning to fall into disrepair (there are tiles missing from the roof for instance). This is a lost opportunity. When the Noise social action project hires the green and pavilion for May half term week, all the children’s and youth activities are always well attended. It is, however, quite expensive for a charity group to afford to pay for such limited facilities. If the pavilion were perhaps equipped with catering facilities or extended, then it could become multi-purpose and might generate more income e.g. supporters at football matches would appreciate the chance to buy a hot drink and snack whilst watching the game. This could help teams raise funds and pay for the hire. The basketball net is good, but often young people want to kick a football against the pavilion wall/use it as a goal.</td>
<td>Parklands Residents’ Association (PRA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selsey needs all its facilities fully open--school tennis courts for instance.. It needs more football pitches and another cricket pitch to allow growth in the sports.</td>
<td>Sports Dream</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would prefer to see increased facilities that were accessible to the local villages.</td>
<td>Tangmere Action Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different Sports using same ground inhibits availability and complicates/degrades maintenance. E.g. N end of Chichester’s Oaklands Park - cricket outfield shared with rugby pitches makes former sports outfield unsuitable; Tangmere Rec. - cricket outfield overlaps football pitch (playing seasons overlap in April, late July, August and September). In both examples quality of cricket pitches degraded by studded boot footfall on squares.</td>
<td>Tangmere Cricket Club (TCC) and member of: Friends of Chichester Priory Park; Tangmere Action Group (TAG).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports &amp; Recreation in 'Sensitive Areas'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Countryside and wildlife can be damaged by inappropriate sport and recreation.</td>
<td>British Horse Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can be very damaging</td>
<td>Chichester Organic Gardening Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Many schoolchildren and teenagers illegally use Brandy Hole Copse for camping and ‘bushcraft’ games. We would like to stop this. One way would be for CD to provide suitable additional facilities for camping and bushcraft activities in areas where they would not damage countryside or wildlife</td>
<td>Friends of Brandy Hole Copse (FBHC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports should be mainly in Chichester - recreational activity fits better into countryside</td>
<td>Friends of Florence Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife can be damaged if facilities are badly placed. Despite the concerns for wildlife near the Bracklesham Bay centre, the facility went ahead without due care resulting in footballs et al regularly reaching the sensitive ditch area</td>
<td>Manhood Wildlife and Heritage Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some provision for noisy activities may be useful in non-sensitive areas - e.g. the skate park is located away from housing and does not damage countryside.</td>
<td>Parklands Residents’ Association (PRA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A difficult balance that needs careful planning. However the facilities are a requirement if expansion and headcount are increasing. One goes hand in hand with the other. Not development at any cost, to the environment and the community.</td>
<td>Tangmere Action Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is it appropriate for wildfouling with firearms to continue in sensitive wildlife areas? What is the impact of marine leisure activities on wildlife (e.g. wash from boats going over habitats?).</td>
<td>Tangmere Community Garden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density of housing and adequate space for such facilities, plus development of schools with community facilities must be the answer to that.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor Provision</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Village Hall caters for – short tennis, table tennis, and other activities which are al heavily subscribed.</td>
<td>Bosham Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A major indoor tennis complex would be great but probably not viable. Indoor bowls could be sited at Westgate, on stilts with parking below.</td>
<td>Friends of Florence Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Westgate Leisure Centre is excellent.</td>
<td>Parklands Residents’ Association (PRA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Westgate Leisure Centre is within easy reach of this area with generous opening hours.</td>
<td>Southern Gateway Residents’ Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All present indoor facilities are fully utilised.</td>
<td>Sports Dream</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The nearest would be in Chichester itself three and a half miles away with poor community transport facilities Not enough Village Halls large enough for indoor sports facilities (e.g. badminton, short mat bowls and for keep fit/martial arts classes big enough to ensure financial viability).</td>
<td>Tangmere Action Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People have to go into Chichester for indoor sports - our only community building is totally inadequate for any sport e.g badminton</td>
<td>Tangmere Community Garden</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary**

- The majority of groups think that generally speaking the study areas’ indoor pools and sports/leisure centres are of good quality. The quality of golf courses is also thought to be high. In contrast facilities for outdoor sports such as motor-cycle scrambling are deemed to be poor by the majority.
- Playing fields for pitch sports and Village/Community Halls are thought to be of at least average quality by the majority of groups. Opinions on other facilities is more varied.
4.5 Sports and Leisure Indoor facilities

The Facilities identified for detailed auditing in relation to sports and leisure centres were:-

- Westgate Leisure Centre
- The Bourne Centre
- The Grange
- The Selsey Centre
- The University of Chichester
- Chichester College
- Schools/Colleges as listed re Sports Halls

We held discussions with a number of the facility managers and sports officers including:

- Kevin McCoy, Westgate Leisure General Manager, CDC; Richer Minton, Westgate Leisure Centre Operations Manager, CDC
- Stuart Mills, The Bourne Centre Manager, CDC
- Ben Polhill, Community Leisure Development Officer, CDC
- Mike Boyce, The Grange Centre Manager (Trust)
- Mervyn Hall, The Selsey Centre
- Gill Jennings, Selsey Town Council
- Mike Lauder/Sid Fletcher - University of Chichester
- Mark Forder/Julie Sleeman - Manager, Operations Manager, Chichester College

The comments from the various managers are noted in the tables below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Westgate Leisure Centre</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Located in Chichester</td>
<td>5-Year Asset Management Plan 2011-2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sports hall</strong></td>
<td>Generally in good condition with refurbishment some 5 years ago. New lighting has been installed. Maintaining required temperature remains an ongoing issue. No volleyball floor fittings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other halls</strong></td>
<td>Good condition and well used for exercise classes, functions, meetings etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minerva, Tuscany</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ravenna</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Swimming Pool</strong></td>
<td>Not competition dimensions. Few galas therefore (which would need a 25m pool). New flume and water features needed in the future to maintain demand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Learner Pool</strong></td>
<td>Improved temperature control needed (always same as main pool). Depth not ideal. Feasibility Study for new teaching pool/hydrotherapy pool was undertaken - not currently progressing based on demand analysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Health Suite</strong></td>
<td>Lacks modern image and ambience. Spa reaching end of life. In need of refurbishment. Inadequate changing rooms. Scheduled for 2013/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sanctum Beauty</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fitness Gym</strong></td>
<td>Needs larger support area - for spinning classes, for free weights, for junior gym. Improved area/equipment for the disabled.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Squash courts</strong></td>
<td>Ongoing refurbishment to keep pace with age (floor, walls). Recently refurbished. Next in 2014/15 scheduled.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Changing rooms</strong></td>
<td>Review underway and proposals in place to improve overall standard and service in wet change areas. Village Change 2015/17 scheduled.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Chichester Open Space Study

#### Part 2 - Needs Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Creche/Nursery</th>
<th>Recently franchised. Improvements to kitchen, facilities needed.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Skate Park</td>
<td>Recently refurbished.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catering areas</td>
<td>Adjacent to main foyer. Effective and attractive area. Franchise branding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrance Foyer</td>
<td>Provides insufficient control for some activity areas. Review is under way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant - general</td>
<td>New CHP and BMS systems. Pool plant good, conversion to UV system installed. Health Suite plant advised as poor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car parks</td>
<td>Front, side and rear. Meets everyday demand.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Other                   | • Low energy lighting planned for 2013 as well as improvements to some ceilings.  
                          | • Improvements to Foyer area being reviewed including ‘smart’ access.  
                          | • Facility lacks soft play area for children to meet demand and provide income. |

#### The Bourne Centre

Located at Bourne Community College, Southbourne.

**Dual use**

- Sports Hall: Some temperature control difficulties. Spacious balcony with seating.
- Dance Studio: Improved storage facilities needed.
- Fitness Gym: Demand for expansion.
- Meeting/Function Room: Multi-use and compromise function servicing. Carpeted. Used for staff training.
- Changing rooms: Meets requirements.
- Multi-Use Games Area: In need of refurbishment.

**Other**

- Small school gym/sports hall - old style in need of refurbishment.
- Discussions progressing with MOD (Thorney) regarding siting of a synthetic turf pitch on the school field.

**Comments**

Managed by Westgate Leisure (out of school hours) on behalf of West Sussex County Council

#### The Grange

Located in Midhurst

**Comments**

Rebuild scheduled on adjacent car park without closure of existing centre, during 2012/14. (currently managed as a Trust - to be managed by Westgate Leisure after rebuild)

**Sports halls**

Comprehensive programmes of use. Includes gymnastics and short mat bowls. Casual and club use.

**Other function and meeting halls**

Liberty Hall, Burdett Room, Strong Suite, Garden Room, Norfolk bar. Well used in the main.

**Fitness and Health**

Two levels. Improved facility planned.

**Changing rooms**

Adequate.

**Catering areas**

Bar/kitchens to service function rooms

**Car park and external profile**

Additional car parking created on former tennis courts.

**Other**

Centre well maintained superficially. Adjoining daycare centre to be relocated in 2014?

#### The Selsey Centre

**Comments**

Managed by Selsey Town Council

Opened in March 2007

**Multi-Purpose Halls**

Excellent facility although additional storage needed. Serviced by kitchen.

