

From: Bob Sharples <Bob.Sharples@sportengland.org>
Sent: 09 September 2021 11:14
To: Development Brief <developmentbrief@cherwell-dc.gov.uk>
Subject: Site PR9: Land West of Yarnton - Draft Development Brief

Good morning,

Thank you for inviting Sport England to comment on the draft development brief for Site PR9 – land west of Yarnton. I have reviewed the document and would make the following observations.

- Consideration should be given to off-road cycle routes within the community woodland and local nature reserve. I would draw your attention to Sport Scotland's guide to project development for mountain bike trails and training facilities <https://sportscotland.org.uk/facilities/design-guidance/outdoor-facilities/guide-to-project-development-for-mountain-bike-trails-and-training-facilities/>
- I would also advise the need to ensure good connectivity in areas to be used by the public and to have low level lighting for safety. This will encourage those feeling anxious about taking informal exercise be it walking or running to continue to go out in the twilight hours. Also the introduction of trim trail equipment should be considered and signage to indicate length of walk, again to encourage informal activity.
- P51 – para 6.5.3. Sport England supports the principle of off-site contributions rather than onsite towards new and improved sports facilities, but this needs to be backed up with a robust and up to date strategy.

There should be contributions towards both indoor and outdoor facilities. Based on 540 dwellings I estimate the population to be between 1350-1890 persons (2.5 -3.5 occupiers per dwelling). Therefore the level of contributions toward built facilities based on Sport England's Sports Facility Calculator are: <https://www.activeplacespower.com/reports/sports-facility-calculator> between £563,559 and £788,982. I accept that CDC may use other occupancy rates but the principles sound and has been tested at Public Inquiries successfully over the years.

The SFC results presented below are based on the following criteria:

Area of Interest:	Cherwell	Population:	1,350
Population Profile:	Cherwell	Date generated:	09/09/2021
Build Costs:	Q2 2020	BCIS:	June 2020
Population:	Population: Projection for 2020, based on 2011 Census data and modified by 2018-based Subnational Population Projections for Local Authorities. Adapted from data from the Office for National Statistics licensed under the Open Government Licence v.3.0. London boroughs modified by GLA 2018-based Demographic Projections - ward projections, SHLAA-based, © Greater London Authority, 2020.		

Facility Requirements:

Artificial Grass Pitches	
Demand adjusted by	0%
Pitches	0.04
vpwpp	28
Cost if 3G	£39,048
Cost if Sand	£35,516

Indoor Bowls	
Demand adjusted by	0%
Rinks	0.09
Centres	0.02
vpwpp	15
Cost	£36,392

Sports Halls	
Demand adjusted by	0%
Courts	0.37
Halls	0.09
vpwpp	109
Cost	£236,899

Swimming Pools	
Demand adjusted by	0%
Square meters	13.86
Lanes	0.26
Pools	0.07
vpwpp	84
Cost	£254,752

The SFC results presented below are based on the following criteria:

Area of Interest: Cherwell **Population:** 1,890
Population Profile: Cherwell **Date generated:** 09/09/2021
Build Costs: Q2 2020 **BCIS:** June 2020
Population: **Population: Projection for 2020, based on 2011 Census data and modified by 2018-based Subnational Population Projections for Local Authorities. Adapted from data from the Office for National Statistics licensed under the Open Government Licence v.3.0. London boroughs modified by GLA 2018-based Demographic Projections - ward projections, SHLAA-based, © Greater London Authority, 2020.**

Facility Requirements:

Artificial Grass Pitches	
Demand adjusted by	0%
Pitches	0.05
vpwpp	40
Cost if 3G	£54,667
Cost if Sand	£49,722

Indoor Bowls	
Demand adjusted by	0%
Rinks	0.13
Centres	0.02
vpwpp	21
Cost	£50,949

Sports Halls	
Demand adjusted by	0%
Courts	0.52
Halls	0.13
vpwpp	153
Cost	£331,659

Swimming Pools	
Demand adjusted by	0%
Square meters	19.40
Lanes	0.37
Pools	0.09
vpwpp	118
Cost	£356,652

NB don't forget contributions to playing fields.

- P55 – there is a statement that *no formal requirement for the playing fields* at the school. This disappointing and I think it is in conflict the aim of creating healthy place shaping. There should be opportunities for the primary aged children to use their school playing fields to pursue formal sport which is age appropriate rather than travel to Kidlington or another town.

I would be grateful if we could be kept informed on the development brief.

Finally I would draw you attention the Active Design which jointly published by Public Health England and ourselves. I believe there are some good practise which can be gleamed from the document to enhance the development brief:

<https://www.sportengland.org/how-we-can-help/facilities-and-planning/design-and-cost-guidance/active-design>

Kind regards

Bob

Bob Sharples RIBA MRTPI
Principal Planning Manager - South Team

T: 07830 315030

