

Runnymede 2035

Open Space Study 2016



Coxes Mill Pond - Addlestone, Surrey

March 2016

Republished in February 2017

Executive Summary

What is the study about?

- 1) This study defines the nature and distribution of open spaces in the Borough of Runnymede and identifies the classifications and broad locations where there is under provision, or where the quality could be improved. The study makes recommendations to address trends of deficits and cater for sustainable growth; however, the Council recognises that new open space provision cannot address existing deficiencies in open space provision and can only be used to meet future requirements.

Definition of open space

- 2) Open Space is defined in the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (section 336) as:
'Any land laid out as a public garden, or used for the purposes of public recreation, or land which is a disused burial ground'.

Current picture of provision in Runnymede

Quantity

- 3) A total of 2570.14 ha of open space is identified. Of the 2570.14ha, 1644.18ha is deemed accessible (meaning open to the general public without having to pay a fee or requiring membership to gain access). The accessible open space figure equates to over 20 ha of open space per 1000 population.
- 4) A shortfall in the Outdoor Sport Provision, Provision for Children and Teenagers and Allotments categories of open space has been identified across the Borough.
- 5) Accessibility standards suggest that, broadly speaking, parks and gardens, amenity green spaces, provision for children and teens, allotments and cemeteries and churchyards are not very accessible in terms of distance from home in some areas of the Borough; however this does not necessarily equate to an underprovision or the feeling of the users that provision of open space in their area is insufficient.

Quality

- 6) The provision of open space in the Borough is generally of medium to high quality, assessed against categories of accessibility; cleanliness; facilities; safety; and overall quality criteria. There was a clear distinction between wards in the Borough with low quality and those with high quality.

Meeting future requirements

- 7) Significant housing growth is anticipated in the Borough during the plan period until 2035. The objectively assessed need for housing in Runnymede is between 466-535 homes per annum as set out in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) (Nov 15), which covers a 20 year period in the Borough of Runnymede. The annual housing target will be set out in the new Local Plan, Runnymede 2035 and it will be against this target that future requirements of open space will be determined.

Contents

Executive Summary	1
List of figures and tables	4
1. Introduction	6
1.1 The need for an Open Space Study (OSS).....	6
1.2 The approach taken	6
1.2.1 National level	6
1.2.2 County and Local Level.....	7
1.3 What is open space?.....	9
1.4 Standards for open space	11
1.5 Setting the context for the OSS.....	11
1.6 Vision for open space in Runnymede.....	13
2. Methodology	14
2.1 Preparing the scoping study and brief (stage 1).....	16
2.2 Review the context (stage 2)	16
2.3 Understand the supply (stage 3)	16
2.4 Understand Demand and Need (stage 4).....	18
2.5 Analysis – qualitative element (stage 5)	18
2.5.1 Questionnaire Findings	19
2.5.2 Questionnaire Results	19
2.5.3 Addlestone superward	20
2.5.4 Chertsey superward	26
2.5.5 Egham superward.....	32
2.5.6 Virginia Water superward	38
2.5.7 Overall summary of open space use in the Borough:	44
2.6 Analysis – quantitative element (stage 5).....	45
2.6.1 Quantity analysis.....	45
2.6.2 Quantity summary of open space in Runnymede.....	46
2.6.3 Quality analysis – ranking of sites.....	47
2.6.4 Ranking of sites.....	47
2.6.5 Summary of quality of open space in Runnymede	48
2.7 Creating a spatial picture of open space in Runnymede.....	49
2.7.1 Addlestone Superward	50
2.7.2 Chertsey Superward.....	54
2.7.3 Egham Superward	58

2.7.4 Virginia Water Superward.....	61
3. Accessibility of open space in Runnymede.....	65
3.1 Accessibility standards	66
3.1.1 Parks and Gardens.....	68
3.1.2 Natural and Semi Natural Green Spaces	69
3.1.3 Outdoor Sports Facilities.....	71
3.1.4 Amenity Green Spaces	72
3.1.5 Provision for children and Teenagers	73
3.1.6 Allotments, community gardens and city farms.....	74
3.1.7 Cemeteries and churchyards	75
3.2 Summary of accessibility of open space.....	77
4. General conclusions	78
4.1 Identify Objectives and Recommendations (stage 6)	78
4.1.1 Demand and need	78
4.2 Recommendations for future work.....	79
5. References.....	80
6. Appendices	82
Appendix 1 – Site Assessment Pro Forma	82
Appendix 2 - Details of assessment criteria.....	85
Appendix 3 - Open Space Study Questionnaire	94
Appendix 4 - Letter to Private Open Space Site Owners and Letter to Schools/Universities	98
Appendix 5 - List of visual amenity sites	100
Appendix 6 List of sites that have been removed from the OSS.....	101
Appendix 7 – Table of questionnaire comments regarding open spaces	102
Appendix 8 – Full list of open space sites identified.....	106

List of figures and tables

Tables

Table Number:

- 1- Open Space Classifications
- 2- Total population by ward (2015)
- 3- Overall quantity of open space in Runnymede
- 4- Quality scale for site assessments
- 5- Boroughwide quality of classifications of open space
- 6- Quantity and quality of open spaces in the Borough by superward
- 7- Overview of open spaces in the Addlestone area
- 8- Overview of open spaces in the Chertsey area
- 9- Overview of open spaces in the Egham area
- 10- Overview of open spaces in the Virginia Water area
- 11- Local Authority buffer distances used to assist accessibility standards for open space classifications

Figures

Figure Number:

- 1- Stages of the Open Space Study
- 2- Addlestone superward
- 3- Bar chart showing importance of green corridors in the Addlestone area
- 4- Bar chart showing importance of amenity green spaces in the Addlestone area
- 5- Bar chart showing importance of provision for children and teenagers in the Addlestone area
- 6- Bar chart showing importance of natural and semi natural spaces in the Addlestone area
- 7- Bar chart showing importance of cemeteries and churchyards in the Addlestone area
- 8- Bar chart showing importance of allotments in the Addlestone area
- 9- Bar chart showing importance of outdoor sports facilities in the Addlestone area
- 10- Bar chart showing frequency of use of natural and semi natural spaces in the Addlestone area
- 11- Bar chart showing frequency of use of cemeteries and churchyards in the Addlestone area
- 12- Bar chart showing frequency of use of allotments in the Addlestone area
- 13- Bar chart showing frequency of use of civic squares and spaces in the Addlestone area
- 14- Chertsey superward
- 15- Bar chart showing importance of green corridors in the Chertsey area
- 16- Bar chart showing importance of natural and semi natural spaces in the Chertsey area
- 17- Bar chart showing importance of amenity green spaces in the Chertsey area
- 18- Bar chart showing the importance of provision for children and teenagers in the Chertsey area
- 19- Bar chart showing frequency of use of natural and semi natural spaces in the Chertsey area
- 20- Bar chart showing frequency of use of parks and gardens in the Chertsey area
- 21- Bar chart showing frequency of use of provision for children and teenagers in the Chertsey area
- 22- Bar chart showing frequency of use of amenity green spaces in the Chertsey area
- 23- Bar chart showing frequency of use of allotments in the Chertsey area
- 24- Bar chart showing frequency of use of cemeteries and churchyards in the Chertsey area
- 25- Egham superward
- 26- Bar chart showing the importance of parks and gardens in the Egham area
- 27- Bar chart showing the importance of natural and semi natural spaces in the Egham area
- 28- Bar chart showing the importance of amenity green spaces in the Egham area
- 29- Bar chart showing the frequency of use of outdoor sports facilities in the Egham area
- 30- Bar chart showing the frequency of use of natural and semi natural spaces in the Egham area
- 31- Bar chart showing the frequency of use of parks and gardens in the Egham area
- 32- Bar chart showing the frequency of use of amenity green spaces in the Egham area

- 33- Bar chart showing the frequency of use of cemeteries and churchyards in the Egham area
- 34- Bar chart showing the frequency of use of allotments in the Egham area
- 35- Virginia Water superward
- 36- Bar chart showing the importance of parks and gardens in the Virginia Water area
- 37- Bar chart showing the importance of green corridors in the Virginia Water area
- 38- Bar chart showing the importance of natural and semi natural spaces in the Virginia Water area
- 39- Bar chart showing the importance of allotments in the Virginia Water area
- 40- Bar chart showing the importance of cemeteries and churchyards in the Virginia Water area
- 41- Bar chart showing the frequency of use of parks and gardens in the Virginia Water area
- 42- Bar chart showing the frequency of use of natural and semi natural spaces in the Virginia Water area
- 43- Bar chart showing the frequency of use of green corridors in the Virginia Water area
- 44- Bar chart showing the frequency of use of civic squares and spaces in the Virginia Water area
- 45- Bar chart showing the frequency of use of cemeteries and churchyards in the Virginia Water area
- 46- Map showing all open spaces in the Addlestone area
- 47- Map showing all open spaces in the Chertsey area
- 48- Map showing all open spaces in the Egham area
- 49- Map showing all open spaces in the Virginia Water area
- 50- Map showing provision of accessible parks and gardens and straight line buffer distances to indicate accessibility of classification across the Borough
- 51- Map showing provision of accessible natural and semi natural spaces and straight line buffer distances to indicate accessibility of classification across the Borough
- 52- Map showing provision of accessible outdoor sports facilities and straight line buffer distances to indicate accessibility of classification across the Borough
- 53- Map showing provision of accessible amenity green spaces and straight line buffer distances to indicate accessibility of classification across the Borough
- 54- Map showing provision of accessible provision for children and teenagers and straight line buffer distances to indicate accessibility of classification across the Borough
- 55- Map showing provision of accessible allotments and straight line buffer distances to indicate accessibility of classification across the Borough
- 56- Map showing provision of accessible cemeteries and churchyards and straight line buffer distances to indicate accessibility of classification across the Borough

1. Introduction

1.1 The need for an Open Space Study (OSS)

- 1) The primary purpose of this study is to identify the supply and quality of open space across the Borough, including the type and location. The Open Space Study will form part of the evidence base and inform the new Local Plan for Runnymede Borough Council.
- 2) The output from the OSS will give the Council a library of the types and number of existing open spaces, the facilities they possess, and an indication of their usage (from user questionnaires). This information can be used in the future, both as part of the decision making process and as part of policy formulation. The audit of open space will assist the Council to understand where further open space should be provided; what type of open space should be provided; and how much open space should be provided; and identify where the quality of sites could be improved to remedy historic deficits and cater for future growth.

1.2 The approach taken

1.2.1 National level

- 3) The study has been produced in line with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), which sets out the Government's planning policies for England and how these are expected to be applied. It provides a framework for local people and their councils to produce local and neighbourhood plans.
- 4) Paragraph 73 of the NPPF sets out that planning policies should be based on robust and up-to-date assessments of the needs for open space, sports and recreation facilities and opportunities for new provision. Assessments should identify specific needs and quantitative or qualitative deficits or surpluses of open space, sports and recreational facilities in the local area. This information should be used to determine what provision is required in the area.
- 5) The NPPF (paragraph 73) also states that access to high quality open spaces and opportunities for sport and recreation can make an important contribution to the health and well-being of communities. Additionally, the NPPF (paragraph 74) states existing open space, sports and recreation sites, including playing fields, should not be built on unless
 - An assessment has been undertaken, which has clearly shown the site to be surplus to requirements.
 - The loss resulting from the proposed development would be replaced by equivalent or better provision in terms of quantity and quality in a suitable location.
 - The development is for alternative sports and recreational provision, the needs for which clearly outweigh the loss.
- 6) The NPPF is supported by the national Planning Practice Guidance (PPG), which gives guidance on carrying out an open space assessment. The PPG states that it is for local planning authorities to assess the need for open space and opportunities for new provision in their areas.

Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment (CABE) guidance – ‘Open Space Strategies: Best Practice’

- 7) The CABE guidance provides practical advice to Local Authorities on how to undertake an OSS with the aim of understanding the supply and demand, and how findings of the study could be used corporately. It also highlights the social, environmental and health benefits of open spaces. CABE guidance sets out a six stage approach which the Council has followed in this study; this is covered in the methodology. Although this guidance has now been archived, it is considered to still be in conformity with guidance in the NPPF and planning officers are utilising what they believe to be a useful source of guidance.

Fields in Trust

- 8) Fields in Trust guidance on planning and design for outdoor play is a useful document for Local Authorities that provides quantity benchmark standards for play provision and outdoor sport provision. The document has been utilised within the OSS for providing both quantity and accessibility standards.

Natural England

- 9) Natural England provides information about the importance of accessible green space and provides a set of benchmark standards for ensuring people have access to places near to where they live. In particular, Natural England looks at Accessible Natural Greenspace Standards (ANGSt). These standards have been utilised in the OSS to identify where there may be an underprovision of natural open spaces in the Borough.