**Conference Room**

Additional storage needed.
### The Oasis, Selsey
Located within the Bunn Leisure Park

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Swimming Pool</td>
<td>Attractive and substantial facility (25m x 6 lane) provided for Leisure Park visitors with open access to the wider community. Includes attractive water features.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure Pool</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitness Gym</td>
<td>Membership scheme open to the general public, or ‘pay and play’ available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External profile</td>
<td>Access constrained by signage and approach to Leisure Park and access through complex.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car parking</td>
<td>Adequate for community use.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Managed by Bunn Leisure

### The University of Chichester
New developments completed October 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sports hall</td>
<td>Priority of teaching and learning. Limited community club use. Two viewing balcony levels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor Dome</td>
<td>Completed October 2012 for indoor tennis (4 courts) and netball 3 courts).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lightweight structure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitness Gym</td>
<td>Demand exists for larger gym at peak times.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synthetic Turf Pitch</td>
<td>Priority use for teaching and learning. Limited community club use. University undertaking business evaluation for a possible Third Generation STP, developing closer links with community sports clubs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full size</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics Track</td>
<td>J section and changing/viewing pavilion completed in October 2012. Track Completion programme in future years to be finalised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other support facilities</td>
<td>Improvements under way, including the development of new sports science laboratories and multi-use studio..</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Chichester College

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sports hall</td>
<td>Priority educational use but offers substantial casual and club community use outside peak education hours.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitness Gym</td>
<td>Membership scheme open to the general public.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitness/Exercise studio</td>
<td>Range of exercise classes available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full size</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor Changing rooms</td>
<td>Improvements planned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor changing rooms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Other School/College Sports Halls

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seaford College, Petworth</td>
<td>Controlled community club use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midhurst Rother College</td>
<td>Controlled community club use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chichester High School for Boys</td>
<td>Controlled community club use. (Also for STP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chichester High School</td>
<td>Controlled community club use.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.6 Sports and Leisure - Key Findings

Football

- Overall there appears to be a decline in Adult 11 v 11 football but an increase in demand for Youth football pitches
- There is a need for more pitches in some parts of the study area to accommodate club needs for both training and fixtures.
- There is a particular shortage of mini-soccer pitches.
- There are no 3G pitches in the study area and provision of such should be seen as a priority.
- Overall the quality of pitches is very variable with some very poor e.g. drainage issues.
- Some sites still suffer from a lack of or poor quality changing facilities e.g. Oaklands Park
- There is potential to develop girls’ and women’s participation in football - this is quite low currently.
- The implementation of The FA Youth Development Revue will see the mandatory introduction of 9 v 9 football, at U11 & U12 in 2013/14, more pitches and goalposts, of the required sizes, will need to be provided to enable young players to participate.

Cricket

- Demand is increasing year on year and opportunities to play cricket are also increasing due to an improved club structure and good school links.
- Overall across the district there are probably enough cricket pitches but quality is an issue at various grounds (in particular pavilions and changing facilities). There is a shortage in some areas though.
- There is a shortage of quality facilities available for clubs to hire as well as a lack of good quality indoor practice facilities.
- The main barriers to club development are a lack of funding and a shortage of volunteers. Other common factors were a lack of/poor quality changing facilities and a shortage of coaches.
- Top priorities for improvement include more access and new pavilion to serve the community sports clubs at Chichester Priory Park and for indoor facilities - improved lighting, improved indoor nets and mat storage Also, provision at Oaklands Park is inadequate (overlaps with Rugby) and there is a need to relocate.

Rugby

- Rugby has seen a recent growth in participation and this is reflected in Chichester with participation numbers at Chichester RFC increasing, particularly within the women’s & girls sections.
- There are insufficient pitches to meet both fixtures and training and the lack of pitches is restricting growth. Chichester RFC has a thriving junior section, to the
extent of not be able to accept any additional new joiners. The club need a 4th Pitch on their top level of Oaklands and would like to see the relocation of the Cricket Square.

- The quality of facilities is regarded as good.
- Regulations for holding League fixtures requires the home club to provide a barrier or partition from the playing area and areas occupied by spectators. Some clubs achieve this by erecting a semi-permanent barrier or fencing for the duration of the match. Chichester RFC needs a similar arrangement.
- A top priority is a 3G floodlit pitch which could be shared with football

**Hockey**

- Demand is increasing. Chichester Priory Park HC are growing, and looking to add 1 Men’s team and U14 Girls league team in the next year. Chichester Centurions HC is looking to recruit new women players.
- There are enough pitches but the quality of pitches and facilities is deemed to be poor (playing surfaces tired and in need of maintenance).
- The NGB report that schools hockey is poorly served.
- Priorities include urgent improvements of floodlights at Chichester Priory Park HC and a clubhouse next to the pitch.
- The NGB suggests that progression could take the form of further combining resources of the Clubs, University and College to create a ‘Team Chichester’

**Tennis**

- In the study area there is one predominant club, Chichester Racquets and Fitness Club (CR&FC), with a number of smaller clubs.
- Membership and demand for tennis is growing, particularly at CR&FC. They report that the quality of facilities is good.
- There is limited provision of publically accessible courts but currently sufficient to meet club fixtures and training.
- There are many schools with tennis courts but little community access and the quality of school courts is very variable - many are poor. Tennis courts are also available in various parishes across the study area (also of variable quality).
- Priorities include maintaining public tennis courts to a good standard, provision of a facility with permanent covered tennis courts and floodlighting to more public tennis courts. The LTA is keen to work with the Council to maximise the best use of public tennis courts.

**Other Sports**

- There is a need and demand for a full size athletics facility. The favoured option is to complete the current “J” type facility at the University.
- Sports club membership levels range from over 275 (Southbourne Gymnastics Club) to smaller clubs such as Judo and Softball who have 20- 50 members.
- Most clubs report an increasing membership base over the last three years with only one club reporting a decline.
- A majority of the clubs have or have tried to have links with schools with varying degrees of success and would like to develop those links further. Most see that engagement with schools is fundamental to developing and growing their sport.
- The main barriers preventing further expansion of club activities were: a shortage of good quality indoor facilities; a lack of, or poor quality, changing facilities; a shortage
of playing members and a shortage of volunteers to run/coach teams and/or administer the club

- The majority of clubs are fairly happy with the quality of most aspects of their main venue. The most common aspects that are rated as poor or very poor at some venues are facilities for the disabled and car parking.

### Other issues and observations

- This study does not cover arts, museums, heritage and other cultural facilities. Such facilities will need to be assessed through a different process (if this is not already in hand).
- The study does not include a formal playing pitch study on the Sport England recommended model. This may need to be completed at some stage.
- There is a demand for improved swimming pool provision across the study area.
- Indoor sports halls - within Chichester there is adequate provision but there is an opportunity to provide greater community access to halls run by the University, College and Schools
- Needs relating to more informal recreation should not be overlooked, for example access to water sports
- There are no regional “strategic” sports facilities currently within the District and it is important that this is not overlooked from a planning point of view. Perhaps a land allocation should be built in for such - e.g., a velodrome, ice skating rink or indoor ski centre.
- There are insufficient MUGAs across the district to meet demand/aspirations and the study should aim to set a local standard for future provision.
- Indoor sports halls - within the city there is adequate provision but there is an opportunity to provide greater community access to halls run by the University, College and Schools.
5. PARKS, GREEN SPACES AND RIGHTS OF WAY

5.1 Stakeholder Views

Chichester District Council - Parks and Green Spaces

We met with the Parks and Green Space Officer Andy Howard and Justin Andy holds responsibility for the management of the District’s own parks and green spaces as well as parks and green space development. Justin is responsible for the maintenance of the Council’s parks and green spaces.

The parks and green spaces managed by the Council include:

- Priory Park
- Oaklands Park
- Jubilee Park
- Lifeboat Green, Selsey
- East Beach, Selsey
- Florence Park
- Whyke Amphitheatre
- Whyke Oval
- Bishops Palace Gardens
- New Park Road Park
- Sherborne Road Park
- St Anne’s Hill, Midhurst
- Foreshore

They operate eight play areas in Chichester which are located at:

- Amphitheatre play area - Velyn Avenue
- Florence Park play area - Florence Road
- Jubilee play area - New Park Road
- Oaklands Park play area - Wellington Road
- Oaklands Park play area - College Lane
- Priory Park play area - Priory Park
- Sherborne Road play area - Sherborne Road
- Whyke Oval play Area - Whyke Oval

Florence Road and Whyke Oval also include a multi use games area. The Council operates Westgate Skate Park, behind Westgate Leisure in Chichester.

