

Rother District Council – setting quantity standards

Field	Comment
National Standards	Details of any existing national standards for each typology usually provided by national organisations e.g. National Playing Fields Association for playing pitches.
Current Provision (per 1,000 population)	This is the current provision in hectares per 1,000 population within the Local Authority area.
Existing Local Standards	There maybe some existing local standards that will need to be taken into account and used as a guidance benchmark when setting new local standards.
Benchmarking	These are figures detailing actual provision and local standards set by PMP within other green space and open space projects and provide another comparison benchmark when setting local standards for other Local Authorities, particularly in Northamptonshire. This is provided as a separate sheet.
Consultation (too much/about right/not enough)	Some statistical information that will come from the household questionnaire and needs to be applied and reported per analysis area to provide some detailed local analysis.
Consultation Comments (Quantity)	<p>A summary of reasons behind peoples choices of whether they feel there provision is about right or not enough in some areas. PPG 17 indicates that where local provision is regarded as inadequate it is important to establish why this is the case. The a feeling of deficiency can sometimes be due to qualitative issues of existing open space sites rather than actual quantity issues.</p> <p>Any other qualitative consultation / information that has been extracted on local needs in terms of quantity of provision e.g. from neighbourhood drop-in sessions and local strategic documents.</p>

APPENDIX Gi – QUANTITY STANDARDS

Field	Comment
PMP Recommendation	PMP recommendation of a local standard for discussion and approval by the client - standard should be in hectares per 1,000 population.
PMP Justification	PMP reasoning and justification for the local standard that has been recommended.
CLIENT APPROVAL	Client to approve local standard before analysis undertaken - any changes in standards at a later date during the project will impact on re-doing calculations, analysis and report - the standards drive the analysis.

PARKS AND GARDENS	
National Standards	No National Standards.
Current Provision ha per 1,000 population (ha)	20.99ha total provision. This equates to 0.25ha per 1,000 population. A substantial amount of this space is located at Bodium Castle (9.86).
Existing Local Standards	No existing local standards.
BENCHMARKING	See attached sheet.
Consultation (too much /about right/not enough)	4% - More than enough. 61% - About right. 11% - Nearly enough. 20% - Not enough.

PARKS AND GARDENS	
<p>'Consultation Comments (quantity)</p>	<p>Household survey: There is an emphasis on the level of provision being enough district-wide (61%). This is reflected across the analysis areas with the exception of East Rother, where 47% consider there to be a shortfall of parks and gardens, suggesting locational deficiencies.</p> <p>With regards reasons for people feeling there are enough parks and gardens, a high number of people stated that there was a good distribution of parks with most areas able to access them. Many people stated that having Egerton Park meant that there was plenty of provision in Bexhill and that residents were fortunate to have access to such a good site. People also appreciated the positive impact the parks had on the areas they lived in.</p> <p>One of the strongest concerns was with the lack of parks in highly residential areas. In Bexhill there is less demand as many people sight the use of the beach as a sufficient amount of open space.</p> <p>Other Consultation: The value of parks is recognised by residents and the council, with some sites having quality issues.</p> <p>Internal consultations that most parishes are content using their recreation grounds as a main open space and there is limited need for new parks, especially in these rural areas. The developments at Pebsham Countryside Park will inevitably increase supply and offer a variety of recreation opportunities. There is a concern amongst Bexhill residents that the supply of parks and open space such as at Galley Hill will diminish with the increase in residential development.</p>

APPENDIX Gi – QUANTITY STANDARDS

PARKS AND GARDENS	
'PMP Recommendation (per 1,000 population)	<p>URBAN STANDARD: 0.43 ha per 1000 population.</p> <p>RURAL STANDARD: 0.71 ha per 1000 population.</p>
PMP Justification	<p>There is a general emphasis on the level of provision being enough and a good level of satisfaction with the quality of existing parks and gardens. There is a general consensus that the current level of supply is sufficient, suggesting that there is an acceptance that traditional parks and gardens provision is not appropriate within the rural villages. East Rother has the most significant shortages (0.04ha per 1,000) although this is a highly rural area that has good access to the provisions within Rye (although this town also requires substantial additional provision). The standard is set at the top end of urban/rural analysis areas respectively in order to protect the current provision and focus upon qualitative improvements.</p> <p>The level of provision in other authorities ranges from 0.51 to 2.85ha per 1000 population, with a number around 0.5ha/1000 population. While the standards may target the lower end of this scale, the significant amount of other relevant open space that offers similar advantages to parks and gardens can balance out this shortfall.</p>
Client Approval	<p>Due to the general levels of satisfaction, it is recommended that this visionary increase is mediated and that maintenance of current sites does not deteriorate because of the need to improve the quantity . This will ensure that the existing level of provision is protected, that locational deficiencies can be prioritised through the application of the accessibility standards (potentially in East Rother where levels of satisfaction were lower) and to ensure there is sufficient park provision to meet increasing demands.</p> <p>The need for a naturalised area of open space/country park will be addressed through the natural and semi-natural open space standard and other sites that provide multi-functional open spaces will be addressed in other typologies but may be referred to within the parks and gardens analysis.</p>
Client Approval	Local Quantity Standard.