1.2.2 County and Local Level

- 10) The Runnymede Borough Council Corporate Business Plan (CBP) is currently in draft form and looks to be published in April 2016. This document will replace the Sustainable Community Strategy that was published in 2012. If there are any specific points arising from the CBP that need to be included within this study, an addendum will be made in due course.
- 11) The Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) was published in November 2015 with Runnymede and Spelthorne Borough Councils working together with their consultants GL Hearn. The SHMA sets out the extent of the housing market area that Runnymede and Spelthorne are located within and the number and type of homes needed to meet housing demand in that combined area over the period 2013 to 2033, based on population and economic projections. The SHMA has shown intensified the overall need for housing over the 2013-33 period for Runnymede as being 466-535 homes per annum.
- 12) The Council is required to produce a Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SLAA). It will inform the Council's new Local Plan by helping in the identification of land that could be used to meet Runnymede's needs for housing and other forms of development. The SLAA assesses particular areas of land to determine if each is suitable, available and viable for development. A list of sites that were put forward in 2015's SLAA call for sites process that were considered open space sites in 2010, have been listed below. These

sites are currently being assessed to determine whether they could assist in meeting Runnymede's housing needs:

1. Thorpe Farm (Thorpe Park)
2. Coltscroft (Rosemary Lane OS)
3. Crockford Farm (Crockford Bridge Farm)
4. Weymanor Farm (Weymanor Road)
5. Parklands (Oracle Park)
6. Land North of Thorpe Lea Industrial Estate, Thorpe Lea Road (Thorpe Lea Road)
7. Land at Great Grove Farm (Spinney Hill forms part)
8. Land adj. Sandgates, Chertsey (part of Sandgates forms part of this SLAA site).

13) Nationally there is a rising trend in overweight and obesity rates in children and young people and current estimates indicate that by 2050 nearly 25% of children in the UK will be obese and nearly 40% overweight. Figures from the Health Survey for England (HSE) estimate that one in four children (up to 10 years of age) in the county of Surrey are either overweight or obese, with this rising to one in three in 11 to 15 year olds. This approximates to over 57,000 children in Surrey being either obese or overweight. Surrey has below average rates of childhood obesity compared to the South East and England; however, because of its relatively large population it does have a large number of both obese and overweight children.

14) Both the Surrey Obesity Strategy (2007) and the Childhood Obesity Needs Assessment carried out by NHS Surrey in 2008 identified that in order to tackle obesity in Surrey, there needs to be interventions for both the prevention and treatment of obesity across the County. This OSS may be able to aid the prevention of obesity within the Borough of Runnymede with the provision of open space for children and teenagers and outdoor sports facilities.

15) The Surrey Local Nature Partnership is another organisation which has a vision to enrich the future for all through a healthy natural environment in Surrey and beyond. Surrey Local Nature Partnership has two main projects (Valuing Surrey and Biodiversity Offsetting) which are focussed on achieving their vision¹. These documents highlight the important role of open space, and of providing accessible open space for:

- Safe/healthy environments for young people
- Access to parks and open spaces for recreation as part of a healthier lifestyle
- Protecting and enhancing the natural environment.

16) These publications will be considered when developing the OSS.

¹ <http://surreynaturepartnership.org.uk/projects/>

1.3 What is open space?

- 17) Open Space is defined in the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (Section 336) as *'land laid out as a public garden, or is used for the purposes of public recreation, or land which is a disused burial ground'*.
- 18) Open spaces are used for recreation, relaxation and social interaction and are an important resource for the community. Open spaces are also important as part of a healthy lifestyle.
- 19) Open spaces are also important as part of a Green Infrastructure network to support biodiversity and wildlife habitats.
- 20) Open spaces have been found by user questionnaires to be an important amenity by local residents in the Borough of Runnymede.
- 21) The archived CABI guidance still utilises the previous Planning Policy Guidance (Section 17) to classify the types of Open Spaces (see table 1).

	Typology	Primary purpose
Greenspaces	Parks and gardens	Including urban parks, country parks and formal gardens
	Natural and semi-natural green spaces including woodlands	Including urban forestry, scrub, grasslands (for example, downlands, commons and meadows), wetlands, open and running water, wastelands, and derelict open land and rock areas (for example, cliffs, quarries and pits).
	Green corridors	Including river and canal banks, cycleways and rights of way.
	Outdoor sports facilities	With natural or artificial surfaces and either publicly or privately owned including tennis courts, bowling greens, sports pitches, golf courses, athletics tracks and school and other institutional playing fields.
	Amenity green space	(Most commonly but not exclusively in housing areas) including informal recreation spaces, green spaces in and around housing, domestic gardens and village greens.
	Provision for children and teenagers	Including play areas, skateboard parks and outdoor basketball hoops, and other more informal areas (for example, 'hanging out' areas, teenage shelters).
	Allotments, community gardens and city (urban) farms ²	Provide an opportunity to grow produce from the land, individually or as part of a group to promote understanding of food and horticulture and promote health and social inclusion.
	Cemeteries and churchyards	Land associated with churches and the burial of the dead, land used for quiet contemplation.
Civic Spaces	Civic squares and spaces	Hard surfaced areas designed for pedestrians, providing a setting for civic artwork and community events

Table 1: Open Space Classification

² Please note that there are no 'City (urban) Farms' within Runnymede however, this classification will be used for any reference to Allotments

1.4 Standards for open space

- 22) Natural England recommends standards for the accessible natural green spaces, which they define as *'all of the accessible green places we can visit and enjoy'*³.
- 23) These are:
- An accessible natural greenspace of at least two hectares in size, no more than 300 metres from home
 - At least one accessible 20 hectare site within two kilometres of home
 - One accessible 100 hectare site within five kilometres of home
 - One accessible 500 hectare site within ten kilometres of home
 - One hectare of statutory Local Nature Reserves per thousand population.
- 24) Fields in Trust sets a benchmark standard recommendation for outdoor sport including playing pitches and parks of 1.6 hectares per 1000 population.
- 25) The OSS interprets the CABI guidance by placing equipped sport provision and designated sport areas in to the Outdoor Sports Facilities category, and urban parks into the Parks and Gardens category.
- 26) Fields in Trust also sets a benchmark standard recommendation for outdoor play space of 0.8 hectares per 1000 population. This is further broken down into:
- Designated equipped playing space of 0.25 hectares per 1000 population
 - Informal playing space of 0.55 hectares per 1000 population.
- 27) The National Society of Allotment and Leisure Gardeners (NSALG) recommend that at least 20 standard size allotment plots (250sq metres per plot in size) be provided per 1000 households.
- 28) These standards are relevant to the Council's OSS and will be used to identify the quantum of provision of these classifications of open space, if there are any shortfalls in provision, and if so, where they are.

1.5 Setting the context for the OSS

- 29) Runnymede Borough Council previously published an OSS in 2010 given that PPG 17 (a predecessor to the NPPF) required the assessment of the need for open space in the Borough. Following the introduction of the NPPF in 2012- which states assessments should be robust and up-to-date the decision was taken to update the 2010 OSS.
- 30) Runnymede is a relatively small Borough measuring only eight miles from north to south. Approximately 79% of its areas lies within the Metropolitan Green Belt. The Borough's location makes the area an attractive location to live, work and visit.
- 31) Runnymede is made up of 14 wards, which in turn can be split into four main groupings around the larger urban settlements of Addlestone, Chertsey, Egham and Virginia Water. These groupings are shown in Table 2 and will be referred to throughout the OSS as a

³ <https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/natural-england>

‘superward’. It should be noted that within these 4 superwards are other smaller settlements (for example New Haw and Ottershaw). These superwards have been used as it gives a good indication of the open space available to different communities in the Borough, which are considered a more helpful approach than assessing availability on a ward by ward basis. Data obtained by Runnymede Borough Council Electoral Services 2015 show there to be a population of 80,510 in the Borough alongside a figure of 35,194 properties.

32) Population data for the borough’s wards can be obtained from the electoral services register for August 2015 and is summarised in table 2.

Superward	Ward	Population per ward (2015)	Total population per superward (2015)
Addlestone	Woodham	5304	
	New Haw	5757	
	Addlestone Bourneside	5596	
	Addlestone North	5905	
	Chertsey South & Rowtown	5328	27890
Chertsey	Chertsey Meads	6038	
	Chertsey St. Anns	6040	12078
Egham	Englefield Green West	5180	
	Englefield Green East	5427	
	Egham Town	6384	
	Egham Hythe	6474	
	Thorpe	5465	28930
Virginia Water	Virginia Water	5940	
	Foxhills	5672	11612
	Total		80510

Table 2: Total Population by ward (2015) Source: RBC Electoral Services

1.6 Vision for open space in Runnymede

- 33) Drawing together the evidence and background discussed in Chapter 1, the Council's approach to the OSS will be to determine the provision of open space in the Borough and, by using national guidance and recommended standards, and mapping the sites, identify where deficiencies are.
- 34) The Council's aim is to produce a robust piece of evidence that supports the maintenance and provision of open spaces in all parts of the Borough where required for the benefit of those visiting, residing and working in Runnymede.
- 35) This aim will be achieved by pursuing specific objectives. These are:
- To identify open spaces sites in the Borough;
 - To categorise open spaces by primary function;
 - To assess the quality of the sites and potential improvements to them;
 - To make recommendations as to how to improve existing deficiencies and best meet future requirements; and
 - To recommend appropriate provision and accessibility standards.

2. Methodology

36) The OSS will form part of the evidence base and background information to inform the Council's emerging Local Plan.

37) The purpose of this research is to help achieve the objectives set out in chapter 1. In particular this research will:

- Identify the existing **quantity** and **quality** of open space
- Help to understand the demand and need for open space in Runnymede

38) A six stage approach to undertaking this research has been developed with reference to the guidance set out in the archived CABE guidance, 'Open Space Strategies: Best Practice Guidance' (May 2009). A thorough and robust methodology will give greater credibility and transparency to the findings of the OSS and ensure that the needs of the local population in terms of open space provision are met.




Figure 1: Stages of the Open Space Study

2.1 Preparing the scoping study and brief (stage 1)

- 39) A brief was assembled which defined the scope of the OSS and set out the preliminary aims and objectives of the study, including the programme of work and key milestones. The brief was written with a view of the available resources, the work that had already been undertaken and the links the study would have with other departments of the Council, in particular the Leisure Services Department.
- 40) From this, the aim and subsequent aims of the study were produced, which can be found in chapter 1.6 of this OSS.

2.2 Review the context (stage 2)

- 41) To set out the parameters of the study, a review of national and local policy and evidence was undertaken. The information gathered informed the introduction to this document.

2.3 Understand the supply (stage 3)

- 42) The rationale of this stage was to build up a picture of the quantity and quality of the existing open space in the Borough of Runnymede and store the information in a purpose-built database. This was achieved through mapping the sites and conducting site assessments.

How much space is there?

- 43) Given that an OSS had previously been produced in 2010, the data from this research was available to provide a starting point for identifying the number of sites in the Borough.
- 44) Runnymede Borough Council's Development Management department was utilised in order to supply data regarding open spaces that had been lost and open spaces that had been created over the last 5 years. A list of the sites removed and added to the 2016 OSS can be found in appendix 6.
- 45) Once a review of the list of sites had been compiled, all sites were categorised according to CABI guidance (see figure 1), and Fields in Trust Guidance, to assess the quantity standard of provision. All sites were mapped by the Council's GIS team and given an ID number for easy reference.

What is the quality?

- 46) A pro-forma was designed for the site assessment stage to ensure that consistent information about each site was gathered. A copy of the site pro forma can be found in Appendix 1. An assessment was made of each site's quality against the criteria listed below and once assessed a quality score for each site was given.

Criteria for quality assessment:

- Accessibility
- Cleanliness
- Facilities
- Safety

➤ Overall quality of site

47) The exact criteria differed for each type of classification. A score of 1-5 (with 1 being the poorest quality and 5 being the highest quality) was awarded against each criterion for each site. To ensure that scoring between sites within a particular category was fair, an accompanying scoring guide sheet was used. Details of the assessment criteria can be found in Appendix 2.

48) Following completion of review of site assessments, data was entered into the database against each site record.

Setting parameters for data collection

49) Given the resources available and the purpose of the study, several parameters were set for data collection purposes.

50) Firstly, the following open space types have been excluded from the assessment in accordance with the 2010 OSS study:

- Grass verges on the side of roads
- Small insignificant areas of grassland or trees – for example at the corner of the junction of two roads
- Space left over after planning in and around new developments
- Agricultural and farm tracks
- Private roads and domestic gardens.

51) All other spaces where public access (deemed as not requiring a fee or membership to freely enter the site) was possible were assessed; predominantly these were Council owned or managed sites. However, there were other sites that were privately owned and not fully accessible due to fee requirements or security measures. Such sites included school playing fields, and golf courses. In these cases, the sites have been noted on the Open Space database, and the relevant information was requested from the owners of the site or retrieved through desk-based research.