We discussed various key issues regarding parks and green spaces across the District; particularly in relation to Chichester City for which the District own and manage the majority of the public open space. Issues raided included:

- Overall, in terms of parks and green spaces provision there is no significant shortfall in the quantity of provision but quality is very variable - need for improvement in many areas some of which are highlighted below.
- Currently Oakland Park provides space for both Cricket and Rugby. There is overlap and joint use of pitches and it is difficult to maintain a satisfactory pitch quality - particularly for Cricket.
- The Rugby Club need their own ground and there is a need to relocate the Cricket pitch to a more suitable location. The public open space at Graylingwell was mentioned as a possibility. The Rugby Club are very active with strong junior and youth sections.
- At Priory Park there is a need for a new Cricket pavilion (relocation within the park). In general terms it has the potential to be developed and improved further to become a real flagship park.
• Football pitches - generally adequate to meet demand in terms of quantity. At New Park and Whyke there is space for pitches. Some pitches are marked but there is a need for changing facilities (none currently).
• Quality - football pitches. There used to be a marked pitch at Oaklands Park - still the space but major drainage problems as regards a potential return to use.
• AFC Chichester have a new club house and excellent facilities - potential for greater “community use”.
• The tennis facilities at Oaklands are reasonable (some floodlit) but probably under-used. They are leased to the Tennis club. Some pay and play available but potential for easing access e.g. some programming for free use by children and young people?
• Play Areas - need for new play facilities at Whyke Oval for younger children (teenage facilities are good). The new play area at Priory Park is a good example of the standard the Council should be aiming at in terms of quality/design etc.
• The Amphitheatre play area in Velyn Avenue, Chichester is a priority for refurbishment. Sherborne Rd Play area is in reasonable condition.
• In general terms over all the Council’s parks, play areas and green spaces there is a need to develop a strategic plan to prioritise needs for development, refurbishment and maintenance.
• Pavillion/Community Centres - need for a new centre at Whyke. There is an active community group working towards this.
• The Council are planning to review their management of parks and preen spaces with a view to develop more diversity in its approach. E.g. to manage some areas for greater biodiversity i.e. to create more areas for wildflowers, wildlife habitats. This will require adding interpretation boards etc, to explain this approach to the general public.
• There are Friends of the parks/volunteer groups at:
  o Bishops Palace Gardens
  o Florence Park
  o Priory Park and Jubilee Gardens
  o Brandy Hole Copse
  o East Beach Pond
• There is a Bowls Club at Priory Park - the green is in excellent condition.
• There are ATPs at Chichester College and the University (suitable for hockey). There are no 3G pitches and this is definite gap in provision.
• There is a need for better Athletics provision - developments underway at the University - need to complete a full track.

Access and barriers

• Pedestrian and cycle access to parks in Chichester generally good - a number of paths within need resurfacing. Car parking generally reasonable (Priory Park less good). The bowls club members drive into the park and this informal agreement is sometimes abused!
• There is a need to improve cycle network within the central city area.
• There is a general no cycling policy within the parks. This should be reviewed site by site as there would be little problem with allowing cycling access within some of the parks.
- Some of the parks e.g. Bishops Palace and Priory have a no dogs policy. This could be reviewed.
- Priory Park is locked in the evenings and this policy could be reviewed (it may be an unnecessary cost).
- The signage within many parks and play areas could be improved to be more welcoming and less negative.
- A review of fencing would be useful as some seems unnecessary and can make it unclear as to what is meant to be accessible to the public e.g. South East Quadrant - East Pallent car park gardens.
- Oakland Park would benefit from public toilet provision. Where there are no toilets signing should indicate where the nearest are e.g. in Bishops Palace Gardens - no signs.
- Potential for a cafe in Priory Park and a kiosk in Bishops Palace Gardens. There is a new cafe within New Park/Jubilee gardens.
- Florence Park is a good example of a planned community approach. It has toilets, good play area and a community room. Friends of Group very active.

Friends of Priory Park and Jubilee Gardens

As noted below there are various Friends of the Parks groups. Priory Park is one of the most important park sites in the District and as such we met with Richard Plowman who is the Chairman of Friends of Priory Park and Jubilee Gardens. We also sent surveys to the other Friends group as recorded in earlier sections. Richard is also a city councillor with a particular responsibility of localism. In relation to his Friends of the Parks role, some key issues raised are noted below:

- Priory Park is a key public open space within Chichester and is well used by local people and visitors. It is an important venue for events e.g. an event for the Diamond Jubilee had over 4,000 attendees. It has been a site for open air theatre and a Real Ale and Jazz Festival. It is estimated that annual attendance at the park is a minimum of 500,000.
- The Friends are keen to ensure that any refurbishments and improvements within the park are in keeping with its history and character. It needs to be maintained at a high level of quality.
- In general terms the park need some investment to bring it up to modern standards in terms of public expectations.
- There is a need to provide a new pavilion for the Cricket Club whose ground is within the park.
- The pavilion could also be developed as a social/community space and offer cafe facilities.
- There is a need for on-site public toilets.
- The bowls green and facilities are a significant asset to the city and are in good condition.
- There is a need to replace fencing around the park as it is not currently adequate/secure.
- A number of essential works are currently taking place re health and safety etc. For example, work on the motte and a small wall behind the bowling club; part of the old priory on site is being repaired.
• Access to the park by foot is good but there is limited car parking. There is no aspiration to encourage more visits by car though.
• The City Council have a medium/long term aspiration to take on ownership and management of the park from the District Council, but only when the park is in good condition.
• Jubilee Park is close to the city centre with one boundary being part of the city walls. It is an excellent floral garden and has a small children's play area.

Some wider points covered are noted below:

• Bishops Palace Gardens is a Green Flag Park. It has an active Friends Group and is a valuable asset for the city. Improvements could be made re signposting and publicity as it is a bit tucked away and hard to find.
• There is no Friends Group at Oaklands Park which now has a reduced area of green space as a result of the theatre development. It hosts a very active Rugby Club as well as offering Cricket and Archery.
• Green space needs to be protected and great care must be taken with developments on the outskirts of the city, in particular if this involves development on agricultural sites.
• The city council are compiling an audit of community assets and carrying out a consultation programme to identify priorities for improvements, potential new provision etc. This should be completed within this financial year.
• The City Council are not producing a technical neighbourhood plan and are focussing mainly on influencing the District Councils LDF.
• The City Council is planning to undertake a heritage and cultural based study (as completed in Bath and Chester). This will aim to assess issues around determining a threshold for development beyond which the impact of development would be detrimental to the historic, heritage and cultural character of the City.
• The City has a dynamic Design and Creative industry and a lot of local and visitor interest and economic spend is associated with this e.g. employment, theatre, Pallant Gallery, Museum etc.
• There is a need for an all weather athletics track and the University has built a “J” type track which can be extended to form a full circuit. The Chichester Runners are a very active club.
• Whyke Oval is a priority for a new community hall and play area
• Swanfield Estate is notably short of facilities and public open space. It is not very child friendly and needs improved play/youth facility provision.
• Green space in the Parklands area needs protection from development
Natural England

Natural England have proposed standards for the provision of natural green space called the Accessible Natural Green Space ANGST standard. Some of their main interests in open space studies are noted below:

**Quantity**

Natural England like to see the ANGST standard used as a starting point for natural green space standards but reviewed in the light of local circumstances e.g. to determine what $X$ ha per 1000 is appropriate for Copeland (or sub areas).

Natural England suggests that the catchment/access element of standards is probably more important than quantity from their point of view. They recommended that studies should think about the specific demographics of the area and how this might affect standards. Could standards reflect this e.g. for play $X$ ha per 1000 children rather than general population? They emphasise the importance of being clear about the evidence base upon which standards are being proposed (i.e. what is the justification for varying from the ANGST standard?).

**Quality**

Some key aspects of quality for Natural England are:
- “Natural-ness”
- Connectivity
- Accessibility (physical and psychological)
- Multi-functional e.g. one area of woodland can perform many functions
- Interpretation/signage etc. and appropriate “infrastructure” - benches, gates etc

In looking at local needs and implementation of standards Natural England suggest that it is important to note that the “shape” of the allocation for semi-natural green can just as easily be a long corridor than a “field” type shape.

**Access**

Key points from the Natural England perspective include:
- Geographical access should be in line with the catchment element of standards
- Practical easy access onto and routes to sites are important
- Important to have community engagement to encourage use of sites
- Consider psychological and cultural barriers to use of natural space/countryside e.g. BME/ need for education
- Ensure disability access wherever possible
- Importance of publicity and promotion so that people are aware of where sites are and how to get to them
- Importance of connectivity planning
- Permissive access from urban fringe are important
- Need to make links with the Rights Of Way Improvement Plan
5.2 Survey of local Community Organisations

Views from the organisations relating to their overall opinion of the quality of facilities across the study area are summarised in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category and comments</th>
<th>VERY GOOD</th>
<th>GOOD</th>
<th>AVERAGE</th>
<th>POOR</th>
<th>VERY POOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local recreation grounds or parks</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footpaths, bridleways, cyclepaths, tow paths, disused railways etc.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to the seaside, coast, beaches</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to water recreation e.g. canals, marinas, lakes, ponds etc</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country parks, local countryside, woodlands</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife areas/Nature reserves</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allotments</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Churchyards and cemeteries</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other open space e.g. grassed areas for dog-walking, informal games, picnics etc.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority of groups rate the quality of parks and recreation grounds as good or very good.

Most groups also think that in general the quality of publically accessible woodlands and countryside is high as they do of wildlife areas/nature reserves. Similarly most groups are happy with the quality of access to the seaside/coast/beaches and inland water recreation sites.

A significant number rate at least some footpaths, bridleways, cycle-paths etc as poor and many rate allotment sites as poor.