APPENDIX Gi – QUANTITY STANDARDS

NATURAL AND SEMI-NATURAL	
National Standards	<p>English Nature Accessible Natural Greenspace Standard (ANGSt) recommends at least 2 ha of accessible natural greenspace per 1,000 people based on no-one living more than: 300m from nearest natural greenspace / 2km from a site of 20ha / 5km from a site of 100ha / 20km from a site of 500ha</p> <p>English Nature Accessible Natural Greenspace Standard (ANGSt) recommends 1 ha of LNR per 1,000 population.</p> <p>The Woodland Trust states: no person should live more than 500m from at least one area of accessible woodland of no less than 2ha in size and that there should be at least one area of accessible woodland of no less than 20ha within 4km (8km round-trip) of people's homes.</p>
Current Provision ha per 1,000 population (ha)	15.35 per 1000 population overall.
Existing Local Standards	No existing standards.
BENCHMARKING	See attached sheet.
Consultation (too much / about right / not enough)	<p>9% - More than enough.</p> <p>54% - About right.</p> <p>11% - Nearly enough.</p> <p>20% - Not enough.</p>

NATURAL AND SEMI-NATURAL	
<p>'Consultation Comments (quantity)</p>	<p>Household survey:</p> <p>There is mixed opinion as to whether the provision of natural and semi-natural open space is enough – 54% feel it is about right compared to 20% who feel there is not enough. Across the analysis areas, the rural area was on average more satisfied with the level of the provision, with Bexhill the least satisfied of the urban areas; 36% believing there is a shortfall in the area.</p> <p>Of those respondents that felt there is enough open space, the majority of comments were around the value of these open spaces.</p> <p>Comments were also made about there simply being enough and that the area they lived in was rural and therefore enough open space.</p> <p>Of those that felt there is not enough, there was a mixture of responses with two key points around the loss of natural spaces to development and the lack of public access to existing sites.</p> <p>Other Consultation: Drop-in sessions identified concern over the loss of natural areas and the countryside to development. There is some mention of the pocket parks from respondents to the household questionnaire and parish council responses. There is a good provision of pocket parks in the district (11 sites). Although, comments through the internal consultations did indicate the difficulties in managing some of these sites as they are left to individual volunteers.</p>
	<p>External consultations indicated that a small part of the Bedgebury Project will be available to residents in the District and offer a variety of activities. There are ten conservation areas identified in the Local Plan, with the potential for another six.</p>

APPENDIX Gi – QUANTITY STANDARDS

NATURAL AND SEMI-NATURAL	
'PMP Recommendation (per 1,000 population)	2ha per 1000 population.
PMP Justification	There is a slight emphasis on the level of provision not being enough which may be due to the limited public access to some sites. In terms of standards set for other authorities, which range from 0.5 to 8.79ha, with a common amount around 1.8. Across the analysis areas, the level of provision is much higher in rural west and rural east than in the remaining analysis areas, which is reflected in the level of satisfaction in the rural area. Due to the significantly rural nature of the district the standard of 2ha is aimed at new developments of large scale to ensure residential expansion is not at the cost of open space. This is specifically appropriate in urban analysis areas where levels of satisfaction are below those rural areas.
Client Approval	Local Quantity Standard.