52) In some instances, where sites are physically inaccessible, a judgement has been made by Planning Officers to leave these in the OSS but not to count them as accessible sites and to note them as 'Visual Amenity Sites'. This is because officers believe that whilst it is important to be able to physically access a range of open space sites across the Borough there are still other sites that provide an amenity feature that the public can view and as such these sites could still have public benefit and should be included. A list of sites that have been discounted as open space but which still provide visual amenity are listed in appendix 5.

53) Open spaces can be multi-functional, and as such, there is a requirement to classify each open space by its primary function as recommended by CABI. In this way, the Open Space sites were counted only once in the audit. However, officers took the decision that where two separate activities take place on one site (for example a playground within a recreational space), the site has been subdivided accordingly and the type of space considered separately. This approach avoided double counting and also gives a more detailed picture of the provision across the Borough.

- 54) With regard to the Sites of Nature Conservation Importance (SNCI's), communication from Surrey Wildlife Trust confirmed that there have been no new SNCI's in Runnymede since the 2010 OSS. Where possible, an assessment of SNCI or SSSI sites has been made, predominately relying on desk based research and/or using information from the 2010 study.
- 55) Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspaces (SANG) were also assessed where possible, and were classified as natural and semi-natural green space.
- 56) It was decided that those sites that were extensive (above two hectares) would not be assessed with a site visit due to their size, and were reviewed in a desk-based exercise so that the information gave a more comprehensive view of the site. In these instances, the site assessment form was completed where possible using planning history, aerial photographs and, where relevant, the planning officers' professional knowledge of each site.

2.4 Understand Demand and Need (stage 4)

- 57) An inclusive approach was taken to assessing the demand and need for open space. Meetings were set up with Community Development Managers and Leisure Services Managers at Runnymede Borough Council to understand deficiencies and opportunities arising in the Borough. This assisted in the preparation of a user questionnaire. A copy of the user questionnaire can be found in appendix 3. There are no national quality survey criteria for open spaces and therefore the questionnaire was designed based on the identified concerns and the objectives of the study.
- 58) The purpose of the questionnaire was to gain an understanding of the usage, demand, accessibility and perceived value, quality and quantity of open spaces in the Borough.
- 59) Need was also assessed through the quantity of accessible open spaces identified, and how the provision compared to national guidance standards.
- 60) Demand for Local Green Space (LGS) was consulted on during the production of the OSS. There are currently no sites within Runnymede that have been designated as LGS as the concept was brought in by the NPPF. A methodology for considering sites for LGS designation was prepared by officers and a consultation to local residents and interested individuals asked for comments on the methodology and for potential site submissions via a proforma. The submitted sites were then assessed by the Policy and Strategy team against formalised criteria. The methodology and consultation material can be found in the open space addendum, which will be published in due course. Sites that the Policy and Strategy team have recommended for LGS designation will be made available in an addendum to the OSS, which will be published in readiness for the Local Plan issues and options consultation.

2.5 Analysis – qualitative element (stage 5)

- 61) The questionnaire was disseminated to assess the provision and quality of open spaces from the users' particular point of view. The questionnaire element of the study was conducted in September-October 2015.

- 62) The questionnaire was sent as a mail out to the specific group named 'Interest Group/ Community Group/ Resident Association' that the Policy and Strategy team holds on their consultation database.
- 63) Invites to complete the online questionnaire were sent to local residents' associations, community groups and private individuals who are signed up to the Policy and Strategy Consultation Database. In order to reach a range of residents, the questionnaire was made widely available both online and in paper format, and was also made available on the Council's webpage and sent out to followers on the social media site of Twitter. A link to the online questionnaire was put on the Council's website homepage.
- 64) Additionally, private open space landowners and schools and universities were emailed to ask about details of sites. A copy of these emails can be found in appendix 4.
- 65) The data from the responses was split up into the superwards of Addlestone, Chertsey, Egham and Virginia Water, using ward data in order to get an accurate picture of how the open spaces in these areas were used (see table 2).

2.5.1 Questionnaire Findings

- 66) Questions were asked about the most frequently used Open Space to gain a better understanding of demand and need of open space throughout the Borough.
- 67) Questionnaires filled in online were analysed by officers. Those questionnaires that did not have responses to each question were disregarded from the analysis process in order to achieve a consistent and accurate interpretation of public responses.
- 68) It is important to note that there were few respondents to the user questionnaire in the Chertsey and Egham superwards. Due to the limited numbers, it is difficult to draw conclusions that are representative of the wider population in these areas.

2.5.2 Questionnaire Results

- 69) There were 64 respondents of the questionnaire, all of whom reside in the Borough of Runnymede.

2.5.3 Addlestone superward




Figure 2: Addlestone superward

70) 25 respondents to the user questionnaire reside in the Addlestone super ward.

General Provision

71) The opinion about provision of open space in the Borough was as follows:

45% felt provision in the Borough was about right

55% felt provision in the Borough was too little

No one thought the open space provision in the Borough was too much

Importance of Open Spaces




Figure 3: Bar chart showing importance of green corridors in the Addlestone area.




Figure 4: Bar chart showing importance of amenity green spaces in the Addlestone area.




Figure 5: Bar chart showing importance of provision for children and teenagers in the Addlestone area




Figure 6: Bar chart showing importance of natural and semi natural spaces in the Addlestone area.

72) Respondents were asked to rate the most important open spaces in their area to them. Those that were most important (shown in the graphs above) were Green Corridors, Amenity Green Spaces, Provision for children and teenagers and Natural and Semi Natural. Those least important to respondents were Cemeteries and Churchyards, Allotments and Outdoor Sports facilities (shown in the graphs below).




Figure 7: Bar chart showing importance of Cemeteries and Churchyards in the Addlestone area.




Figure 8: Bar chart showing importance of allotments in the Addlestone area.




Figure 9: Bar chart showing importance of outdoor sports facilities in the Addlestone area.

Frequency

73) Respondents were asked which open spaces they used most frequently in their area. The most frequently used open spaces, were Natural and Semi natural spaces.




Figure 10: Bar chart showing frequency of use of natural and semi natural spaces in the Addlestone area

74) The least frequently used open spaces included Cemeteries and Churchyards, Allotments and Civic squares and spaces (shown in the graphs below).




Figure 11: Bar chart showing frequency of use of cemeteries and churchyards in the Addlestone area




Figure 12: Bar chart showing frequency of use of allotments in the Addlestone area




Figure 13: Bar chart showing frequency of use of civic squares and spaces in the Addlestone area

General Quality

75) Respondents were asked to rate the open spaces in their area based on Accessibility, Cleanliness, Facilities, Safety and General Appearance. Respondent results were as follow:

Accessibility

28% of respondents said accessibility to open spaces in their area was very good

44% of respondents said accessibility to open spaces in their area was satisfactory

16% of respondents had no strong view either way

8% of respondents said accessibility open spaces in their area was unsatisfactory

4% of respondents said accessibility to open spaces in their area was very poor

Cleanliness

12% of respondents said cleanliness of open spaces in their area was very good

4% of respondents said cleanliness of open spaces in their area was satisfactory

8% of respondents had no strong view either way

40% of respondents said cleanliness of open spaces in their area was unsatisfactory

36% of respondents said cleanliness of open spaces in their area was very poor

Facilities

8% of respondents said facilities at open spaces in their area were very good

36% of respondents said facilities at open spaces in their area were satisfactory

36% of respondents had no strong view either way

16% of respondents said facilities at open spaces in their area were unsatisfactory

4% of respondents said facilities at open spaces in their area were very poor

Safety

20% of respondents said safety of open spaces in their area was very good

32% of respondents said safety of open spaces in their area was satisfactory

36% of respondents had no strong view either way

8% of respondents said safety of open spaces in their area was unsatisfactory

4% of respondents said safety of open spaces in their area was very poor

General Appearance

16% of respondents said general appearance of open spaces in their area was very good

40% of respondents said general appearance of open spaces in their area was satisfactory

28% of respondents had no strong view either way

16% of respondents said general appearance of open spaces in their area was unsatisfactory

Summary of responses of Addlestone respondents

76) Approximately half of respondents felt the provision of open space in the Borough was about right and half of respondents felt the provision of open space in the Borough was too little.

77) The most important classification of open space was Green Corridors. The least important classification of open space was Outdoor Sports Facilities.

78) The most frequently used classification of open space was Natural and Semi Natural open spaces. The least frequently used classification of open space was Outdoor Sports Facilities.

79) Over half of respondents felt accessibility to open spaces in their area was either very good or satisfactory.

80) Half of respondents thought cleanliness of open spaces in their area was satisfactory whilst the other half thought it was unsatisfactory.

81) The majority of respondents either thought facilities at open spaces in their area were satisfactory or they had no strong view.

82) Over half of the respondents thought that safety in the open spaces in their area was either very good or satisfactory.

83) Over half the respondents thought that the general appearance of open spaces in their area was very good or satisfactory.

2.5.4 Chertsey superward



Figure 14: Chertsey superward

84) 4 respondents to the user questionnaire reside in the Chertsey superward.

General Provision

- 85) The opinion about provision of open space in the Borough was as follows:
 35 % felt provision in the Borough was about right
 65 % felt provision in the Borough was too little.

Importance

- 86) Respondents were asked to rate the most important open spaces in their area to them. Those that were most important (shown in the graphs below) were Green Corridors, Natural and Semi Natural, Amenity Green Spaces and Provision for children and teenagers. Those least important to respondents were consequently Provision for children and teenagers.




Figure 15: Bar chart showing importance of green corridors in the Chertsey area.




Figure 16: Bar chart showing importance of natural and semi natural spaces in the Chertsey area.




Figure 17: Bar chart showing importance of amenity green spaces in the Chertsey area.




Figure 18: Bar chart showing importance of provision for children and teenagers in the Chertsey area.

Frequency

87) Respondents were asked which open spaces they used most frequently in their area. The most frequently used open spaces were Natural and Semi Natural spaces, Parks and Gardens, Provision for children and teenagers and Amenity Green Spaces (shown in the graphs below). The least frequently used open spaces included Allotments and Cemeteries and Churchyards (shown on the next page).




Figure 19: Bar chart showing frequency of use of natural and semi natural spaces in the Chertsey area.




Figure 20: Bar chart showing frequency of use of parks and gardens in the Chertsey area.

Provision for Children and teenagers




Figure 21: Bar chart showing frequency of use of provision for children and teenagers in the Chertsey area.

Amenity Green Space




Figure 22: Bar chart showing frequency of use of amenity green spaces in the Chertsey area.

Allotments




Figure 23: Bar chart to show frequency of use of allotments in the Chertsey area.

Cemeteries and Churchyards




Figure 24: Bar chart showing the frequency of use of cemeteries and churchyards in the Chertsey area.

General Quality

88) Respondents were asked to rate the open spaces in their area based on Accessibility, Cleanliness, Facilities, Safety and General Appearance. Respondent results were as follow:

Accessibility

50% of respondents said accessibility to open spaces in their area was satisfactory.

50% of respondents said accessibility to open spaces in their area was unsatisfactory.

Cleanliness

50% of respondents said cleanliness of open spaces in their area was satisfactory

25% of respondents had no strong view either way

25% of respondents said cleanliness of open spaces in their area was unsatisfactory

Facilities

50% of respondents said facilities at open spaces in their area were satisfactory

50% of respondents said facilities at open spaces in their area were unsatisfactory

Safety

25% of respondents said safety of open spaces in their area was satisfactory

50% of respondents had no strong view either way

25% of respondents said safety of open spaces in their area was unsatisfactory

General Appearance

25% of respondents said general appearance of open spaces in their area was very good

25% of respondents had no strong view either way

25% of respondents said general appearance of open spaces in their area was unsatisfactory

25% of respondents said general appearance of open spaces in their area was very poor

Summary of responses of Chertsey respondents:

- 89) The majority of respondents felt the provision of open space in the Borough was too little.
- 90) The most important classifications of open space were Natural and Semi Natural spaces and Green Corridors. The least important classification of open space was Provision for Children and Teenagers.
- 91) The most frequently used classifications of open space were Parks and Gardens, Natural and Semi Natural spaces and Green Corridors. The least frequently used classification of open space was Allotments.
- 92) Half of respondents felt accessibility to open spaces in their area was satisfactory whilst the other half felt accessibility to open spaces in their area was unsatisfactory.
- 93) Half of respondents thought cleanliness of open spaces in their area was satisfactory.
- 94) Half of respondents felt facilities at open spaces in their area were satisfactory and half of respondents felt facilities at open spaces in their area were unsatisfactory.
- 95) Half of respondents had no strong view on safety of open spaces in their area. The other half either thought that safety of open spaces in their area was satisfactory or unsatisfactory.
- 96) Respondents had a mixed response for general appearance of open spaces in their area ranging from very poor to satisfactory.

2.5.5 Egham superward



Figure 25: Egham superward

97) 5 respondents to the user questionnaire reside in the Egham superward.