Specific comments of relevance to parks, natural green space and rights of way included:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Category and comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local recreation grounds or parks</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosham Association</td>
<td>The two small open spaces available to the village are well managed by the NT and residents. However the available size has not kept up with the population increase.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chichester Organic Gardening Society</td>
<td>Oaklands Park excellent; and Transition Chichester has recently planted community fruit trees and ‘wildflower’ meadow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chichester Ship Canal Trust</td>
<td>Parks are good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends of Florence Park</td>
<td>I am very happy with the present provision in Chichester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manhood Wildlife and Heritage Group</td>
<td>The Volunteers managing open space in Selsey have achieved outstanding awards from the Green Pennant Community</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Orchard Street and Old Somerstown Area Residents Association** | In ‘our’ local area the management and improvement of Henty’s Field (the surplus bit of the Central School Playing field now being taken over by the City Council) should be addressed.  
Priory Park is a beautiful place but there is plenty of scope for improving facilities there. |
| **Parklands Residents’ Association (PRA)** | The recent play day during the summer school holidays with a climbing tower organised between CDC and Hyde Martlet was much appreciated and attracted a lot of interest. More please! |
| **Richmond Park Residents Association** | Facilities at the University of Chichester should be more available for public use |
| **Southern Gateway Residents’ Association** | As well as the canal the Bishop’s Palace Gardens are within easy walking distance. These are very well maintained and have recently been given a ‘makeover’ |
| **Tangmere Action Group** | - Within Tangmere village there is a recreation field with a MUGA, skate park, toddlers play area. Outside of this one has to travel to Chichester 3 miles away and local transport provision from Tangmere to Chichester and back is not great  
- Insufficient local open spaces to minimise children playing on streets.  
- Parish Recreation fields suffer from lack of resources to fully maintain (e.g. sufficiently frequent grass cuts to keep height and cuttings at levels that make spaces attractive to use; weed control; hedge and tree pruning). Many lack sufficient boundary measures to prevent unauthorised vehicular access. |
| **Tangmere Community Garden** | More variety of facilities through landscaping |
| **East Broyle Residents Association** | - Yes there enough and EBRA enhances the village green with appropriate planting and coordinates with the council to see that it is well maintained.  
- Priory Park badly needs upgrading in accord with the City councils plan.  
- The proposed small children’s play area at Graylingwell should be situated next to the café/pavilion building (presently used as a sales suite) |
<p>| <strong>Footpaths, bridleways, cycle-paths, tow paths, disused railways etc.</strong> | |
| <strong>Bosham Association</strong> | We are well served by footpaths and bridle paths. On road protection for cyclists is an issue. |
| <strong>British Horse Society</strong> | We do not have enough public rights of way (PRoW), especially bridleways which are usable by all. What is needed is the creation of linking routes to provide a safe network. In general they are maintained as well as funding will allow. Please remember that footpaths can only be used by walkers. Cyclists and equestrians need more PRoW available to them. Better use could be made of waterside paths to make them available to all. |
| <strong>Chichester Cathedral</strong> | The cycle route to the Witterings and neighbouring beaches from Chichester is difficult to negotiate with children. Improving this facility would make the beaches more accessible. |
| <strong>Chichester Conservation Volunteers</strong> | If properly maintained, the area has a sufficient network of footpaths and bridleways. As well as some becoming overgrown, some footpaths are suffering because of use by cyclists and horses. |
| <strong>Chichester Organic Gardening Soc</strong> | Probably need more cyclepaths |
| <strong>Chichester Ship Canal Trust</strong> | Already provided |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Friends of Brandy Hole Copse (FBHC)</td>
<td>There are enough attractive footpaths, and a number of commercial publications testify to this. There is a limited number of cyclepaths, but they are not sufficiently linked. We need to ensure that cyclists can cycle from one side of Chichester to the other without having to switch to roads on which cars drive. Although Chichester does not have responsibility for roads, I believe it should establish a district-wide ‘cycle map’ and then open negotiations with WSCC to get the map properly implemented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends of Florence Park</td>
<td>We have enough good footpaths and bridleways but not as well maintained as they were. The linkage is good - probably need more cycleways. The canal towpath has been much improved and is well used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manhood Wildlife and Heritage Group</td>
<td>The foot paths on the Pagham Harbour Nature Reserve now administered by the RSPB are not being maintained was well as they were by WSCC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orchard Street and Old Somerstown Area Residents Association</td>
<td>Much greater attention should be paid to extending and improving cycleways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parklands Residents’ Association (PRA)</td>
<td>There are some great walks/cyclepaths in the area that are well maintained but there could be more. However we are trying to work constructively with the Roman Palace to find a mutually agreeable solution to the threat to the Fishbourne cycle path. More publicity could be given to these attractive links between town and country.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond Park Residents Association</td>
<td>More and safer cycle routes within Chichester and to villages within a five mile radius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Gateway Residents’ Association</td>
<td>The SCCR passes through Chichester with links north and south, the latter via the canal towpath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tangmere Action Group</td>
<td>No we do not have enough in the villages and they are not well enough maintained, due to budget cuts we are told. Many existing PROW Footpaths and Bridleways poorly drained and surfaced which, along with minimal cutting of summer vegetation growth, inhibits use. Maintenance of existing Cycleways limited (usable widths being encroached by vegetation). Existing Cycleways within urban areas disjointed hence increased journey times. More direct cycle-ways required to facilitate cycle journeys between Chichester and adjacent villages. In Tangmere Parish, potential exists for additional PROW around old Airfield.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tangmere Community Garden</td>
<td>Cycle tracks that do exist are poorly maintained and they should be alongside roads as a matter of course, as on the Continent. If tourism is such a big part of our local economy these sort of facilities would help develop that even further.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Sussex Local Access Forum</td>
<td>Rights of Way links between the town and countryside are severed by the A27 which discourages use. Improvements to the number and type of crossings available to provide safe access are required in order to satisfactorily link the town to the adjoining countryside - allusers should be considered including walkers, cyclists and horse riders. Improvement to the paths along rivers and canals linking them to the wider rights of way network would also increase use by the public. We do not have enough public rights of way (PRoW), especially bridleways which are usable by all. What is needed is the creation of linking routes to provide a safe network. In general they are maintained as well as funding will allow. Please remember that footpaths can only be used by walkers. Cyclists and equestrians need more PRoW available to them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Broyle Residents Association</td>
<td>The lack of a comprehensive plan for the A27 around Chichester prevents any chance of good footway or cycle-way access to and from the south. The rural footpaths are not maintained enough or monitored to ensure that that landowners do not encroach on them, preventing easy access.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Royal Society for the Protection of Birds</td>
<td>Properly signposted and maintained rights of way are an important means of recreation, enabling people to enjoy the countryside and exercise. But care is needed such that increased, unmanaged access does not adversely impact on other interests, such as nature conservation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramblers Sussex Area</td>
<td>Rights of Way links between the town and countryside are severed by the A27 which discourages use. Improvements to the number and type of crossings available to provide safe access are required in order to satisfactorily link the town to the adjoining countryside. Improvement to the paths along rivers and canals and linking them to the wider rights of way network would also increase use by the public.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosham Association</td>
<td>We live in the middle of fabulous countryside.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| British Horse Society               | • Footpaths can only be used by walkers, the links between town and country should be bridleways (usable by walkers, cyclists, equestrians), a high proportion of equestrians live and keep their horses on the urban fringe (frequently in livery yards), and this is also where riding schools tend to be located.
  • Countryside and wildlife can be damaged by inappropriate sport and recreation.                                                                                                                                 |
<p>| Chichester Cathedral                | The cycle route to the Witterings and neighbouring beaches from Chichester is difficult to negotiate with children. Improving this facility would make the beaches more accessible. |
| Chichester Conservation Volunteers  | There are some excellent accessible wildlife areas around the District thanks to the voluntary efforts of the Sussex Wildlife Trust, National Trust, Chichester Harbour Conservancy, RSPB etc. Our organisation works in many of these areas to conserve the plants and wildlife, as do local groups. It is really important that these are preserved and protected from future development. The footpaths are a mixed bag - some good and well-used, others overgrown and neglected. |
| Chichester Ship Canal Trust         | Plenty of such provision.                                                                                                                                                                         |
| Friends of Brandy Hole Copse (FBHC) | Brandy Hole Copse is a small nature reserve consisting of 6.5 hectares of managed woodland. It is bounded by housing on the north and east, and there are proposals to build more houses further south. The Friends are opposing these, especially those to the West of Centurion Way, as it wants both to preserve the natural environment, and to establish a nature improvement area as indicated in our response to question 3b. Many schoolchildren and teenagers illegally use Brandy Hole Copse for camping and ‘bushcraft’ games. We would like to stop this. One way would be for CD to provide suitable additional facilities for camping and bushcraft activities in areas where they would not damage countryside or wildlife. |
| Friends of Florence Park            | Centurian Way provides excellent link to Lavent and North. Good footpaths abound Sports should be mainly in Chichester - recreational activity fits better into countryside |
| Manhood Wildlife and Heritage Group | There is a lot of scope to improve things with respect to the Medmerry coastal realignment project ie bridleways, cycleways, footpaths Wildlife can be damaged if facilities are badly placed. Despite the concerns for wildlife near the Bracklesham Bay centre, the facility went ahead without due care |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Chichester Open Space Study</strong></th>
<th><strong>Part 2 - Needs Assessment</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| **Parklands Residents’ Association (PRA)** | The area west of Centurion Way is a fantastic resource for residents of Parklands and is much used and valued. We made the point in last year’s consultation on the Local Development Framework of the need to keep this area free from development (the White House Farm site) as it provides a vital buffer from urban sprawl, protects biodiversity and makes the area an attractive place to live, work and learn. |
| **Southern Gateway Residents’ Association** | Once past the A27 the canal is a peaceful wildlife haven |
| | **Tangmere Action Group** |
| | • You need a car and be prepared to travel the A27 which we all know is more than not very congested |
| | • Is it appropriate for wildfouling with firearms to continue in sensitive wildlife areas? What is the impact of marine leisure activities on wildlife (e.g. wash from boats going over habitats?). |
| | • A difficult balance that needs careful planning. However facilities are a requirement if expansion and headcount are increasing. One goes hand in hand with the other. Not development at any cost, to the environment and the community. |
| **East Broyle Residents Association** | We have excellent, easy to get too, immediately adjacent countryside and wildlife areas, constantly threatened by the unchecked, rapacious, unnecessary building programme of the Councils |
| | Any intrusion by humans affects other animals. Modern humans with no empathy with other animals are totally destructive. The more machine enhanced a sport is, the smaller the space, and the greater the frequency, the greater the damage. |
| **The Royal Society for the Protection of Birds** | Access to such sites is important, but careful management may be necessary. Wildlife and wildlife sites can be damaged by inappropriate recreational activities. The impact of recreational disturbance on wildlife and wildlife sites depends on the nature of the activity, the receptor species/sites, time of year and state of tide for example. Different sites/species will also be subject to different levels of protection ranging from none, to local, national and international. All these factors need to be taken into account in developing appropriate and environmentally sustainable recreation strategies. Depending on the nature of the issue, appropriate measures might include zoning in space and/or time, encouraging particular behaviours (eg dogs on leads) or providing suitable alternative space to accommodate particular activities. |
| | The RSPB is in the process of developing its new reserve at Pagham Harbour, and in due course, at nearby Medmerry. We aim to maintain and enhance the nature conservation interests of these sites, whilst at the same time providing appropriately managed access and interpretation to enable visitors to enjoy both sites. |