AMENITY GREENSPACE	
National Standards	<p>NPFA - 6 acre standard (2.43ha) per 1,000 population for 'playing space' consisting of 2 acres (ie 0.81 ha per 1,000 population) for children's playing space - includes areas designated for children and young people and casual or informal playing space within housing areas.</p> <p>NPFA - in the past some LA's have added 1 acre (0.4ha) arbitrary to cover 'amenity areas' and 'leisure areas' or something similar that mat not be covered within the NPFA standard. In almost all cases, this additional requirement are intended for residential areas and do not cover open spaces such as parks or allotments.</p> <p>LAPs - aged 4-6; 1 min walk or 100m (60m in a straight line); min area size 100msq; LAPs typically have no play equipment and therefore could be considered as amenity greenspace.</p>

APPENDIX Gi – QUANTITY STANDARDS

AMENITY GREEN SPACE	
Current Provision ha per 1,000 population (ha)	0.88 ha per 1000 population.
Existing Local Standards	No existing local standards.
BENCHMARKING	See attached sheet.
Consultation (too much / about right / not enough)	<p>2% - More than enough.</p> <p>43% - About right.</p> <p>16% - Nearly enough.</p> <p>26% - Not enough.</p>
'Consultation Comments (quantity)	<p>Household survey: There is a fairly mixed response in terms of whether people feel there is enough/not enough amenity green space with 43% of respondents feeling it is about right versus 26% stating there is not enough. When added to those who feel there is nearly enough provision, (42%), the emphasis is more on there not being enough. Across the analysis areas, Area 2, Battle has the highest levels of dissatisfaction with 33% of residents believing there is not enough amenity green space provision.</p> <p>Respondents commented mainly on the lack of reasonably sized amenity green spaces, especially in high-density residential areas. There was a common theme of lack of amenity green space around new developments.</p> <p>Of those that felt there is not enough amenity green space, the key theme is that there is a lack of informal play area suitable for children or young people in the immediate locality of residential areas. It was also expressed that this open space needs to provide adequate ancillary facilities.</p>

APPENDIX Gi – QUANTITY STANDARDS

	<p>Other Consultation: Drop in sessions highlighted a demand for open space sites that are fenced where people can let their dogs off the lead while being supervised. There is also the concern amongst some resident that dog fouling is a persistent problem.</p>
'PMP Recommendation (per 1,000 population)	1.73 ha per 1000 population.
PMP Justification	<p>Comparing against other local authorities, the level of provision is significantly high with the average range from 0.72ha to 1.37ha, with the majority over 1ha. In terms of standards set, they range from 0.5ha to 1.6ha. The consultation responses indicate a mixed message in terms of whether there is enough and there is some concern from a quality perspective about the provision of small areas of functionless open space. In addition to this however, the visual benefit of amenity green space sites is also important.</p> <p>As such, the standard is set at the highest existing level of provision for any one analysis area (Battle), in an attempt to align the whole district and in response to the slightly higher proportion of people who felt there is not enough of this type of open space. This will protect the existing level of provision and will ensure that an appropriate level of provision will be provided in future developments.</p>
Client Approval	Local Quantity Standard.

APPENDIX Gi – QUANTITY STANDARDS

PROVISION FOR CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE	
National Standards	<p>NPFA - 6 acre standard (2.43ha) per 1,000 population for 'playing space' consisting of 2 acres (ie 0.81 ha per 1,000 population) for children's playing space - includes areas designated for children and young people and casual or informal playing space within housing areas.</p> <p>NPFA - in the past some LA's have added 1 acre (0.4ha) arbitrary to cover 'amenity areas' and 'leisure areas' or something similar that mat not be covered within the NPFA standard. In almost all cases, this additional requirement are intended for residential areas and do not cover open spaces such as parks or allotments.</p> <p>1) LAPs - aged 4-6; 1 min walk or 100m (60m in a straight line); min area size 100msq; LAPs typically have no play equipment and therefore could be considered as amenity greenspace.</p> <p>2) LEAPs - aged min 5; min area size 400msq; should be located 400 metres or 5 minutes walking time along pedestrian routes (240 metres in a straight line).</p>
Current Provision ha per 1,000 population (ha)	<p>0.69 child play facilities per 1,000 population.</p> <p>0.06 ha child play per 1,000 population.</p>
Existing Local Standards	No existing local standard.
BENCHMARKING	See attached sheet.

APPENDIX Gi – QUANTITY STANDARDS

PROVISION FOR CHILDREN	
<p>Consultation (too much / about right / not enough)</p>	<p>3% - More than enough.</p> <p>39% - About right.</p> <p>19% - Nearly enough.</p> <p>25% - Not enough.</p>
<p>Consultation Comments (quantity)</p>	<p>Household survey: Across the whole district, there was a fairly even split between people who felt that provision was about right (39%) and those that felt that there is not enough (25%) (44% nearly enough/not enough). There was a fairly even level of satisfaction between rural and urban areas with respondents in Battle indicating the largest shortfall in child provision.</p> <p>The reasons commonly given for inadequate level of provision were related to the poor quality of the sites, often in terms of quality of equipment, safety and anti-social behaviour problems. Although these are quality issues they have clearly affected the public perception of quantity of provision. Comments were centred around the lack of provision, specifically for older children and the fact there were no facilities at all in several of the smaller settlements.</p> <p>Drop in sessions identified the need to replace dated or damaged equipment in many of Rother’s play areas. There is a need for a greater variety of play items, especially on the larger sites. The Disability Forum highlighted the current lack of provision specific for disabled children. The internal consultations identified that many of current play area locations were not conducive to encouraging children to gather there.</p>