General Provision

98) The opinion about provision of open space in the Borough was as follows:

60% felt provision in the Borough was about right

20% felt provision in the Borough was too little

The rest of the respondents did not know

Importance

99) Respondents were asked to rate the most important open spaces in their area to them. Those that were most important (shown in the graphs below) were Parks and Gardens and Natural and Semi Natural spaces. Those least important to respondents were Amenity Green Spaces.




Figure 26: Bar chart showing the importance of parks and gardens in the Egham area.




Figure 27: Bar chart showing the importance of natural and semi natural spaces in the Egham area.




Figure 28: Bar chart showing the importance of amenity green spaces in the Egham area.

100) Respondents were asked which open spaces they used most frequently in their area. The most frequently used open spaces were Outdoor Sports Facilities, Natural and Semi Natural spaces, Parks and Garden and Amenity Green Space. The least frequently used open spaces included Cemeteries and Churchyards and Allotments. All graphs are shown below.




Figure 29: Bar chart showing the frequency of use of outdoor sports facilities in the Egham area.




Figure 30: Bar chart showing the frequency of use of natural and semi natural spaces in the Egham area.




Figure 31: Bar chart showing the frequency of use of parks and gardens in the Egham area.




Figure 32: Bar chart showing the frequency of use of amenity green spaces in the Egham area.




Figure 33: Bar chart showing the frequency of use of cemeteries and churchyards in the Egham area.




Figure 34: Bar chart showing the frequency of use of allotments in the Egham area

General Quality

101) Respondents were asked to rate the open spaces in their area based on Accessibility, Cleanliness, Facilities, Safety and General Appearance. Respondent results were as follow:

Accessibility

20% of respondents said that accessibility of open spaces in their area was very good

80% of respondents said that accessibility of open spaces in their area was satisfactory

Cleanliness

20% of respondents said that cleanliness of open spaces in their area was very good

20% of respondents said that cleanliness of open spaces in their area was satisfactory
40% of respondents said that cleanliness of open spaces in their area was unsatisfactory

20% of respondents did not answer this question

Facilities

80% of respondents had no strong view either way on the quality of the facilities

20% of respondents said that facilities at open spaces in their area were unsatisfactory

Safety

40% of respondents said that safety of open spaces in their area was satisfactory

40% of respondents had no strong view either way

20% of respondents said that safety of open spaces in their area was unsatisfactory

General Appearance

20% of respondents said that general appearance of open spaces in their area was very good

60% of respondents said that general appearance of open spaces in their area was satisfactory

20% of respondents did not have a strong view either way

Summary of responses of Egham respondents:

- 102) The majority of respondents felt the provision of open space in the Borough was about right.
- 103) The most important classifications of open space were Parks and Gardens and Natural and Semi Natural spaces. The least important classification of open space was Amenity Green Space.
- 104) The most frequently used classifications of open space were Natural and Semi Natural spaces. The least frequently used classifications of open spaces was Allotments.
- 105) All respondents felt accessibility to open spaces in their area was either very good or satisfactory.
- 106) Less than half of respondents thought cleanliness of open spaces in their area was unsatisfactory.
- 107) The majority of respondents had no strong view either way in relation to facilities.
- 108) Just less than half of the respondents thought that safety of open spaces in their area was satisfactory. Just less than half of the respondents had no strong view either way.
- 109) The majority of respondents thought that general appearance of open spaces in their area was very good or satisfactory, the rest had no strong view either way.

2.5.6 Virginia Water superward




Figure 35: Virginia Water superward

110) 27 respondents to the user questionnaire reside in the Virginia Water superward.

General Provision

111) The opinion about provision of open space in the Borough was as follows:

79% felt provision in the Borough was about right

17% felt provision in the Borough was too little

Importance

112) Respondents were asked to rate the most important open spaces in their area to them. Those that were most important (shown in the graphs below) were Parks and Gardens, Green Corridors and Natural and Semi Natural spaces. Those least important to respondents were Allotments and Cemeteries and Churchyards (show on the next page).




Figure 36: Bar chart showing the importance of parks and gardens in the Virginia Water area.




Figure 37: Bar chart showing the importance of green corridors in the Virginia Water area.




Figure 38: Bar chart showing the importance of natural and semi natural spaces in the Virginia Water area.




Figure 39: Bar chart showing the importance of allotments in the Virginia Water area.




Figure 40: Bar chart to show the importance of cemeteries and churchyards in the Virginia Water area.

Frequency

113) Respondents were asked which open spaces they used most frequently in their area. The most frequently used open spaces used were Parks and Gardens, Natural and Semi Natural space and Green Corridors (shown in the graphs below). The least frequently used open spaces included Civic Squares and Spaces and Cemeteries and Churchyards.




Figure 41: Bar chart showing the frequency of use of parks and gardens in the Virginia Water area.




Figure 42: Bar chart showing the frequency of use of natural and semi natural spaces in the Virginia Water area.




Figure 43: Bar chart to show the frequency of use of green corridors in the Virginia Water area.




Figure 44: Bar chart showing the frequency of use of civic squares and spaces in the Virginia Water area.




Figure 45: Bar chart showing the frequency of use of cemeteries and churchyards in the Virginia Water area.

General quality

- 114) Respondents were asked to rate the open spaces in their area based on Accessibility, Cleanliness, Facilities, Safety and General Appearance. Respondent results were as follow:

Accessibility

15% of respondents said that accessibility of open spaces in their area was very good

63% of respondents said that accessibility of open spaces in their area was satisfactory

22% of respondents had no strong view either way

Cleanliness

11% of respondents said that cleanliness of open spaces in their area was very good

63% of respondents said that cleanliness of open spaces in their area was satisfactory

22% of respondents had no strong view either way

4% of respondents said that cleanliness of open spaces in their area was unsatisfactory

Facilities

7% of respondents said that facilities at open spaces in their area were very good

56% of respondents said that facilities at open spaces in their area were satisfactory

30% of respondents had no strong view either way

11% of respondents said that facilities at open spaces in their area were unsatisfactory

Safety

4% of respondents said that safety of open spaces in their area was very good

59% of respondents said that safety of open spaces in their area was satisfactory
33% of respondents had no strong view either way

4% of respondents said that safety of open spaces in their area was unsatisfactory

General Appearance

11% of respondents said that general appearance of open spaces in their area was very good

67% of respondents said that general appearance of open spaces in their area was satisfactory

19% of respondents had no view either way

4% of respondents said that general appearance of open spaces in their area was unsatisfactory

Summary of responses of Virginia Water respondents:

- 115) The majority of respondents felt the provision of open space in the Borough was about right.
- 116) The most important classifications of open space were Natural and Semi Natural spaces. The least important classification of open space was Allotments.
- 117) The most frequently used classifications of open space were Natural and Semi Natural spaces. The least frequently used classifications of open spaces were Cemeteries and Churchyards and Civic Squares and Spaces.
- 118) The majority of respondents felt accessibility to open spaces in their area was either very good or satisfactory.
- 119) The majority of respondents felt the cleanliness of open spaces in their area was very good or satisfactory.
- 120) Just over half of respondents felt facilities were satisfactory in open spaces in their area.
- 121) Most respondents felt safety was very good or satisfactory for open spaces in their area.
- 122) The majority of respondents thought that general appearance of open spaces in their area was very good or satisfactory.

2.5.7 Overall summary of open space use in the Borough:

- 123) In summary, half of respondents felt the supply of open space is about right across the Borough. There has been a significant change from the 2010 study in regard to this question. In 2010, 75% of respondents in Chertsey thought provision in their area was about right. However, in the most recent survey only 35% of respondents felt provision of open space was about right.
- 124) Concerns identified in regard to maintenance of park apparatus and other issues were raised in comments. Comments were passed onto the Leisure Services Department as appropriate. These comments can also be found in Appendix 7.
- 125) Most importance spaces within the Borough were those classified as Natural and Semi Natural Spaces and Green Corridors.
- 126) Most frequently used open spaces in the Borough were those classified as Natural and Semi Natural Spaces and Parks and Gardens.
- 127) From these findings it is clear that Natural and Semi Natural Spaces are highly valued as open spaces for respondents within the Borough of Runnymede.

Summary conclusion

- 128) Suggestions for improvements to open space are based on the demands and needs identified in the user questionnaires as follows:
 - Improved maintenance of open space sites
 - More open spaces may need to be provided
 - A focus on the area of Chertsey with regard to ensuring that the amount of open spaces in the area meets the demand of local residents.

2.6 Analysis – quantitative element (stage 5)

- 129) To understand the supply of open space provision in the Borough, two main objectives are relevant; identifying the quantity of open space in the Borough within the identified classifications and making an assessment of the quality of open space in the Borough.

2.6.1 Quantity analysis

- 130) A total of 267 sites were identified. 75 were not assessed in any way. These included privately owned sites and Sites of Nature Conservation Importance (SNCI) that were not accessible or were larger than 2ha. Some sites were inaccessible (either physically or financially due to a fee charge) and it was not practical to conduct site assessments. In these instances, officers attempted to obtain information through desk-based research. 8 Visual Amenity sites and 2 new sites have been included in the table below.

Classification	No. of Sites	Total Area	Accessible Sites	Accessible provision per 1,000 population ⁴	Does this meet national recommended standard?
Allotments, Community gardens and city (urban) farms	13	36.6	36.6 (540 plots)	0.45 (15.6 plots per 1000 households)	No ⁵
Amenity green spaces	50	97.13	67.41	0.84	None set
Civic Squares	3	0.08	0.08	0	None set
Cemeteries and Churchyards	10	13.37	13.37	0.17	None set
Green Corridors	23	111.67	111.67	1.39	None set
Natural and Semi Natural	54	1176.29	1003.74	12.5	None set
Outdoor sports facilities	56	671.35	28.78	0.40	No ⁶
Parks and Gardens	15	394.61	377.61	4.7	None set
Provision for children and teenagers	41	4.92	4.92	0.06	No ⁷
Other ⁸	2	64.12	0	0	Not applicable
	267	2570.14	1644.18	20.51	

Table 3: Overall quantity of open space in Runnymede

⁴ Accessible defined as not having to pay a fee to enter, and freely accessible to members of public. However to ensure a standard is derived for Allotments, these have been included even though they are inaccessible

⁵ Standard of 20 plots per 1000 households as recommended by The National Society of Allotment and Leisure Gardeners (NSALG). A plot size is 250 sq.m.

⁶ Standard of 1.6 ha per 1000 population as recommended by Fields in Trust

⁷ Standard of 0.8 ha per 1000 population as recommended by Fields in Trust

⁸ The two sites forming the Other open space category were Thorpe Park in the Egham superward and Chertsey Camping and Caravanning Club in the Chertsey superward

- 131) More than one classification of open space existed in some open spaces which was most apparent where sites contained an equipped play space. A full list of all sites identified can be found in appendix 8.
- 132) The sites were considered in terms of the superwards using ward data into: Addlestone, Chertsey, Egham and Virginia Water in order to get an accurate picture of how the open spaces in these areas were used.
- 133) From the site assessment undertaken and undertaking a GIS mapping exercise, table 3 identifies how the 267 sites were classified as per the CABE guidance, and the total site areas for each classification formed on a Borough wide basis. The table also identifies the current level of provision per 1,000 population using 2015 estimates from ONS data.

2.6.2 Quantity summary of open space in Runnymede

- 134) The Borough as a whole has a good provision of accessible Open Spaces (supported by 64% of respondents in the user questionnaire), with a large provision being evident in the classifications for Natural and Semi-Natural Green Spaces and Parks and Gardens.
- 135) However, there is a large Borough-wide underprovision of accessible Outdoor Sports Facilities (0.40 ha per 1000 population) compared with the Fields in Trust recommended standard of 1.6 ha (including pitch sport and parks).
- 136) There is also a Borough-wide underprovision of accessible Provision for Children and Teenagers in the Borough. The current supply across the Borough is 0.06 ha per 1000 population compared to 0.8 ha (as recommended by Fields in Trust).
- 137) There is also an underprovision of Allotments in Addlestone and Egham compared to the recommended provision set by NSALG. The recommendation by NSALG is 20 standard plots per 1000 households, and based on recent calculations using the electoral register, there are 34,562 households in Runnymede. The current provision of allotment plots in the Borough is 540, and this equates to 15.6 plots per 1000 households.
- 138) A local standard for the classifications of Amenity Green Space and Parks and Gardens was not derived in the absence of a national standard. Each of the Borough's superwards is contrasting, and to develop a Borough wide standard for the classifications would have made it difficult for some areas to achieve the target standard set. For example, Virginia Water Lake is almost 300 ha and would skew the average provision of Parks and Gardens significantly, making it difficult for an area like Addlestone to achieve the developed recommended standard. However, these open spaces are recognised as an important resource, so the maintenance of current provision in each of the areas is essential. Similarly, there is no national standard for Green Corridors, but this classification is recognised as being important as natural habitat and helps to connect nature and its species with residential areas, as well as having recreational and health benefits. Therefore maintenance and enhancement of these sites at the current provision is also important.
- 139) Natural England also recommends the provision of 1 ha of Local Nature Reserve (LNR) per 1000 population, and this figure is exceeded throughout the Borough.