| **Allotments and Other Green Spaces,** |
| **Chichester Organic Gardening Society** | Allotments could be better managed |
| **Friends of Brandy Hole Copse (FBHC)** | I would like to see a ‘civic allotment area’ established in a suitable venue. |
| **Friends of Florence Park** | The city council have a waiting list for allotments. |
| **Parklands Residents’ Association (PRA)** | The new allotments at Durnford Close have been a big success. We would now like to plant a native species hedgerow along the boundary to protect it from vandalism. |
5.3 Parks, Green Spaces and Rights of Way - Key Findings

Use

- Of all the open space, sport and recreation facilities covered in the study it is the footpath, bridleway, and cyclepath network that is commonly and most regularly used by most households.
- The seaside, coast and beaches as well as country parks/countryside and woodlands are also accessed at least monthly by over 70% of households.
- Other spaces used on an almost daily basis by many households are the local parks/recreation grounds and “other open spaces” e.g. grassed areas for dog-walking, informal games, picnics etc.
- Play areas, areas for water recreation and wildlife areas/nature reserves are also fairly frequently used but with fewer households using them on a regular basis.
- Over 40% of allotment users visit at least weekly.

Quantity

- CDC parks officers suggest that overall, in terms of parks and green spaces provision there is no significant shortfall in the quantity of provision but quality is very variable - need for improvement in many areas.
- A majority of residents think there is a need for more outdoor facilities for teenagers and nearly half of households thought that there were not enough footpaths, bridleways, cyclepaths etc.
- Other aspects where there was a significant view of there being a shortfall were wildlife/nature reserves, allotments, and country parks/accessible countryside.
- Specifically there appear to be insufficient allotment plots available in Chichester.
- Many sources indicate an issue with the lack of cycle-path provision within and across the central Chichester City area.
- There is a reported shortage of bridleways and links between such.

Quality

- Facilities where the quality is rated good or very good by over 60% of households include parks/recreation grounds, country parks/countryside/woodlands and wildlife areas/nature reserves. Over 50% rated access to beaches/cost/seaside similarly.
- The majority of community groups rate the quality of parks and recreation grounds as good or very good.
- Most groups also think that in general the quality of publically accessible woodlands and countryside is high as they do of wildlife areas/nature reserves. Similarly most groups are happy with the quality of access to the seaside/coast/beaches and inland water recreation sites.
- Bishops Palace Gardens is a Green Flag Park and the Place survey indicated that about 80% of residents are very or fairly happy with provision of parks and open spaces - a higher proportion than West Sussex as a whole, the South East and England.
- The Volunteers managing open space in Selsey have achieved outstanding awards from the Green Pennant Community Award (4 years running); achieved gold standard in SE
Britain in Bloom (4 years running); and been awarded the Queen’s Commendation for Voluntary Service in 2010.

- The factors the groups most value in parks and open spaces are appropriate levels of maintenance, adequate control of dogs/freedom from dog fouling and feeling safe and secure.
- The quality of footpaths, bridleways and cyclepaths are very variable across the study area. A significant number of groups rate at least some footpaths, bridleways, cycle-paths etc as poor.
- Many community organisations rate some allotment sites as being of poor quality.
- Management of the City open spaces in general may benefit from a more varied cutting regime better suited to biodiversity - too much close cropped grass, for example.

Access

- Many community groups highlighted the importance of parks and open spaces being easy to get to for all members of the community; and the need for there being good links - by footpaths and cycleways - to them and between them.
- 74% of residents confirmed that they would be prepared to walk/cycle further if the quality of the route was improved and a similar proportion said that if the quality of the route was improved they would make the journey more often.
- The need for enabling easier physical access to parks and the countryside for disabled people has been highlighted by many stakeholders.

Priorities/Other Issues

- The priority highlighted by the most households (by a significant margin) for potential improvement/new provision was for better footpaths, bridleways and cyclepaths; followed by access to the seaside/coast/beaches.
- Other notable priorities for improvement highlighted by significant numbers were country parks/countryside/ woodlands, parks/recreation grounds and children’s play areas.
- Specifically, many sources highlight the need and potential for improvements at Priory Park.
- The Friends of Groups are very active and their valuable contribution should be recognised.
- Natural England stress the need to take into account the ANGSt standard as a starting point for developing a standard for natural and semi-natural green space. Variation from this standard should be justified.
- The Rights of Way Improvement Plan highlights many priorities for footpaths, cycle routes and bridleways.
- It is important to promote the value of walking and cycling and the use of open spaces and rights of way in relation to their benefits to health, and to encourage community involvement.
6. CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE

Introduction

This section includes findings related to:

- The Chichester Play Strategy
- Stakeholder interviews.
- Community Organisations Survey
- The role of schools and colleges

6.1 Findings from the Chichester Play Strategy

Though the timeframe of the play strategy is just out of date its findings are still relevant and important to take on board in the current study. Some of the main findings from the strategy that are still current are highlighted in the box below:

Some Findings from the Play Strategy

- Ownership of play sites across the district is varied including CDC, Parish Councils, Registered Social Landlords and management committees.
- The situation is that the level and quality of fixed play provision is reasonable but it is very noticeable that the play areas owned and managed by Registered Social Landlords are worse in most aspects, although they were better from a security perspective due to them often being overlooked by residential properties.
- There is a lot of provision for young children, but very limited provision for older young people. There are also few play areas of any significant size provided in the district either in the form of supervised adventure play or unsupervised play areas.
- Consultation with the providers of fixed equipped play areas showed that there is a large variance between the parishes in terms of their current knowledge, skills, and ability to provide play opportunities. Some parishes clearly have more capacity than others, but all are in need of a person, or organisation, at District level or higher, that can provide a co-ordinating, strategic role to deliver play across the district.
- In relation to the demographics of the area it showed that there were some gaps in provision in some rural locations but the Parish Council’s in those areas were not in a position financially or otherwise to provide fixed play provision.

Policy

An analysis of the audit data identified gaps in provision, and this information was used by the play partnership to identify the priorities and proposed projects to improve play provision within the district. The Play Partnership devised five Play Policy statements to help scope and shape the Strategy. In no order of priority they were to:

1. Develop a strategic approach to play provision throughout the District, through partnership working
2. Improve some of the existing play facilities to challenge, interest and increase enjoyment and fun for children and young people
3. Increase provision of, and access to, play facilities and opportunities for older children and young people
4. Support existing play provision for children and young people, including those with disabilities
5. Explore opportunities for supervised play and outreach playwork throughout the district

All of these policy statements remain important though funding to implement a realistic action plan is much reduced.

6.2 Stakeholder Interviews

CDC Senior Community Engagement Officer

David Hyland, the District Council’s Senior Community Engagement Officer highlighted that “provision for Children and Young People has significantly suffered over recent years and there has been significant disinvestment in designated space for them, with a number of youth clubs and buildings. It has been proven that designated or exclusive space for young people has significant advantages in participation and usage, but single use buildings are expensive to maintain without the additional income that alternative usage would draw in. In addition, the community led, big society expectations of delivery in the future lends itself to activity in generic or existing community spaces, with resources stretched simply to maintain sessions. I can’t foresee much community aspiration for creating exclusive youth spaces, which is very sad”.

West Sussex County Council Youth Service

We spoke to Stuart Kingsley who is the Senior Youth Worker for the Chichester area and is currently based at the Chichester Youth Wing on the Chichester High Schools’ campus.

He explained that the service works to a “Youth Support and Development model” aimed at targeting the county’s most vulnerable young people with its centres based in areas of highest need. It therefore works primarily on early intervention and prevention work with young people, for example, targeting support to young people not in education, employment or training (NEETs). It also provides specialist services to prevent offending or re-offending. The priority target age is 13-19 within a broader age band of 11-25.