APPENDIX Gi – QUANTITY STANDARDS

PROVISION FOR CHILDREN	
'PMP Recommendation (per 1,000 population)	0.2 ha of children’s play facilities per 1,000 population.
PMP Justification	<p>There is a slight emphasis on the level of provision not being enough but a number of the qualitative comments suggest site specific issues in particular areas. In terms of benchmarking against other authorities, the level of provision varies considerably and varies between hectare and number of facilities standard. It is considered that the level of provision in Rother is relatively low compared to the provision at other authorities.</p> <p>By setting the standard in hectares it will encourage larger sites to be built, ideally always alongside large-scale residential developments. These play areas are more likely to offer a wider range of facilities, as specifically requested throughout the consultations. However, it is recommended that in the rural analysis areas this quantity shortfall is rectified by a multitude of smaller items offering more equitable distribution, which would benefit a wider number of residents, especially for children who have a lower propensity for travel. Design guidelines should be put in place to ensure that a varied and imaginative facility is provided rather than ticking off the number of facilities to be provided.</p> <p>The standard is set higher than the existing level of provision at 0.06 of children’s play facilities per 1000 population. This reflects the emphasis on the level of provision not being enough, but is a pragmatic increase to account for the majority of comments being around the quality of provision and area specific deficiencies. The application of the accessibility standards will identify locational deficiencies.</p>
Client Approval	Local Quantity Standard.

APPENDIX Gi – QUANTITY STANDARDS

PROVISION FOR YOUNG PEOPLE	
National Standards	<p>NPFA - 6 acre standard (2.43ha) per 1,000 population for 'playing space' consisting of 2 acres (ie 0.81 ha per 1,000 population) for children's playing space - includes areas designated for children and young people and casual or informal playing space within housing areas</p> <p>NPFA - in the past some LA's have added 1 acre (0.4ha) arbitrary to cover 'amenity areas' and 'leisure areas' or something similar that mat not be covered within the NPFA standard. In almost all cases, this additional requirement are intended for residential areas and do not cover open spaces such as parks or allotments</p> <p>1) LAPs - aged 4-6; 1 min walk or 100m (60m in a straight line); min area size 100msq; LAPs typically have no play equipment and therefore could be considered as amenity greenspace</p> <p>2) 2) LEAPs - aged min 5; min area size 400msq; should be located 400 metres or 5 minutes walking time along pedestrian routes (240 metres in a straight line)</p>
Current Provision ha per 1,000 population (ha)	0.015ha per 1000 population.
Existing Local Standards	No existing local standard.
BENCHMARKING	See attached sheet.
Consultation (too much / about right / not enough)	<p>2% - More than enough.</p> <p>10% - About right.</p> <p>10% - Nearly enough.</p> <p>59% - Not enough.</p>

PROVISION FOR YOUNG PEOPLE	
<p>'Consultation Comments (quantity)</p>	<p>Household survey: The emphasis of responses is on the level of provision not being enough (59%) and nearly enough/not enough 69%. This is reflected across the analysis areas. Of those limited number of respondents that felt there is enough young people facilities, people felt that those that were provided were vandalised or caused a nuisance to surrounding residents. Of those respondents that felt that there is not enough provision, a large number of people felt that more facilities would keep teenagers off the streets and give them something to do. The majority of comments were around the quantitative lack of provision. There needs to be a greater variety of facilities offered rather than just skate parks. There was a common theme regarding the need for indoor sites such as youth clubs that can offer a variety of sports. It was felt my many that the shortage of teenage facilities was the most major concern facing Rother currently in terms of open spacer provision.</p> <p>Other Consultation: Internal consultations identified conflicts between younger and older users and was being identified through the Play Strategy work currently being undertaken. There is a need at a council and planning level to understand the broad range of facilities available. The Youth Forum proposed the use of youth shelters as a way of encouraging more girls to visit these open space sites.</p> <p>The drop-in sessions realised the fact that if more provision is provided then it needs to be supervised by a greater presence of youth workers, especially in rural areas as a way of discouraging anti-social behaviour. There needs to be greater team sport promotion as well as greater floodlighting on certain facilities. Hastings skate park was sighted as a type of facility that would enhance Bexhill, Battle or Rye.</p>