2.6.3 Quality analysis – ranking of sites

- 140) The quality of the sites was assessed against five criteria:
- 1) Accessibility (e.g. disabled access, locality to public transport and signage)
 - 2) Cleanliness
 - 3) Facilities
 - 4) Safety; and
 - 5) Overall Quality
- 141) Guides from the 2010 study were used to assist the assessor in scoring each site. These can found in Appendix 2.

2.6.4 Ranking of sites

- 142) Each criterion was scored out of 5, and an overall score out of 25 was calculated. The sites were then ranked into high, medium and low quality brackets using the grouping of quality scores below.

Lower Quality	Medium Quality	High Quality
0-14	15-19	20-25

Table 4: Quality scale for site assessments

2.6.5 Summary of quality of open space in Runnymede

- 143) Table 5 gives an overview of the quality of different types of spaces assessed in the Borough which indicates the classifications of open space which may be in need of improvements to raise the quality.

Classification	No. of sites identified	No. of sites assessed	Quality Range	Average quality score (median) of sites assessed
Allotments, community gardens and city (urban) farms	13	13	14-24	20
Amenity green space	50	48	8-25	17
Cemeteries and Churchyards	10	10	12-25	18
Civic Spaces	3	3	20-23	20
Green Corridors	23	14	8-22	17
Natural and Semi-Natural	54	26	10-24	16/17
Outdoor Sports Facilities	56	26	9-25	20
Parks and Gardens	15	14	16-24	21/22
Provision for children and teenagers	41	37	11-25	19/20
Other	2	1 ⁹	22	22
TOTAL	267	192	8-25	19/20

Table 5: Boroughwide quantity of classifications of open space

- 144) The table identifies that in general across the Borough, there are no classifications of open space that are of a low quality. There is a possibility that improvements could be made within the classifications of amenity green spaces, cemeteries and churchyards, green corridors and natural and semi natural; however, each of these has scored within the medium quality on the quality assessment.
- 145) Additionally it should be noted that there is a significant variance in the scores per each categorised space in a specific criterion even when the average score show high quality. Therefore even where an overall average high quality has been achieved there may be individual sites that could still benefit from improvements.

⁹ Only one of the sites forming the Other open space classification could be assessed

2.7 Creating a spatial picture of open space in Runnymede

	No of sites identified	No of sites assessed	Accessible area(ha) including allotments	Quality Range	Median Quality Score
Addlestone	80	57	179.553	8-25	17
Chertsey	48	35	143.79	8-25	18/19
Egham	88	67	800.966	9-24	19
Virginia Water	51	33	519.871	12-24	20
Total	267	192	1644.18	8-25	18/19

Table 6: Quantity and quality of open spaces in the Boroughs' superwards

- 146) Table 6 identifies the quantity and general quality of open spaces in the four main geographical areas. All areas are of a medium or high quality. The following section discusses each area in terms of the amount of provision and its quality.
- 147) Where the open space covered more than one superward, it was allocated to the superward where the majority of the site was located and the score was attributed to this superward accordingly. However, the scoring for such sites was attributed to the portion of the site only within the dominant superward.

2.7.1 Addlestone Superward

Current household figure: 12,561

Current population figure: 27,890

- 148) The Addlestone super ward combines Addlestone Bourneside, Addlestone North, Chertsey South and Row Town, New Haw and Woodham. The super ward has a number of open spaces, the majority of which are amenity green spaces and/or provisions for children and teenagers. A greater proportion of the open spaces in Addlestone are owned by Runnymede Borough Council than in the other superwards that have been assessed and tend to be located in residential developments.
- 149) The following section discusses the Addlestone superward with regard to open space provision in terms of quantity and quality, and draws attention to what under provision the area has, and where quality could be improved.




Figure 46: Map showing all open spaces in the Addlestone superward.

Classification	Total No. accessible sites	Area (ha) – accessible only	Per 1000 population provision	Meet standards?	Quality Range	Median score of sites assessed
Allotments, community gardens and city (urban) farms	4	28.91 (2.86ha is allotments) ¹⁰	9.9 plots per 1000 households ¹¹	No ¹²	17-20	19/20
Amenity Green Spaces	24	19	0.69	n/a	10-21	16
Cemeteries and churchyards	1	2.44	0.08	n/a	12	12
Civic squares and spaces	0	0	0	n/a	0	0
Green Corridors	11	28.08	1.00	n/a	8-22	12
Natural and semi-natural green spaces	9	87.213	3.13	n/a	14-19	14/15
Outdoor sports facilities	2	7.87	0.28	No ¹³	14-25	22
Parks and gardens	2	4.93	0.178	n/a	17-22	19/20
Provision for children and teenagers	12	1.11	0.04	No ¹⁴	14-24	17
Total	65	179.553			8-24	16/17

Table 7: Overview of open spaces in the Addlestone area

150) Table 7 shows the number of accessible sites in the Addlestone superward and provision per 1000 population. The types of classification where underprovision has been identified is all those with national standards (outdoor sport facilities, provision for children and teenagers, and allotments, community gardens and city (urban) farms).

¹⁰ Allotments are not publicly accessible as it is a requirement to pay to grow plants on a plot, however to give an indication of the provision, it was considered pertinent to include the number of plots in this table

¹¹ There are 124 allotment plots in the Addlestone area

¹² Standard of 20 plots per 1000 households as recommended by The National Society of Allotment and Leisure Gardeners (NSALG). A plot size is 250 sq.m.

¹³ Standard of 1.6 ha per 1000 population as recommended by Fields in Trust

¹⁴ Standard of 0.8 ha per 1000 population as recommended by Fields in Trust

Outdoor Sports Facilities

- 151) There is a current underprovision of outdoor sports facilities, with a provision of 0.28 ha accessible outdoor sports facilities per 1000 population compared to the recommended standard of 1.6ha. Outdoor sports facilities were stated as very important by 48% of respondents to the questionnaire. However, only 4% of respondents to the questionnaire stated that they use outdoor sports facilities in the Addlestone area on a daily basis and only 20% of respondents used outdoor sports facilities on a weekly or occasional basis.

Provision for children and teenagers

- 152) There is underprovision of play space in the superward. There is currently 0.04 ha accessible provision per 1000 population which falls far short of the recommended standard of 0.8ha per 1000.

Allotments

- 153) There is an underprovision of allotments in the Addlestone superward. The current provision is 124 plots, equating to 9.9 plots per 1000 households, instead of 20. There is a waiting list for allotments plots within the Addlestone area with at least 19 local residents on the list. Specifically, there is only provision in the ward of New Haw currently.

Summary

- 154) With reference to the quality of open spaces in the Addlestone area they are generally of a medium quality.
- 155) Both Natural and Semi Natural Spaces and Green Corridors were important to local residents who responded in the user questionnaires. However, they are both of a low to medium quality and as such improvement to them would be beneficial.
- 156) St Augustine's Open Space is a good example of this. This is used as a short cut between Albert Road and Weybridge Road. This site is poorly maintained with no properties overlooking the site, reducing the amount of natural surveillance and the perceived safety of the site. This could be addressed to improve the quality and then potentially the usage by local residents.

2.7.2 Chertsey Superward

Current Household Figure: 5722

Current Population Figure: 12,078

- 157) The Chertsey superward combines Chertsey Meads and Chertsey St. Anns. The following section discusses the Chertsey area with regard to open space provision in terms of quantity and quality, and draws attention to what underprovision the area has, and where quality could be improved.




Figure 47: Map showing all open spaces in the Chertsey superward.

Classification	Total No. accessible sites	Area (ha) – accessible only	Per 1000 population provision	Meet standards?	Quality Range	Median score of sites assessed
Allotments, community gardens and city (urban) farms	2	2.16 ¹⁵	22.2 plots per 1000 households ¹⁶	Yes ¹⁷	20-23	21/22
Amenity Green Spaces	9	5.28	0.44	n/a	8-25	18
Cemeteries and churchyards	2	2.74	0.23	n/a	17-25	21
Civic squares and spaces	1	0.04	0	n/a	20	20
Green Corridors	5	4.32	0.36	n/a	17	17
Natural and semi- natural green spaces	6	117.51	9.7	n/a	12-23	14
Outdoor sports facilities	11	5.78	0.48	No ¹⁸	9-24	19/20
Parks and gardens	2	4.82	0.4	n/a	20-21	20/21
Provision for children and teenagers	8	1.14	0.09	No ¹⁹	12-25	19/20
Other	0	0	0	n/a	0	0 ²⁰
Total	46	143.79			8-25	19/20

Table 8: Overview of open spaces in the Chertsey area.

158) Table 8 shows the number of accessible sites in the Chertsey superward, and provision per 1000 population. The types of classification where underprovision has been identified using national standards are outdoor sports facilities and provision for children and teenagers.

¹⁵ Allotments are not publicly accessible as it is a requirement to pay to grow plants on a plot, however to give an indication of the provision, it was considered pertinent to include the number of plots in this table

¹⁶ There are 127 allotment plots in the Chertsey area

¹⁷ Standard of 20 plots per 1000 households as recommended by The National Society of Allotment and Leisure Gardeners (NSALG). A plot size is 250 sq.m.

¹⁸ Standard of 1.6 ha per 1000 population as recommended by Fields in Trust

¹⁹ Standard of 0.8 ha per 1000 population as recommended by Fields in Trust

²⁰ Due to a lack of information the open space site from the Other classification was not assessed

Outdoor sport facilities

- 159) There is a current underprovision of accessible outdoor sport facilities at 0.48 ha per 1000 population whereas the recommended national standards seek 1.6 ha per 1000 population. 75% of respondents to the questionnaire stated that outdoor sports facilities are quite important or very important to the area.

Provision for children and teenagers

- 160) There is an underprovision of open space for children and teenagers. There is currently 0.09 ha provision per 1000 population compared with the recommended standard of 0.8 ha per 1000 population. 50% of respondents to the questionnaire stated that provision for children and teenagers was very important to the area with another 50% of respondents saying they used provision for children and teenager spaces on a weekly or monthly basis.

Allotments

- 161) The provision of allotments in the Chertsey superward exceeds the national standards. There are 127 plots providing 22.2 plots per 1000 households, which is higher than the recommended 20. However, there is a high demand for allotment plots within the Chertsey area with at least 35 local residents on the waiting list.
- 162) The quality of allotment sites in Chertsey is high. Barrsbrook Farm Allotments is the newest allotment site and is well maintained with an improvement made to the wheelchair access since the site was last assessed in the 2010 study.

Summary

- 163) With reference to the overall quality across all categories of open space in the Chertsey superward they are of a medium to high quality.
- 164) Respondents to the user questionnaire showed that local residents use a range of each classification of open space but in particular use Natural and Semi Natural Spaces.
- 165) Natural and Semi Natural Spaces in the Chertsey area are one of the classifications with a lower quality than the rest. Therefore it would be beneficial to improve these open spaces due to their importance to local residents.
- 166) An example of this is St. Ann's Hill in ward of Chertsey St. Ann's. This site is a wooded park that features a nature trail and a range of facilities such as benches, maps and a water point. However, the open space does not have much natural surveillance. Improvements in this regard could improve its quality for residents.

2.7.3 Egham Superward

Current household figure: 11,670

Current population figure: 28,930

- 167) The Egham superward combines Egham Hythe, Egham Town, Englefield Green East, Englefield Green West and Thorpe.




Figure 48: Map showing all open spaces in the Egham superward.

Classification	Total No. accessible sites	Area (ha) – accessible only	Per 1000 population provision	Meet standards?	Quality Range	Median score of sites assessed
Allotments, community gardens and city (urban) farms	6	3.61 ²¹	15.8 plots per 1000 households ²²	No ²³	14-24	19/20
Amenity Green Spaces	11	36.56	1.26	n/a	9-24	19
Cemeteries and churchyards	4	6.49	0.22	n/a	18-20	18/19
Civic squares and spaces	2	0.04	0	n/a	20-230	21/22
Green Corridors	6	58.03	2.01	n/a	12-20	17
Natural and semi-natural green spaces	15	520.5	18.0	n/a	10-24	19
Outdoor sports facilities	5	9.3	0.32	No ²⁴	13-22	19
Parks and gardens	6	164.5	5.69	n/a	16-23	21
Provision for children and teenagers	15	1.92	0.07	No ²⁵	11-23	20
Other	0	0	0	n/a	22	22 ²⁶
Total	70	800.966			9-24	19/20

Table 9: Overview of open spaces in the Egham area

168) Table 9 shows the number of accessible sites in the Egham superward, and provision per 1000 population. The type of classifications where underprovision has been identified is all these with national standards (outdoor sport facilities, provision for children and teenagers and allotments, community gardens and city (urban) farms).