The service used to provide a more “universal” offer to young people but recent reductions in budget has led to the decision to target work. There is still some “open access provision” e.g. the Youth Wing has open access sessions on Tuesdays and Thursdays. It still supports 2 village clubs whereas 2 years ago it supported 6. The service is still facing further review and reorganization.

Youth services also provide a support service to voluntary sector youth clubs e.g. re CRB checks, advice on setting up new clubs etc.

There is a mobile youth unit covering the north of the District.

Some issues highlighted were:

- With the focus on targeted work in areas of high youth population and disadvantage there is a danger that young people in the rural areas miss out - important to provide something for them
• There has been successful partnership working with the District Council e.g. work with leisure services on a joint summer activity programme/youth work initiative covering the whole district. The Youth service is keen to develop such work. Another such project is a joint alcohol awareness project.
• A new project is planned to work with Gypsy/traveller families - again such groups face particular issues in relation to access to youth and leisure services
• The housing associations are responsible for quite a lot of open space in the district and the audit should include their land.
• There is an important new detached youth work project about to get underway focused on 3 “hot spot areas” within Chichester where young people congregate (Parklands, Swanfield and Florence Park). This is a good opportunity to gather young people’s views on needs re open space, leisure provision etc.
• The new provision in Wick ward is a good example of high quality outdoor youth facilities (skatepark etc. There was also good consultation with young people on this development. Further development still in progress on this site.
• Cost and transport are two key barriers for many young people re access to leisure opportunities e.g. swimming. Though Chichester District in general is quite affluent there are pockets of disadvantage.
• Stuart noted that young people travel up to 30 minutes by foot to access the youth wing and that this was about the maximum they should be expected to (for major facilities)
• Young people are quite territorial so this also needs to be taken into account - they may not be prepared to travel far to facilities that they do not see as being within their “territory”
• Stuart highlighted the need for more MUGAs, open space youth facilities etc that everyone recognize as being “for them”. Places where it is seen by all the community as appropriate for young people to meet.
• Such areas should be safe and well lit and not “on the edge” of everything else. Important not to give the impression that young people are outcasts from the rest of the community!
• Young people need to actively engaged in the nature, location and design of such facilities
• Where possible such facilities should be placed within a wider area that also provides for younger children so that older and younger children can meet together.
• There are some good and active voluntary sector clubs in Chichester e.g. the Boys Club (Clubs for Young People). Also various uniformed and faith based clubs.
• The youth service also offers support to clubs through “volunteer co-ordinators” and there is a senior manager with responsibility for liaising with the voluntary sector.
• There is also a youth information van that visits Priory Park on a regular basis (Tuesday evenings)

West Sussex Council for Voluntary Youth services (WSCVYS)

We spoke to Lisa Rumbold who is the play contact for West Sussex Council for Voluntary Youth services. She also supports the West Sussex Play Forum. Up until last year she was the District
Council’s Play Development Officer. Independent of WSCVYS she also delivers community play activities for public, voluntary and private sector clients under the badge of “Playmosaic”.

Lisa previously convened a Chichester Play Partnership as part of her District Council responsibility and provided us with contact details of its membership groups. These groups were included in our play and youth organisations survey.

She highlighted some examples of good play provision in the district:

- South Harting in the north west of the district (funded through the Playbuilder programme). Good design with challenging play opportunities. Good process of community consultation and involvement.
- Priory Park - new and more adventurous play opportunities provided integrating play within the wider park environment. Good consultation process involving children from local schools.
- Sidlesham in the south of the district involved an active local group through the parish council leading to a play area well suited to local need.
- Whyke Oval - good provision for older teenagers. Consultation involved young people from the Chichester Youth Wing. This is part of a broader project to improve facilities in the area including efforts to provide a community hall.
- Manor Park in Selsey has an area fenced for dogs rather that fencing around the play area.

A couple of key areas needing attention were mentioned:

- Whyke Oval - the play area for younger children is very poor and is a priority for improvement
- At Jubilee park there is a very poor play space in need of improvement or relocation (possibly to New Park Rd site).

Some key issues mentioned:

- Need to consider the most recent play audit undertaken by the District Council - this updated an audit completed as part of the previous District Play Strategy.
- Rural provision is important - this needs to be covered parish by parish
- Good, safe access to play space is vital e.g. consideration of road crossings etc
- There is a need to address the problem of small-scale developments incrementally leading to the need for neighbourhood play spaces (which individually they do not). E.g. At Swanfield.
- Provision by housing associations needs to be considered. Sometimes play areas have been closed without alternatives being provided e.g. at Tangmere
- In broad terms the Council planning system should adhere to the guidance provided in Play England’s Better Places to Play through Planning.
- Local access standards for Play space should be based on the Play England model of Doorstep, Local and Neighbourhood playable space.
- Quality standards should be based on the Play England guidance Design for Play and follow the recommended process for development. Good consultation with young people
and the local community is essential. Costs associated with this should be built into developer contributions.

- The brief for a new play space project is very important. The Priory Park brief is a good example to consider in relation to future projects (though it could have been improved more in line with Play England guidance).
- The West Sussex County Play Strategy should be considered as well as the (expired) District Play strategy. There is a need for a new district Play Strategy.
- Play provision and planning should be integral to a holistic approach including spatial planners, leisure services, transport, regeneration etc. It is not only play area provision - the wider public space should be child friendly and “playable” as much as possible e.g. homezones.
- Play spaces should be constantly e.g. annually reviewed and amended in relation to changing local need. This should be suggested in any supplementary planning guidance.
- Areas of particular need in relation to play include Tangmere, Chichester East and Selsey.
- It would be useful in the planning process if there was an automatic consultee organisation with an interest in play who would be consulted in relation to appropriate planning applications e.g. the Chichester Community Alliance

Some general barriers to play as regards access were:

- Traffic and access that is not perceived as safe by children and parents
- Dogs not being managed in relation to play space

Other points and issues:

- A new play area is being installed soon at the Fishbourne Centre in Fishbourne village. This has followed a good consultation process with children and the local community
- The grants team (Claire Hurst) at the District Council may be aware of some potential play/youth projects currently seeking funding

Play England

We discussed general policy issues with a national officer from Play England, Steve Chown. He made some broad observations about overall policy direction and advice on local standards.

Quantity

Play England are keen to see a range of play spaces in all urban environments:
- A Door-step spaces close to home
- B Local play spaces - larger areas within easy walking distance
- C Neighbourhood spaces for play - larger spaces within walking distance
- D Destination/family sites - accessible by bicycle, public transport and with car parking

Quality

Play England would like the new Play England Design Guide *Design for Play* to be referenced and added as a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). Steve also pointed out that Play England had developed a *Quality Assessment Tool* that can be used to judge the quality of individual play spaces. He recommended that Chichester consider adopting this as a means of assessing the quality of play spaces in the District.
Access

Access is the key element for Play England as referred to in the Quantity section - a range of doorstep, local, neighbourhood, and destination play spaces with appropriate catchments. Steve also pointed out the need for standards for smaller settlements and rural areas where the doorstep, local, neighbourhood, and destination hierarchy is unlikely to be appropriate.

Disability access is also an important issue for Play England and they would like Chichester to adopt the KIDS publication *Inclusion by Design* as an SPD.

Priorities

Steve referred to the recent guidance document produced by Play England *Better Places to Play through Planning*. The publication gives detailed guidance on setting local standards for access, quantity and quality of playable space. It also shows how provision for better play opportunities can be promoted in planning policies and processes; giving detail of how local development frameworks and planning control can be utilised in favour of child-friendly communities. He recommended that Chichester adopt this guidance generally in terms of play and spatial planning.

6.3 Young People Focus Group

In October we met with a group of 17 local young people at the Chichester Youth Wing. The group were aged from 13 to 17 with an average age of 15. It was a mixed group of 10 girls and 7 boys. Some of the key observations and points raised included:

Outdoor spaces - General points

- The areas of public space that the largest numbers of young people commonly used were the city centre, near local shops, on the street and local parks/play areas. This illustrates the importance of planning “child-friendly” public space beyond simply play areas, youth facilities etc.
- More than a third of the group did use local youth shelters/seated areas, MUGAs, kickabout areas and playing fields on a regular basis.
- More than half of the group thought that there were not enough play areas and youth facilities to meet the needs of children and young people.
- A clear majority of the group thought that the play areas and youth facilities that did exist were well maintained and of good quality.
- A clear majority agreed that they would be happy to walk a bit further to somewhere bigger, where there are more things to do and there are more interesting facilities on offer.
- On the other hand, a clear majority also reported that they liked the nearest place that they visit to “hang out” and that it is more important to keep this than have something more exciting a bit further away.
- The last two points illustrate the need to have both local spaces to play/hang out as well as a “strategic” network of more exciting and interesting youth facilities.
- A clear majority indicated that they would very much like to have their say in how new facilities were built and how existing spaces can be improved.
Outdoor spaces - priorities

We did an exercise to identify the young people’s views on priorities for new and/or improved provision. This indicated that their top priorities were:

- Play areas with more challenging equipment for teenagers
- Safe places to meet, to sit and chat with friends; youth shelters.
- Bigger open spaces to visit and use.

Other priority spaces for improvement, highlighted by at least half of the group were:

- Local equipped play areas with swings, slides, roundabouts, climbing frames.
- Wild, natural areas (e.g. less maintained grassed areas with ponds, trees for climbing, sand/mud etc.)
- More places to cycle and safe cycle paths to places to visit and hang out.