APPENDIX Gi – QUANTITY STANDARDS

PROVISION FOR YOUNG PEOPLE	
'PMP Recommendation (per 1,000 population)	0.2 ha of young people facilities per 1,000 population.
PMP Justification	There is a relatively strong emphasis on the level of provision of young people facilities not being enough. There is limited information available for other authorities in terms of comparing provision, but this is considered to be a relatively good level of provision, which is supported through consultations that identify a number of skate ramps etc. at recreation grounds across the district. Young people and anti social behaviour is considered to be an issue in Rother, although in a number of cases this is site specific rather than across the board and it may be that additional youth facilities would alleviate this issue. As such, the standard is increased to reflect the higher levels of dissatisfaction with the existing level of provision and to provide the flexibility to combat specific areas where youths hanging around and creating a nuisance is a particularly issue due to a lack of alternative facilities. The standard is set at the same level as children's facilities as it is believed that there should be an equitable provision of facilities for all young residents across the whole district.
Client Approval	Local Quantity Standard.

OUTDOOR SPORTS FACILITIES	
National Standards	NPFA - 6 acre standard (2.43ha) per 1,000 population for 'playing space' consisting of 4 acres (ie 1.62 per 1,000 population) for outdoor sport - includes pitches, athletics tracks, bowling greens, tennis courts training areas and croquet lawnsNPFA - in the past some LA's have added 1 acre (0.4ha) arbitrary to cover 'amenity areas' and 'leisure areas' or something similar that mat not be covered within the NPFA standard. In almost all cases, this additional requirement are intended for residential areas and do not cover open spaces such as parks or allotments.

APPENDIX Gi – QUANTITY STANDARDS

OUTDOOR SPORTS FACILITIES	
Current Provision ha per 1,000 population (ha)	2.76 ha per 1,000 population. Rural: 1.7ha per 1000 Urban: 4.70ha per 1000. (all provision excludes golf courses and wet areas)
Existing Local Standards	No existing local standard
BENCHMARKING	See attached sheet
Consultation (too much / about right / not enough)	<p>General Outdoor Sports Facilities:</p> <p>4% - More than enough. 39% - About right. 16% - Nearly enough. 29% - Not enough.</p> <p>Specific types of outdoor sports facilities:</p> <p>Grass pitches - 53% about right. STP's – 68% (of those with an opinion) felt there was not enough provision. Tennis Courts - 54% (of those with an opinion) felt there was enough provision, 39% felt there was a shortfall. Bowling Greens - 69% (of those with an opinion) felt provision was about right. Golf Courses – 37% had no opinion and 42% felt provision was about right.</p>

OUTDOOR SPORTS FACILITIES	
<p>'Consultation Comments (quantity)</p>	<p>Household survey: The majority of respondents to the household survey indicated that there was a shortfall in outdoor sports facilities. 52% of people (who had an opinion) stated there was Nearly Enough/Not Enough provision of this typology. However, a good percentage also suggested provision was adequate (48%). The highest levels of discontent were in analysis area 5, East Rother, where 58% sighted a shortfall and no resident indicated that there was an existing oversupply. Bexhill had the highest levels of satisfaction with regards outdoor sports facilities. General comments centred around accessibility/provision in rural areas. There was a concern over the overuse of facilities during winter periods where the quality of existing sites are severely affected due to overuse. Both the household survey and the drop in sessions across the district highlighted a problem with gaining public access to school sites as they are a resource that could be used to increase supply. Many comments were made regarding the shortage of tennis courts although this was not reflected by those who had a specific opinion/interest, who would probably be the users of existing facilities. It is therefore thought that facilities are adequate to meet needs but there should be greater promotion/information distribution to raise awareness amongst potential new users.</p> <p>Other consultations: Drop in sessions revealed that residents felt that there was a serious problem with drainage of many sites and these were deteriorating due to overuse, especially in rural areas where recreation grounds were substituting for sports pitches. There was also a demand for a greater number of publicly accessible golf courses. It was felt that a more strategic approach to the scheduling of matches would contribute to alleviating the pitch problem. As highlighted by the drop-in sessions and the household survey, there is a shortage of tennis courts in the district.</p> <p>Internal consultations identified that most teams felt that pitch supply catered adequately for their needs. Rural facilities required greater funding for improving existing facilities that were of poor quality and that rather than increasing the supply the council should look at ways to assist in the management of these smaller scale sites. Issues regarding drainage were again raised, especially in areas such as Rye Salts and Little Common. Camber Sands offered good provision for a number of sporting activities.</p>