²¹ Allotments are not publicly accessible as it is a requirement to pay to grow plants on a plot, however to give an indication of the provision, it was considered pertinent to include the number of plots in this table

²² There are 184 allotment plots in the Egham area

²³ Standard of 20 plots per 1000 households as recommended by The National Society of Allotment and Leisure Gardeners (NSALG). A plot size is 250 sq.m.

²⁴ Standard of 1.6 ha per 1000 population as recommended by Fields in Trust

²⁵ Standard of 0.8 ha per 1000 population as recommended by Fields in Trust

²⁶ Although this open space site in the Other classification was not accessible, a desk based assessment was carried out with information from the site

Outdoor Sports Facilities

- 169) There is a large underprovision of accessible outdoor sport facilities, with a provision of 0.32 ha per 1000 population as opposed to the 1.6 ha per 1000 population as recommended by Fields in Trust. 80% of respondents to the questionnaire said that outdoor sports facilities that do exist in Egham were either quite or very important.

Provision for children and teenagers

- 170) There is a shortfall in provision for children/teenagers; the provision is 0.07 ha per 1000 population as opposed to 80% of respondents to the questionnaire said that outdoor sports facilities in Egham were either quite or very important.

Allotments

- 171) There is an under provision of allotments. There are 184 plots, providing 15.8 plots per households, which is lower than the recommended 20. There is a high demand for allotment plots within the Egham area and at least 45 local residents are on the waiting list.

Summary

- 172) With reference to the overall quality of open spaces in the Egham superward they are medium to high quality.
- 173) In particular the classification that has been proved to be popular with local residents through the user questionnaire responses was Natural and Semi Natural Open Spaces and Green Corridors.
- 174) Green Corridors have the lowest quality rating for the Egham area and so improvements would be beneficial for the local residents. Additionally, the maintenance of Natural and Semi Natural Open Spaces would be beneficial.
- 175) Parks and Gardens are also highly popular with local residents who responded to the user questionnaire. They are also of a high quality and therefore the continued maintenance of these open spaces would be very beneficial to the local community.
- 176) An example of the Parks and Gardens classification would be Walnut Tree Gardens. The open space is clean, well maintained and has mature trees and some attractive formal planting.

2.7.4 Virginia Water Superward

Current household figure: 4609

Current population figure: 11,612

177) The Virginia Water super ward combines the ward of Virginia Water with Foxhills.




Figure 49: Map showing all open spaces in the Virginia Water superward.

Classification	Total No. accessible sites	Area (ha) – accessible only	Per 1000 population provision	Meet standards?	Quality Range	Median score of sites assessed
Allotments, community gardens and city (urban) farms	1	1.92 ²⁷	22.8 plots per 1000 households ²⁸	Yes ²⁹	24	24
Amenity Green Spaces	4	6.568	0.57	n/a	21-23	21/22
Cemeteries and churchyards	3	1.7	0.15	n/a	14-20	15
Civic squares and spaces	0	0	0	n/a	0	0
Green Corridors	1	21.24	1.83	n/a	17	17
Natural and semi- natural green spaces	14	278.517	24.0	n/a	12-18	15/16
Outdoor sports facilities	1	5.83	0.50	No ³⁰	20-24	22
Parks and gardens	4	203.346	17.51	n/a	21-24	22/23
Provision for children and teenagers	6	0.75	0.06	No ³¹	16-24	20
Total	34	519.871			12-24	21

Table10: Overview of open spaces in the Virginia Water area

178) Table 10 shows the number of accessible sites in the Virginia Water superward and provision per 1000 population. The types of classification where underprovision has been identified using national standards are outdoor sport facilities and provision for children and teenagers.

²⁷ Allotments are not publicly accessible as it is a requirement to pay to grow plants on a plot, however to give an indication of the provision, it was considered pertinent to include the number of plots in this table

²⁸ There are 105 plots in the Virginia Water area

²⁹ Standard of 20 plots per 1000 households as recommended by The National Society of Allotment and Leisure Gardeners (NSALG). A plot size is 250 sq.m.

³⁰ Standard of 1.6 ha per 1000 population as recommended by Fields in Trust

³¹ Standard of 0.8 ha per 1000 population as recommended by Fields in Trust

Outdoor sports facilities

- 179) There is an underprovision of accessible outdoor sports facilities of 0.50 ha per 1000, compared with the recommended standard of 1.6 ha per 1000 population.

Provision for children and teenagers

- 180) There is a large underprovision of play space, at only 0.06 ha per 1000 population compared with the recommended 0.8ha per 1000 population by Fields In Trust.

Allotments

- 181) The provision of allotments in this area exceeds the national recommended standards. There are 105 plots, providing 22.8 plots per 1000 households, higher than the minimum standard of 20. There is less demand for allotment plots in the Virginia Water space with only 3 local residents on the waiting list.
- 182) There is only one allotment provided for the area of Virginia Water at Stroude Road Allotments. The open space is rated very high in terms of quality and therefore it is important to local residents.

Summary

- 183) There are no civic spaces in the Virginia Water superward. Although civic spaces were not the most important or frequently used by any of the respondents in the user questionnaires. Civic squares are an important place for people to socialise, so provision of some civic space in Virginia Water would be beneficial.
- 184) The three classifications of Natural and Semi Natural Open Space, Parks and Gardens and Green Corridors were all identified as important to respondents who answered the user questionnaires within the Virginia Water area.
- 185) Parks and Gardens in the Virginia Water superward are of a high quality and so continued maintenance of these sites would be beneficial.
- 186) Green Corridors are of a medium quality and so improvements could be made to these sites as they are popular with local residents.
- 187) Natural and Semi Natural open spaces are rated as medium quality and therefore improvements will need to be made so that the local residents can fully benefit from these sites. This is because Natural and Semi Natural open spaces are popular with local residents.
- 188) An example of this is Chaworth Copse in the Foxhills ward. The open space site is an area of woodland with a high quality car park. However the sign advertising the site is set back and therefore not clearly visible to the public. Improvements made in this regard could help to improve the usability of the site although further improvements would need to be made in order to address concerns about the quality.

3. Accessibility of open space in Runnymede

- 189) As part of the OSS, as well as making a quantity and quality analysis of the open spaces, accessibility is also assessed in terms of distance from residence as this is an important contributor to open space usage. Open space needs to be accessible to the public, not only in terms of being publicly available to everyone, but also in terms of being within a suitable distance from where people live to increase the likelihood of people using them.
- 190) The following table identifies different accessibility distance thresholds for different types of classification which are in part derived from using standards identified by neighbouring Local Authority open space studies as they are similar to Runnymede Borough and part derived from user questionnaires to give a more local justification. Appropriate walking times were established using the average walking speed of 5km/h³². Appropriate driving times were established using the UK road speed limits.

³² Appropriate walking times were found by this link <https://www.bhf.org.uk/get-involved/events/training-zone/walking-training-zone/walking-faqs>

3.1 Accessibility standards

<u>Classification</u>	<u>Mole Valley 2007</u>	<u>Spelthorne 2005</u>	<u>Woking 2008</u>	<u>Runnymede Accessibility Option</u>
Parks and Gardens	10 minute walk, approx. 550m	5 minute walk, 400m	15 minute walking, approx. 800m	10 minute walking, 800m
Natural/Semi natural green space	15 minute walk, approximately 800m	10 minute drive, 4km	Size greater than 20ha = 5000m Size 2-20ha = 2000m	5 minute walking, 400m
Green Corridors	None set	None set	None set	None set
Outdoor Sports Facilities	10 minute drive, approximately 4km	10 minute drive. 4km	15 minute walking, 800m	15 minute walking, 1200m
Amenity Green Space	10 minute walk, approximately 550m	5 minute walk, 4km	None set	5 minute walking, 400m
Provision Children/Teens	10 minute walk, 550m to a reasonable quality and equipped play space	5 minute walk	400m	5 minute walking, 400m
Allotments	10 minute drive, approximately 4km	none	15 minute walking, 800m	10 minute walking, 800m
Cemeteries	none set	10 minute drive, 4km	Size greater than 20ha = 5000m Size less than 20ha = 800m	10 minute walking, 800m
Civic Spaces	None set	None set	None set	None set

Table 11: Local authority buffer distances used to assist Runnymede accessibility standards for open space classifications

- 191) The following accessibility maps show the location of different open spaces classifications and their accessibility buffers as a straight line distance. These maps are indicative, as straight line distances are not the same as travel distances. A criticism of straight line travel distances instead of true travelling distance buffers was made in the 2010 study.
- 192) An alternative option looked at accurate travelling distances from points that were systematically connected to the nearest road on the map. However, these points did not show a true representation of the travelling distance, as the GIS modelling selects the nearest road to the open space site, not the access point. In some instances the nearest

road was the M25 which clearly cannot be included in the study. The Planning Policy team could have surveyed the open space sites and noted down the access points that surround them so these could be plotted by GIS but a decision was made not to given time and resource pressures. It was thought that this would have delayed the study to a much later date and the team could not be sure that all access points would be covered. For example, some people may be able to access some open space sites from their back garden, while some sites could have several access points.

3.1.1 Parks and Gardens




Figure 50: Map showing provision of accessible parks and gardens and straight-line buffer distances to indicate accessibility of classification across the Borough

- 193) There are deficiencies in accessibility to parks and garden sites, particularly in the Woodham and Virginia Water areas. This does not necessarily mean there is an underprovision of this classification in quantity terms in the four superwards but it does mean that if any new sites are planned, it would be most beneficial for them to be located where accessibility is currently poor.

3.1.2 Natural and Semi Natural Green Spaces




Figure 51: Map showing provision of accessible natural and semi-natural green spaces and straight-line buffer distances to indicate accessibility of classification across the Borough

- 194) There are deficiencies in access to certain sizes of natural and semi natural green space, but the Borough as a whole is well serviced by this type of classification, according to ANGSt. There are gaps in the 300m accessibility buffer for natural and semi-natural green spaces sized 0-500ha or larger in much of the Foxhills ward and in Woodham, but where there are gaps, there are sites of 20ha or larger that are accessible using the ANGSt standards. Most of the Borough is within 2km of at least a 20ha site with a small area not covered in Addlestone, but there are smaller sites accessible in this area. In other parts of the Borough, areas are covered by a site of at least 100ha e.g. Windsor Great Park. However, where there is not a site of at least 100ha, there are

smaller natural and semi-natural green spaces that are accessible. Almost the whole of the Borough meets the access threshold to a 500ha or larger site.

3.1.3 Outdoor Sports Facilities




© Crown copyright and database rights 2016 Ordnance Survey 100006086

Figure 52: Map showing provision of accessible outdoor sports facilities and straight-line buffer distances to indicate accessibility of classification across the Borough

- 195) Most of the Borough meets the access standards to an outdoor sports open space and this level of access should be maintained especially as quantitative deficit has been identified for this classification.

3.1.4 Amenity Green Spaces



© Crown copyright and database rights 2016 Ordnance Survey 100006086

Figure 53: Map showing provision of accessible amenity green spaces and straight-line buffer distances to indicate accessibility of classification across the Borough.

196) A large part of the Borough does not meet the recommended accessibility standard for the Amenity Green Spaces classification, in particular the areas of Ottershaw and Virginia Water. This does not necessarily mean that there is a quantity underprovision of Amenity Green Spaces in the four superwards but it does mean that if any new sites for this classification are planned, it would be most beneficial for them to be located where accessibility is currently poor.

3.1.5 Provision for children and Teenagers




Figure 54: Map showing provision of accessible provision for children and teenagers and straight-line buffer distances to indicate accessibility of classification across the Borough

197) A large part of the Borough has poor accessibility to open spaces for provision for children and teenagers when assessed against the Fields In Trust standards and local guidance, in particular Virginia Water. It has also been identified that there is a quantitative underprovision in this classification across the Borough. If any new sites for this classification are planned, it would be therefore most beneficial for them to be located in Virginia Water.

3.1.6 Allotments, community gardens and city farms



Figure 55: Map showing provision of accessible allotments and straight-line buffer distances to indicate accessibility of classification across the Borough

- 198) A large part of the Borough does not meet the recommended access standards to allotments, community gardens and city farms, in particular at Ottershaw and Virginia Water. In these areas, there is not an underprovision in terms of quantity, but if any new provision was planned for the Ottershaw and Virginia Water areas it would be beneficial to be in the west of the Virginia Water area, as accessibility is poor here.

3.1.7 Cemeteries and churchyards




Figure 56: Map showing provision of accessible cemeteries and churchyards and straight-line buffer distances to indicate accessibility of classification across the Borough.