Indoor Provision

- Over two thirds reported that they made use of local swimming pools, leisure centres as well as the youth club.
- Well over half of the group said that they were involved with sports clubs or some kind of sports activity.
- About a third reported that they attended scouts/guides and/or took part in arts, music or dance activities.
- The quality of both swimming pools and leisure centres was rated as very good or good by a clear majority. No-one said quality was poor. The Youth Wing was rated “very good” by the largest number of young people.
- The young people expressed a lot of concern over the loss of youth services and dedicated youth clubs over the last few years and had a particular fear that the Young Wing club may be next in line. Their view was that youth clubs provided a great service to young people and that it was important to keep them going.
- The top priorities for improvements were swimming pools, leisure centres and youth clubs. The next priority highlighted by most young people was for improvements/new provision of arts, music and dance activities.

6.4 Community Organisations Survey

The Community and Youth Organisations survey provided groups’ views on the general quality of play and youth facilities across the study area as noted in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Very Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local recreation grounds or parks</td>
<td>3 12 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children’s play areas</td>
<td>5 6 4 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor facilities for teenagers (e.g. youth shelters, skate parks, BMX etc)</td>
<td>1 3 3 4 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is clear that the majority of the groups think that looking at the study area as a whole the quality of parks and play areas is regarded as good in contrast to facilities for teenagers which many regard as poor.

Some of the specific comments from the survey were directly relevant to play facilities for children and young people as noted below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Library Service</td>
<td>Need more active youth groups</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Chichester Children and Family Centre      | • Need to improve activities and opportunities for teenagers. Need for more indoor facilities for teenagers  
• Facilities should be age appropriate, considering how interest in leisure activities change as children get older. They should where possible, cater for all ages. |
| Home-Start Chichester & District           | • We need more spaces where youths feel able to relax in appropriate ways.  
• When children / youths are simply enjoying play in these areas they should not be shouted at by older members of the community when they are not actually doing any harm... just being children and playing |
| Bosham Association                        | The Recreation Ground has a nominal play area for younger children. The Bosham Sailing Club and Cobnor Activities provide excellent opportunities for youngsters who want to go afloat |
| Chichester Cathedral                      | I would like to see more sporting opportunities routinely made available for disabled children. It would be worth liaising with St Anthony’s School in Chichester on this point. |
| Chichester Organic Gardening Society       | Children’s area in Priory Park very good. Better to concentrate on a few large ones like this.                                            |
| Chichester Ship Canal Trust                | Need more for teenagers                                                                                                                 |
| Friends of Florence Park                  | Maybe there is not enough for adventurous play but we have good play areas in the parks and housing estates                                  |
| Parklands Residents’ Association (PRA)    | We appreciate that there are lots of other facilities nearby (Westgate Leisure Centre and Skatepark for instance), but many of the local children want somewhere closer with a range of activities (for girls as well as boys). Play equipment which might appeal to slightly older children/early teenage has been installed on Sherborne Road playing field but I am not sure if this would count as adventurous play. More youth and community facilities or activities would always be welcome but we recognise the need of other areas as well and know that the budgets are limited. We would welcome the chance to work with the Council on improving our area to the benefit of all. |
| Richmond Park Residents Association        | Proposals for any play areas creates a lobby group against because of alleged noise and nuisance issues. Existing facilities do not generally give rise to many complaints. Additional facilities are needed, but possibly small scale play areas are better than large elaborate ones. Smaller ones are more controllable and may provoke less hostility in the planning stages. Fashions change in the kinds of facilities which are likely to be popular. Putting under 8 year-olds play equipment together with those of interest to 13-14 year olds is a recipe for problems |
| Tangmere Action Group                      | Apart from that which the village provides Chichester is the nearest location.                                                          |
| Tangmere                                   | Few accessible by foot without transport. Access to areas of wildlife, space and                                                          |
Community Garden

Green lungs, for dog walkers, cyclists and kids wanting to kick a ball, should be everywhere.

Assessment of whether existing provision in Towns/Villages complies with Fields in Trust ("6 acre") standards required. Closer scrutiny of planning applications to ensure overall area, pitch size and range of provision as well as location/relation to adjacent dwellings and roads needed. Issues arise where incremental residential development leads to cumulative shortfalls (e.g. current CDC Service Infrastructure SPG only requires individual developments >200 dwellings to provide recreation field, however e.g. 2 x 50 and 1 x 100 house developments in same locality would not. Current Section 106 policies are leading to financial contributions only being sufficient to refurbish/improve existing facilities but not provide land for additional facilities to match expanding population.

East Broyle Residents Association

The provision of small children’s play areas within 150 metres of homes is welcome. BMX/Skate parks need to be further away and within sound proofing walls.

6.5 School and Colleges

6.5.1 University of Chichester

Consultations were undertaken with Mike Lauder, Head of Sport and Exercise Sciences and with Sid Fletcher, Sport Development Manager for the Student Union. Key points included:

- New sports facilities are opening in October 2012, namely the new lightweight structure Dome comprising 4 indoor tennis courts and 3 netball courts (cushioned floor), the new athletics track ‘J’ section comprising the straight and one bend (and pavilion facilities), with new sports laboratories to be completed in 2013
- These facilities supplement the existing 4 badminton court sports hall (cushioned floor), 15 station fitness gym plus Olympic weights room, comprehensive indoor and outdoor climbing walls, full size floodlit Artificial Grass Pitch and grass sports pitches for football and rugby
- With priority for the University’s teaching and learning programmes, limited controlled community club use on all of these facilities is available
- Extended community use of the facilities may be achieved in the future following proposed improvements to access to the site
- It is proposed that the Athletics Track will be completed when funding and improved site access is achieved
- The University has developed a Sport England funded Get Active team and programme now in its second year which has successfully increased participation from within and outside the University in sports activities with close links to governing bodies of sport and other club and community activities
- The University has developed close links with Chichester Football Club to support its development, management and resources
- The Student Union has developed strong links with leagues, sports programmes, numerous local Sports Clubs across Sussex, and NGB links; new Higher Education pilot schemes have been launched including a University Netball Officer, and University Club Mark.
- The University led a major Watersports Centre Feasibility Study in 2011 with partners Arun District Council and Bourne Leisure (Butlin’s South Coast World) establishing need and demand for a range of watersports (Sailing, Kite Surfing, Wind Surfing, Rowing, Powerboats) and sand sports (Beach Volleyball, Football, Rigby, and children’s sand activities) to be potentially based in Bognor Regis close to the University’s Bognor Campus and the Butlin’s holiday resort.
The University recognises the need for a 3G (third generation) artificial turf pitch in Chichester for both football training and matches, subject to league approval. Resurfacing its own sand-filled ATP pitch at the Bishop Otter Campus could be an option or Oaklands Park could provide an alternative location. (This could be a 4G ATP meeting national governing body specifications for both football and rugby training if located in Oaklands Park and shared with the Chichester Rugby Club for example). Other locations in Chichester could be considered subject to a more detailed review.

6.5.2 Chichester College

We spoke to Julie Sleeman who is the Chief Operating Officer for the College. The key points from the discussions are noted below:

**Facilities**

Julie confirmed that the main facilities at the college available for community use were:
- Indoor Sports Centre (4 court)
- Climbing Wall
- Gym and Fitness suite
- Floodlit ATP (used for Hockey and Football)
- Tennis courts (hard-surface - not floodlit)
- Rugby pitch
- Trim-trail

**Community use and Sports Development**

The college were committed to long-term community use of the above facilities (balanced with the college’s own curriculum use).

They also undertook sports development work with younger children outside of the college curriculum. In particular they provided a Rugby Academy and Football Academy that offered coaching and sports development opportunities to the wider community.

**Supply and Demand**

Currently the college has sufficient facilities to meet demand but there are a number of “pinch points” when they are at full capacity e.g., Wednesday afternoons. The gym and fitness suite are also near to capacity.

**Potential developments**

There were three areas of interest for potential future development.

- The college would like to provide a new 3G ATP on the college grounds (space available). No funding available though so mainly an aspiration rather than a firm plan.
- They would like to expand their gym/fitness facility but no funding available.
- There have also been discussions about the feasibility of establishing a Boxing Academy at the College but again there were no specific plans.
6.5.3 School Sports Partnership

We spoke to Kate Smith of the West Sussex (West) Schools Sports Partnership. The SSP supports and coordinates sports development in both secondary schools and their feeder primaries. Some key points raised are noted below:

- All of the secondary schools in the study area (Bishop Luffa, Chichester High School for Girls, Chichester High School for Boys, Bourne Community College, Manhood Community College (Selsey) have some level of community use of their sports facilities outside of the school day. Few (other than Bourne) have a formal community use agreement guaranteeing long-term community use.
- Each school is responsible for its own arrangements for community use, setting fees, taking bookings etc. All have a positive attitude to use by the wider community. Systems are normally arranged by the school bursar/business manager in liaison with the head of PE. Most schools also appreciate community use as providing an element of income.
- Schools also see community use by clubs as a good opportunity for developing constructive links with local sports clubs and they often benefit from such links in terms of access to coaches etc.
- The most common community use of the school sports facilities is the sports hall by regular groups and sports clubs e.g. gymnastics, 5-a-side football, badminton, netball, cricket, karate etc. (as compared to casual pay and play type systems). The ATPs also tend to have a high level of community use for football and hockey.
- Some schools provide community use of outdoor grass sports pitches but this is less common.
- All the school sports halls of a good standard and quality and are in good condition (all being built within the last 5 years).
- Bourne Community College is the site for Bourne Leisure Centre which is managed by Westgate Leisure for the District council). This has full community use.
- The schools also use club facilities for inter-school competitions e.g. Rugby
- There is potential to develop stronger links between the SSP and the District Council’s Sports Development team. This is quite weak at the moment and there is a need to improve communication and liaison. The Community Sports Network used to provide a useful forum but this has not met for a few years (does it still exist?).