APPENDIX Gi – QUANTITY STANDARDS

	<p>The Primary Care Trust are undertaking a program to target school groups with sporting activities, with the aim of improving participation rates, especially amongst girls. The Bedgebury Project Forestry Commission are also providing opportunities for archery, walking and cycling specifically targeting disabled participation.</p>
'PMP Recommendation (per 1,000 population)	<p>Urban: 2.97ha per 1000 population. Rural: 4.84ha per 1,000 population.</p>
PMP Justification	<p>The standard for sports pitches is set for broad planning need only. The level of provision compared to other authorities (excluding golf but including all schools) is high with the provision ranging from 1.69 to 2.69 ha per 1000 population elsewhere. Standards are also set around this range with a higher number around 2ha per 1000 population.</p> <p>In terms of consultations, there is an emphasis on the level of provision not being enough, although other consultations suggest that a re-organisation of pitches and management of pitches may alleviate this deficiency considerably. The standards are therefore set at the top level for that rural/urban analysis area split so as to protect current provision while attempting to offer standardisation across the District. This standard allows for provision of facilities in line with the scale of any future developments. In addition, this provides greater flexibility in terms of meeting the standard either through new provision or through increased public use of school sites.</p>
Client Approval	<p>Local Quantity Standard.</p>

APPENDIX Gi – QUANTITY STANDARDS

ALLOTMENTS	
National Standards	National Society of Allotment and Leisure Gardeners - 20 allotment plots per 1,000 households (ie 20 allotments plots per 2,200 people (2.2 people per house) or 1 allotment plot per 200 people. With an average allotment plot of 250 sq/m this equates to 0.25 ha per 1,000 population 1970 Thorpe Report suggested 0.2 ha per 1,000 population.
Current Provision ha per 1,000 population (ha)	0.19 ha per 1000 population.
Existing Local Standards	No existing standards.
BENCHMARKING	See attached sheet.
Consultation (too much / about right / not enough)	3% - More than enough. 29% - About right. 9% - Nearly enough. 21% - Not enough.
'Consultation Comments (quantity)	Household survey: the emphasis is slightly on the level of provision being not enough (29% about right / 30% nearly enough/ not enough), although the response rate is much lower for this typology. The highest levels of satisfaction with supply of allotment was in analysis area 5, East Rother where over 70% of those with an opinion suggested supply was adequate. The area that indicated the greatest shortfall was analysis area 2, Battle. Specific residents comments are split between there being a significant undersupply with long waiting lists as people don't have sufficient plots in their immediate area, and where sites are unused and becoming derelict because people don't have the motivation to maintain their plots. There needs to be some sort of umbrella management strategy that identifies these issues and attempts to redistribute those on the waiting lists, with closer consultation with allotment managers. There is also the concern that housing developments are endangering allotment sites and many areas are being sold off for residential expansion projects.

APPENDIX Gi – QUANTITY STANDARDS

ALLOTMENTS	
	<p><i>Other consultations:</i></p> <p>Internal consultations highlighted the varying levels of use across the District, with specific sites at Broad Oak Park, Collington Hall and Barrack Hall sighted as having large waiting lists.</p> <p>Drop-in sessions highlighted a concern with the loss of allotments to development.</p>
'PMP Recommendation (per 1,000 population)	Urban: 0.45 ha per 1,000 population. Rural: 0.17 ha per 1,000 population
PMP Justification	<p>Allotments are very much a demand led-typology.</p> <p>Consultations indicate that there is a slight emphasis on the level of provision being about right. More importantly, consultations with allotment managers show a good level of interest in allotments, which is increasing rapidly. There is a mixed response in terms of sites that are used to capacity and sites that have some plots currently un-used. The level of provision compared to other authorities is reasonably high.</p> <p>In light of the consultation responses and the need to support allotments as a holistic approach to healthier lifestyles through exercise and the production of health food, the standard is set higher than existing levels of provision. While new plots are required, especially in residential urban areas where residents may not have access to a garden, there is some flexibility in terms of re-organisation of allotments plots (especially in rural areas with a lower standard). Essentially the standard protects the existing level of provision in rural areas and ensures that where required, new allotment plots are provided alongside any new housing developments.</p>
Client Approval	Local Quantity Standard.