- 199) A large part of the Borough does not comply with the advised accessibility standard for cemeteries and churchyards, in particular Woodham and New Haw, and Virginia Water. This does not necessarily mean there is a quantitative underprovision of cemeteries and churchyards in the Borough, but it does mean that if any new sites for this classification are planned, it would be most beneficial for them to be located where accessibility is poor.
- 200) With regard to Council-owned cemeteries and churchyards it has been identified that there is no more availability for burials in Addlestone Cemetery. Chertsey Cemetery has

burial capacity for approximately 30 to 40 years. Englefield Green Cemetery has burial capacity for approximately 30 to 40 years and Thorpe Cemetery has capacity for approximately 2 to 3 years. It has been identified that Thames Water have begun to back fill the gravel site surrounding Thorpe Cemetery but no further correspondence has been received by RBC regarding the extension of available space at Thorpe Cemetery. No additional space has been given to RBC cemeteries in the time since the publication of the 2010 OSS³³.

- 201) Privately owned cemeteries and churchyards are owned by the church and RBC has no input into them until they are full. At the present time, RBC has no information on any additional burial space in these churchyards.
- 202) Based on accessibility standards the Addlestone superward is under provided with cemeteries and churchyards. In general, cemeteries are visited less than other classifications (none of the respondents to the questionnaire indicated a cemetery/churchyard as their most important or most frequently used open space), therefore there is not a particularly strong demand for this classification within the superward although it should not be forgotten that these types of open space provides an important service to the community beyond the benefit as an open space. In this regard it has been identified that in the Addlestone superward, there is a shortage of burial ground, so it would be beneficial to supply additional burial space if possible. In addition, there are no identified active cemeteries or churchyards in Virginia Water, and so the area could benefit from the supply of additional burial space.
- 203) Green Corridors within Runnymede are seen as a key to providing an essential linkage between open spaces. No access standards for Green Corridors have been set. Taking both of these factors into consideration, it is recommended that the current provision should be retained, as Green Corridors increase the accessibility to other sites within the Borough and the user questionnaires suggest that they are greatly important to the local residents. Additionally, they are also important as wildlife corridors.
- 204) Additionally, no national access standard has been set for civic squares or spaces. This is in line with the archived PPG17 guidance which suggested that it was not realistic for authorities to set a quantity standard for hard surface civic spaces and officers at Runnymede agree with this advice. Furthermore, it is considered that within the Borough of Runnymede there are too few civic squares or spaces for it to be worthwhile to create a bespoke access standard. This may be something Planning Policy officers will consider in the future if more civic squares or spaces are created in the Borough.

³³ All this information can be found via this link

<https://www.runnymede.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=7424&p=0>

3.2 Summary of accessibility of open space

- 205) Deficiencies in access to different open space classifications have been identified. Poor access to most classifications of open space is identified in the Virginia Water area. As this area is a lower populated one, with less residential development than the other areas, it cannot realistically be expected to have the same level of access to all classifications of open space that are available in the larger populated areas.
- 206) If there is any opportunity for addressing the balance of classifications of open space in the Borough, it would be useful to consider what are the classifications with poor access in particular areas for a more even distribution.
- 207) Improvement of access to allotments and to provision for children/teenagers is considered to be particularly beneficial as these classifications also have been found to be in a deficit within Runnymede. In the short term this could be done through improved signage and maintenance. However, in the long term there will need to be consideration of whether more open spaces should be developed in the Borough.

4. General conclusions

- 208) General conclusions drawn from the findings are listed below. However, when considering the findings, the Council will only have control over Runnymede Borough Council owned sites.
- 209) All areas of the Borough should provide, where practicable, outdoor sports facility provision, play provision and allotments to meet future need over the plan period up to 2035.
- 210) Outdoor sports facilities provision per 1000 population is lowest in Addlestone and highest in Virginia Water but Virginia Water still has an underprovision in this category.
- 211) Provision for children and teenagers per 1000 population is lowest in Addlestone and highest in Chertsey although there is still an underprovision in this category in all 4 superwards.
- 212) Provision of allotments per 1000 households is lowest in Addlestone and also underprovided in Egham.
- 213) Natural and Semi Natural open spaces are more accessible across the Borough than any other classification. The quality of this classification has been recognised as medium across the Borough and it is important to improve the quality, especially on sites which individually scored poorly, as this classification was strongly identified as important and the spaces were shown to be well used in the user questionnaires.
- 214) There is a shortage in burial spaces and grounds within the Borough of Runnymede. Any new burial spaces should be located in Addlestone or Virginia Water if possible as these are the areas with the lowest amount.

4.1 Identify Objectives and Recommendations (stage 6)

- 215) The Council's OSS has identified the amount and variety of open spaces available within the Borough.

4.1.1 Demand and need

- 216) There is a variety of open space across the Borough. In comparison to the 2010 study, where there was a high demand and need for outdoor sports facilities and additional play space, the user questionnaires from 2015 have shown less of a demand for outdoor sports facilities. However, accessibility maps and standards show that there is a requirement for more outdoor sports facilities in the Borough of Runnymede.
- 217) The questionnaires also identify a demand for:
- Attention to apparatus and facilities in parks
 - Increase in parks and play space
 - More CCTV as it is important for safety
 - Improvement in toilet cleanliness.
- 218) In the 2010 study, most people used the open space closest to where they lived. It has been considered reasonable to assume that this is still the case. Existing, well used sites

near to residential areas need to be protected where possible, which will help to promote the principles of sustainable development and contribute to healthy lifestyles.

4.2 Recommendations for future work

- 219) The following recommendations have been identified and will be used in the development of the Council's new Local Plan, Runnymede 2035. They are in no particular order:
- 220) The OSS will be used to inform the Green Infrastructure Strategy when it is published in due course.
- 221) The OSS will be used to inform the Issues and Options consultation of the new Local Plan, to help form policies of open space provision which will underpin the Local Plan.
- 222) The Council will seek to promote and protect the open spaces' unique 'selling points', which in turn will help to inform the SWOT analysis in the new Local Plan.
- 223) The OSS will help to inform the Infrastructure Delivery Plan when it is published in due course.
- 224) The Council should use the recommended national standards for Outdoor Sports Facilities, Provision for Children and Teenagers and Allotments identified in the OSS to inform the development of the Council's Local Plan, and to help prepare relevant Development Management Control policies.
- 225) The Council should use recommended standards to identify future provision requirements of open space across the Borough.
- 226) The Council should maintain and improve where appropriate the quality of open spaces for the needs of the community at the present time and in the future.
- 227) The Council should use the OSS to provide recreational facilities for the community in line with the broader visions within the Runnymede Borough Council Corporate Business Plan
- 228) The Council should monitor regularly open space sites to identify any changes to the quality and quantity of open spaces in the Borough, with regard being had to national recommended standards being met.

5. References

- CABE guidance *Open Space Strategies Best Practice Guidance*. Retrieved from <http://www.cabe.org.uk/publications/open-space-strategies>
- Field in Trust *Planning and Design for Outdoor Sport and Play*
- Government. *Health Survey for England*. Retrieved from https://data.gov.uk/dataset/health_survey_for_england
- Government *Town and Country Planning Act 1990*. Retrieved from <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1990/8/contents>
- National Planning Policy Framework. Retrieved from https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/6077/2116950.pdf
- National Planning Practice Guidance. *Local Green Space Designation paragraph 005*. Retrieved from <http://planningguidance.communities.gov.uk/blog/guidance/open-space-sports-and-recreation-facilities-public-rights-of-way-and-local-green-space/local-green-space-designation/>
- Natural England *Standards for Accessible Natural greenspace – ANGSt*. Retrieved from <http://naturalengland.org.uk/ourweb/enjoying/places/greenspace/greenspacestandards.aspx>
- Runnymede Borough Council Corporate Business Plan. Due to be published in April 2016 on the Council website <https://www.runnymede.gov.uk/article/4442/Home>
- Runnymede Borough Committee Meeting with Allotment Representatives March 2011. Retrieved from the Runnymede Borough Council Leisure Services Department.
- Runnymede Borough Council Open Space Study 2010. Retrieved from <https://www.runnymede.gov.uk/article/5243/Open-Space-Study>
- Runnymede Borough Council Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2015. Retrieved from <https://www.runnymede.gov.uk/article/10102/Strategic-Housing-Market-Assessment-SHMA>
- Runnymede Borough Council Strategic Land Availability Assessment 2015. Retrieved from <https://www.runnymede.gov.uk/article/10103/Strategic-Land-Availability-Assessment-SLAA-previously-known-as-the-SHLAA>
- Surrey County Council *Surrey Obesity Strategy 2008*. Retrieved from <http://www.surreyi.gov.uk/Resource.aspx?ResourceID=417&cookieCheck=true>
- Surrey Nature Partnership. Information retrieved from <http://surreynaturepartnership.org.uk/about-us/>

- Surrey Wildlife Trust. Information retrieved from <http://www.surreywildlifetrust.org/>

6. Appendices

Appendix 1 – Site Assessment Pro Forma

SITE ASSESMENT PRO FORMA

Ownership.....

**Name and address/ Description
of site**

Classification

Site area (hectares)

Policy Site Constraints

	Yes	No	Other info.
Local Nature Reserve			
National Nature Reserve			
SNCI			
SSSI			
Green Belt			
Conservation Area			
Other Constraints (i.e in residential area)			

Accessibility

Score

Cleanliness

	<i>Score</i>
--	---------------------

Facilities

	<i>Score</i>
--	---------------------

Safety

	<i>Score</i>
--	---------------------

Overall Quality of site

	<i>Score</i>
--	---------------------

Additional Comments

Total Score: /25

Appendix 2 - Details of assessment criteria

Parks and gardens

accessibility

5 signs to site from road, obvious multiple access points. within walking distance and/or near public transport. Parking available for attraction. Good/safe access. Disabled access

3 Some signage. Within walking distance to resi, public transport nearby. Disabled access

1 No signage, no disabled access. Not accessible by foot

cleanliness

5 No ASB, site well maintained-inviting and tidy.

4 No ASB-good maintenance, little liter or dog fouling, no graffiti

3 0-6 ASB incidents, no graffiti, reasonably clean and tidy on inspection but doesn't hinder use significantly

2 0-6 incidents including graffiti, unclean. Litter/dog fouling that detracts from use of site.

1 0-6 plus graffiti,. Unclean and significantly detracts use of site.

Facilities

5 recycling facilities available. Community/garden area. Benches, bins available, including picnic areas. Excellent condition. Interactivity.

3 some benches bins, in reasonable condition

1 No seating/picnic area or bins (or in poor condition)

Safety

5 Wardens. Night time shutting (and locked). Good lighting and cctv. Clearly defined boundaries

3 some lighting and overlooking. Night time closing, some sign of boundary

1 No lighting or cctv/surveillance. No closing/locking of site, ill defined boundaries

Overall quality

5 well maintained, high quality/varied planting, seasonal. Excellent first impression. Clean and pleasant surroundings, formal feature planting.

3 Well maintained good quality planting. Good first impression, fairly clean and pleasant.

1 Poor maintenance, quality of planting low, and sparse. Untidy and unclean.

Green Corridors (does not include streams)

Accessibility

5 Several access points along course of corridor, accessed via foot/cycle, signage for directions and timings, access ramp

3 Some access points, signage for directions, access via foot/cycle, disability access

1 limited access points, limited access via environmentally friendly modes of transport, no signage no disabled access

Cleanliness

5 No ASB, site well maintained-inviting and tidy.

4 No ASB-good maintenance, little litter or dog fouling, no graffiti

3 0-6 ASB incidents, no graffiti, reasonably clean and tidy on inspection but doesn't hinder use significantly

2 0-6 incidents including graffiti, unclean. Litter/dog fouling that detracts from use of site.

1 0-6 plus graffiti,. Unclean and significantly detracts use of site.

Facilities

5 benches, regular litter/dog bins-appropriate to length of corridor

3 occasional benches, litter/dog bins

1 no benches, litter/dog bins

Safety

5 extra wide paths, safety railing, well kept paths (paths kept clear), life buoys, natural surveillance

3 wide path, fairly well maintained, some surveillance

1 narrow/poorly maintained paths, no natural surveillance

Overall quality

5 good first impression-attractive and well kept

3 average first impression-maintained to a standard not significantly detracting from use of site

1 poor first impression-unkempt and overgrown, unclean. Safety concerns.

Allotments etc

Accessibility

Within walking/cycling/public transport distance of residential area. Good vehicular access for deliveries, disabled access

3 limited access by environmentally friendly modes of transport. No vehicular access on to site

1 access by car/foot only, no vehicular access, no disabled access

Cleanliness

5 No ASB, site well maintained-inviting and tidy.

4 No ASB-good maintenance, little litter or dog fouling, no graffiti

3 0-6 ASB incidents, no graffiti, reasonably clean and tidy on inspection but doesn't hinder use significantly

2 0-6 incidents including graffiti, unclean. Litter/dog fouling that detracts from use of site.

1 0-6 plus graffiti,. Unclean and significantly detracts use of site.