6.6 Access to play and youth facilities for disabled children

Access to play and leisure for disabled young people has been highlighted by various stakeholders as a key issue and in relation to improvements for the future the following box provides findings from a valuable research study undertaken by the Joseph Rowntree foundation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disabled teenagers’ experiences of access to inclusive leisure (Joseph Rowntree Foundation - Pippa Murray -2003)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leisure is a key area in paving the way towards full community inclusion and participation. It takes on an additional significance for disabled young people when barriers to full participation in education and employment result in them having more time for leisure pursuits whilst simultaneously experiencing greater difficulty in accessing leisure services, activities, and pastimes. This research project consulted with over 100 disabled teenagers to uncover their experience of ‘inclusive leisure’. The teenagers said that:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


• Disabled young people felt that their experiences at school/college strongly affected their access to friends and leisure outside school.
• Many young disabled people described their lives being tainted with the experiences of isolation, loneliness and exclusion.
• Whereas professionals viewed inclusive leisure as a means of learning life skills, increasing independence and/or self-esteem, young people focused on friendships and fun.
• Whilst wanting to participate in ordinary, mainstream leisure activities, disabled young people welcomed the opportunity to meet with each other in order to share their mutual experience.
• Lack of appropriate support (such as transport, personal assistance, and support to facilitate and/or interpret communication) was a major barrier to the participation of disabled young people in ordinary leisure activities. This was particularly apparent for disabled young people with complex impairments and high support needs.
• Beyond the specific experience of exclusion due to impairment, the interests and concerns of disabled young people are no different from those of non-disabled teenagers.

In addition Play England referred to an excellent publication published by KIDS (which is a national voluntary organisation promoting improved access to play for disabled children and young people) called *Inclusion by Design*. This document supplies very good practical guidance in relation to inclusive design of play and youth facilities.

### 6.7 Children, Young People and Colleges/Schools - Key Findings

#### Quantity

• Of all the categories of open space sports and recreation facilities it is the need for more outdoor facilities for teenagers that is most frequently highlighted by households (58% report that there are not enough of such facilities).
• There is also a shortage of indoor youth facilities such as youth clubs. A number of County Council centres have closed over recent years and more closures are anticipated.
• About a third of households also think there are not enough play areas.
• The provision of play and youth facilities in the parishes is very varied and a number of parishes report a shortage of such facilities.

#### Quality

• Most residents and community groups rate the quality of play areas as good or very good as do the majority of community organisations.
• In contrast the majority opinion of residents and groups as regards outdoor youth facilities is that the quality is poor or very poor.
• A number of parishes highlight the need to improve the quality of local play and youth facilities.
• There is a need for play spaces to provide more challenging and “risky” play opportunities, particularly for older children.
• There is need to ensure that the design of play and youth facilities is inclusive as regards use by disabled children and young people.
Access

• The need for improved transport to facilities for children and young people (particularly in the rural areas) and safe walking and cycling routes to play opportunities.
• It is important that younger children have access to some kind of play space within easy walking distance from home and that teenagers have access to spaces to hang out independently with friends.
• It appears that children and young people will walk and cycle further to access more interesting sites and these will therefore have a larger “catchment”. Young people will walk further than younger children to access such sites.
• Disability - need for a mix of greater inclusivity re all play facilities and schemes; and special provision at the request/preference of the children/young people

Colleges and Schools

• The University, College and the local secondary schools are key providers in relation to publically accessible sports and leisure opportunities.
• There is potential for greater community use of these facilities.
• There is potential to improve co-ordination between the University, College, Schools and the District Council. The Community Sports Network could provide a good forum in this respect; but it is not currently meeting.
• The School Sports Partnership is helping create good links between sports clubs and schools.

Other Issues and priorities

• Improvements or new provision of outdoor youth facilities is one of the top three priorities identified through the household survey.
• Children and teenagers play and hang out regularly “on the street”, near local shops, etc as well as on spaces planned for play and recreation. The study should therefore highlight planning related issues aimed at making the wider residential environment more child-friendly.
• A key barrier to teenagers’ use of “public” open space is that they are often moved on by nearby residents and authorities such as the police. They need more tolerance and places recognised as “theirs”.
• Play England provide excellent guidance on play and spatial planning; play space design; a Quality Assessment Tool for play spaces; and managing risk in play. Some of these could be adopted as guidance and Supplementary Planning Documents.
• There is potential for more community (extended) use of school facilities for play (after school, weekends and during holidays).
7. CONCLUDING REMARKS

The survey work, stakeholder consultation, desk-based research and group sessions has highlighted a wide range of issues of value to the wider open space study. There is a strong degree of consistency across the various sources on key areas of local need and aspiration from which we can be confident that the findings are robust and reliable, providing a strong evidence base to be combined with the detailed facilities audit.

Open Spaces

Some overall points of interest relating to open spaces include:

- The relative popularity (usage) of various forms of informal open space and rights of way in comparison with formal sports facilities though the latter tend to be used by a smaller percentage of the population on a regular basis.
- In terms of quantity most households and community groups report there are enough of the various kinds of open space. However significant numbers reported a shortage of outdoor facilities for teenagers, access to the beach/coast, wildlife/nature reserves, allotments, and country parks/access to the countryside.
- A large number of Parish Councils highlighted a need for additional Multi-Use Games Areas (MUGAs).
- Most individuals and groups report that in general the quality of public open spaces across the district is satisfactory. Exceptions include facilities for teenagers and specialist sports facilities.
- The importance placed by local people on measures to improve safety and security.
- As regards sports pitch and courts provision it is important to consider the supply and demand in relation to the needs of the individual sports.
- Respondents highlight that the quality of sports pitches and outdoor courts is very variable across the District.
- There is great variance in respondents’ apparent willingness to spend time travelling to different types of opportunity and the preferred mode of transport appropriate for each. In drawing up the “access” element of specific local standards for different kinds of open space/facility it is clearly very important to take careful note of all of these findings.
- The rural nature of much of the area and related transport difficulties means that as much as possible needs to be provided locally or opportunities provided to access facilities and activities more readily.
- Problems faced in accessing facilities and opportunities for people with disabilities and limited mobility.
- There is a need to promote initiatives to enable improved community access to and use of the coastal area in an appropriate way.

Some other important factors that have been highlighted consistently through the consultation exercise include:

- The need for improved provision in terms of both quantity and quality for children and young people, in particular for the older age range.
- The need for a 3G artificial turf pitch that can be used for both football and rugby.
- In Chichester city there are insufficient allotment plots to meet current demand.
- The potential for more and better cycling, horse riding and footpath links across the District (a shortage of bridleways and cyclepaths); for example, improved cycle-path links within the central area of Chichester.
• The need for accessibility in both physical and cost terms.
• The potential for greater community use of school facilities.

Built Facilities

Some overall points of interest relating to built facilities include:

• The areas’ village/community halls are used regularly by significant numbers with nearly half of households using them at least monthly. Indoor swimming pools are also used frequently by many residents as are the sports/leisure centres.
• A significant number of households and organisations highlighted a shortage of swimming pool space across the district. In relation to indoor facilities the priority highlighted by the largest number of households for new/improved provision was swimming pools.
• There appears to be a need for various indoor sports training facilities specific to individual sports.
• There is a fairly good distribution of village/community halls across the District but the quality and adequacy of the facilities to meet local need is very varied. Many halls need small extensions and improvements re access etc.
• There appears to be a shortage of indoor facilities for children and youth - there are very few dedicated youth centres and many community/village halls do not provide youth clubs.
• Views on the quality of sports halls and swimming pools is quite varied with nearly 40% deeming them good or very good but over 15% saying quality is poor.
• Discussions with the facility managers suggest that the quality of public indoor sports halls is very varied. In general the quality of secondary school sports halls appears to be good.
• Residents are more likely than not to drive to specialist sports facilities, sports/leisure centres and swimming pools. Walking and cycling are the norm for accessing village/community halls.
• More than 60% of residents would not wish to walk more than 10 minutes to visit a village/community hall. A similar proportion would not drive more than 15 minutes to use a swimming pool or sports hall.
• The University, College and the local secondary schools are key providers in relation to publically accessible indoor sports and leisure opportunities.
• There is potential for greater community use of these facilities.

Some other important factors that have been highlighted consistently through the consultation exercise include:

• Indoor sports halls - within Chichester there is thought to be adequate provision but there is an opportunity to provide greater community access to halls run by the University, College and Schools.
• Across the District there is potential for greater community use of school facilities in general.
• There are a number of gaps in village hall provision, for example, Tangmere where further growth is anticipated yet there has been a deficiency of halls for a number of years.
• There are no regional “strategic” sports facilities currently within the District and it is important that this is not overlooked from a planning point of view. Perhaps a land allocation should be built in for such - e.g. a velodrome, ice skating rink or indoor ski centre.

• The need for accessibility in both physical and cost terms.

• This study does not cover arts, museums, heritage and other cultural facilities. Such facilities will need to be assessed through a different process.