Facilities

5 ample space to provide for shed, a communal block inc. toilet, electricity, several water points, raised beds, spacious feel, paths around plots

3 some space for shed provision, adequate water points for size of allotment

1 cramped feel, no space onsite for shed, no paths around site, 1 water point

Safety

5 secure access and boundary. Well maintained, modern and well built site, some surveillance

3 secure access, secure means of enclosure, limited natural surveillance

1 no secure access, enclosure poorly maintained, isolated location

Overall quality

5 good initial impression, well maintained, safe feel, pleasant surround and tidy

3 average impression, maintained to standard that doesn't detract from using the site

1 poor impression of site, concerns over safety, cleanliness issues that would affect use of site

Natural/semi natural

Accessibility

5 good signage to site, accessible by several environmentally friendly MoT. Good signage and maps within site.

3 reasonable access by environmentally friendly MoT, limited signage/maps

1 only accessible by car

Cleanliness

5 No ASB, site well maintained-inviting and tidy.

4 No ASB-good maintenance, little litter or dog fouling, no graffiti

3 0-6 ASB incidents, no graffiti, reasonably clean and tidy on inspection but doesn't hinder use significantly

2 0-6 incidents including graffiti, unclean. Litter/dog fouling that detracts from use of site.

1 0-6 plus graffiti,. Unclean and significantly detracts use of site.

Facilities

5 excellent variety of planting, where appropriate benches, sympathetically designed to fit surroundings. Toilets/bins at entrance. Information boards.

3 sporadic facilities such as bins and benches

1 no/poor facilities

Safety

5 where appropriate, car parks locked. Surveillance and lighting, good maintenance of grounds so no hazards, wardens.

3 limited surveillance where appropriate, reasonable maintenance so possibility of hazard e.g. fallen tree across paths.

1 Poorly maintained, likelihood of hazard

Overall quality

5 attractive, well maintained site, inviting with a range of planting, and shrubbery. Clean and tidy, safe.

3 reasonably attractive, safe. Limited planting and shrubbery, fairly clean and tidy

1 poor first impression of site, reason to feel unsafe, poorly maintained, lacking biodiversity

Cemeteries and churchyards

Accessibility

5 signage and parking. Accessible by foot and other Modes of transport, good opening times, disabled access

3 limited parking/disabled access. Accessible by foot. Reasonable opening times.

1 no parking/not accessible by foot. No disabled access. Poor opening times

Cleanliness

5 No ASB, site well maintained-inviting and tidy.

4 No ASB-good maintenance, little litter or dog fouling, no graffiti

3 0-6 ASB incidents, no graffiti, reasonably clean and tidy on inspection but doesn't hinder use significantly

2 0-6 incidents including graffiti, unclean. Litter/dog fouling that detracts from use of site.

1 0-6 plus graffiti, Unclean and significantly detracts use of site.

Facilities

5 good bin/bench provision, in good condition. Attractive chapel, community info board. Good quality paths

3 some bin/bench provision in reasonable condition, reasonable path maintenance

1 no/poor quality bin/bench provision, poor/no paths.

Safety

5 well maintained path around site, good lighting and cctv, site locked at night. Natural surveillance

3 reasonably maintained paths, some lighting and natural surveillance

1 poorly maintained paths, poor lighting, no cctv, overgrown, no natural surveillance.

Overall quality

5 inviting and safe feel. Attractive, good planting and well maintained, clean and tidy

3 reasonably inviting and safe, some planting, and some maintenance, reasonably clean and tidy

1 does not feel safe. No/poor quality lighting and not well maintained, unclean and untidy

Civic spaces

Accessibility

5 centralised location within comfortable distance of several env friendly modes of transport and good signage, disabled access.

3 good location but limited accessibility by env friendly modes of transport

1 not located centrally in e.g. a town centre, and isolated from environmentally friendly modes of transport

Cleanliness

5 No ASB, site well maintained-inviting and tidy.

4 No ASB-good maintenance, little litter or dog fouling, no graffiti

3 0-6 ASB incidents, no graffiti, reasonably clean and tidy on inspection but doesn't hinder use significantly

2 0-6 incidents including graffiti, unclean. Litter/dog fouling that detracts from use of site.

1 0-6 plus graffiti. Unclean and significantly detracts use of site.

Facilities

5 2attraction2 feature, ample seating/bins in excellent condition suitable for all age groups, bikes racks, notice board, planting.

3 some seating/bins and in good condition

1 no seating bins/or in poor condition. No planting.

Safety

5 cctv/surveillance, open feel, not enclosed. Well maintained, no hazards, lighting.

3 limited surveillance, some lighting, adequately maintained

1 enclosed space-poorly maintained

Overall quality

5 Attractive, suitable for all age groups, well maintained, clean and tidy

3 Reasonably inviting and safe, clean and tidy

1 At times, wouldn't feel safe, poorly maintained.

Provision for children

Accessibility

5 Signage to site, obvious access, accessible by walking and within reasonable distance where children are not required to cross a main road. Bike rack available, disabled access

3

1 no signs, not within reasonable walking distance of housing, remote site only accessible by car

Cleanliness

5 No ASB, site well maintained-inviting and tidy.

4 No ASB-good maintenance, little litter or dog fouling, no graffiti

3 0-6 ASB incidents, no graffiti, reasonably clean and tidy on inspection but doesn't hinder use significantly

2 0-6 incidents including graffiti, unclean. Litter/dog fouling that detracts from use of site.

1 0-6 plus graffiti. Unclean and significantly detracts use of site.

Facilities

5 a variety of facilities suitable for children and teens that are in excellent condition, well looked after and inviting

3 some or one facility, reasonably well maintained, fairly modern/and space within enclosure to kick a ball

1 no facilities, or if available outdated/vandalised/poor condition. Uninviting

Safety

5 good natural surveillance, more open surroundings with safe access. Good lighting and CCTV if appropriate. Signage illustrating potential site users/activities prohibited

3 some natural surveillance, some enclosure on boundaries, some lighting

1 no natural or artificial surveillance, no enclosures and next to busy road, no lighting or signage to define user.

Overall quality

5 good initial impression of site including safety aspect, well maintained pleasant surroundings that are clean

3 average impression if site, not concerned about safety issues, maintained to standard that doesn't significantly detract form use of site

1 poor impression, concerns over safety, cleanliness, significant enough to detract any users

Outdoor sport

Accessibility

5 within walking/cycling distance of resi area and near to public transport. No need to cross main road to access. Disabled access. Signs indicating facilities available onsite

3 within walking/cycling distance of residential area with disabled access.

1 Not within walking distance or public transport. Need to cross main road to get to site. No disabled access and poor/no signage

Cleanliness

5 No ASB, site well maintained-inviting and tidy.

4 No ASB-good maintenance, little litter or dog fouling, no graffiti

3 0-6 ASB incidents, no graffiti, reasonably clean and tidy on inspection but doesn't hinder use significantly

2 0-6 incidents including graffiti, unclean. Litter/dog fouling that detracts from use of site.

1 0-6 plus graffiti. Unclean and significantly detracts use of site.

Facilities

5 a varied array of facilities available, and areas to observe from. Bike racks, and modern equipment/pitches marked out clearly.

3 observation areas available, reasonably well maintained equipment/pitch

1 limited facilities/limited variety of sport opportunities, poorly marked out pitches. No observation areas, poorly maintained

Safety

5 night time shutting/locking, cctv and natural surveillance, well maintained equipment. Not near to main road and good/safe enclosure

3 some natural surveillance, equipment fairly well maintained, , enclosures where appropriate

1 site obscured from view by excess of hedges/planting, near to a main road with no enclosures, equipment poor

Overall quality

5 pitches cut regularly, and in good order, safe and secure site leaving a good first impression

3 Pitches in good order, some security measures put in place, average impression of site.

1 pitches not maintained, unsafe, poor impression, poor range/quality of equipment/provision

Amenity green space

Accessibility

5 a variety of modes of transport, specifically walking and public trans, cycle paths, easily accessible to a number people. Good directional signs, disabled access

3 access via 2 MoT preferably environmentally friendly

1 poor/no signage or access via env friendly MoT

Cleanliness

5 No ASB, site well maintained-inviting and tidy.

4 No ASB-good maintenance, little litter or dog fouling, no graffiti

3 0-6 ASB incidents, no graffiti, reasonably clean and tidy on inspection but doesn't hinder use significantly

2 0-6 incidents including graffiti, unclean. Litter/dog fouling that detracts from use of site.

1 0-6 plus graffiti. Unclean and significantly detracts use of site.

Facilities

5 Ample facilities such as litter/dog bins and benches, information boards, and well looked after-inviting. Opportunity to hold events

3 Some/1 facility, reasonably well maintained

1 no facilities, or if available vandalised. Poor condition, uninviting

Safety

5 good natural surveillance-if play spaces present, lighting and safe grounds/access, boundaries where appropriate

3 some natural surveillance, boundaries where appropriate

1 no natural or artificial surveillance, no enclosures if next to as busy road, no lighting

Overall quality

5 good initial impression; attractive so would actively want to visit-good variety/age of planting/shrubs. Well kept grass and clean/tidy site

3 average impression of site-no obvious attractions for visitors . some variety of planting and shrubs. Maintained to a standard that doesn't significantly detract user.

1 poor impression of site, no variety in planting, unkempt/overgrown. Concerns over safety/cleanliness.

Appendix 3 - Open Space Study Questionnaire

Open Space Study Questionnaire

Runnymede Borough Council is updating its Open Space Study. Open Spaces and recreation areas are important in helping to create towns and villages that are attractive, that make a positive contribution to nature conservation and biodiversity, and that are also valuable to local communities (to help aid healthy lifestyles).

The update of this study will involve assessing the quality of open spaces in the Borough. As part of the study we also want to ask residents for their views using a questionnaire.

In order to help fill in this questionnaire, CABE (the government's advisor on architecture, urban design and public space) have some guidance regarding open space classification definitions which are listed below. The classifications will be used throughout the questionnaire, please refer back to this list should you need to.

- **Parks and gardens**
Including urban parks, country parks and formal gardens.
- **Natural and semi natural**
Including urban forestry, scrub, grasslands, wetlands, open and running water, wastelands, and derelict open land and rock areas (for example, cliffs, quarries and pits).
- **Green corridors**
Including river and canal banks, cycleways and rights of way.
- **Outdoor sports facilities**
With natural or artificial surfaces and either publicly or privately owned including tennis courts bowling greens, sports pitches, golf courses, athletics tracks and school and other institutional playing fields.
- **Amenity green space**
Most commonly but not exclusively in housing areas – including informal recreation spaces, green spaces in and around housing, domestic gardens and village greens.
- **Provision for children and teenagers**
Including play areas, skateboard parks and outdoor basketball hoops, and other more informal areas (for example, 'hanging out' areas, teenage shelters).
- **Allotments, community gardens and city farms**
Opportunity to grow produce from the land, individually or as part of a group to promote understanding of food and horticulture and promote health and social inclusion. (There are currently no city farms within Runnymede Borough therefore, city farms has been taken out throughout the questionnaire to reflect this)
- **Cemeteries and Churchyards**

Land associated with churches and the burial of the dead, land used for quiet contemplation.

- **Civic Squares and Spaces**

Hard surfaced areas designed for pedestrians, providing a setting for civic artwork and community events.

Personal Details

1. **Please write your Name, Address and Postcode below:** (this data remains confidential – we ask for this data so we can ascertain the area you live in)

Name:

Address (Required):

Postcode:

2. **Please circle the option that includes your age:**

0-16 17-25 26-39 40-49 50-59 60-69 70-79 80+ Prefer not to say

Open Space Provision

- 3. With regard to the amount of open space available in the Borough of Runnymede for public use, do you think the amount is:**

Too Much	About Right	Too Little	Don't Know	No Opinion

- 4. How important do you think each of the following types of open space is to you and your household? (1 – not very important to 5 – very important)**

	1 (Not Important at all)	2 (Not that important)	3 (No strong view either way)	4 (Quite important)	5 (Very Important)	No Opinion
Parks and Gardens						
Natural and Semi Natural						
Green Corridors						
Outdoor sports facilities						
Amenity Green Space						
Provision for children and teenagers						
Allotments and community gardens						
Cemeteries and Churchyards						
Civic Squares and Spaces						

- 5. How often have you/ or your household used each of the following types of open space within your area in the last 12 months?**

	Daily	Weekly	Monthly	Occasionally	Don't Use	Other (Please

						Specify)
Parks and Gardens						
Natural and Semi Natural						
Green Corridors						
Outdoor sports facilities						
Amenity Green Space						
Provision for children and teenagers						
Allotments and community gardens						
Cemeteries and Churchyards						
Civic Squares and Spaces						

6. How would you rate each of the following matters for the open spaces in your area? (1 – very poor to 5 – very good)

	1 (Very Poor)	2 (Unsatisfactory)	3 (No strong view either way)	4 (Satisfactory)	5 (Very Good)
Accessibility					
Cleanliness					
Facilities					
Safety					
General Appearance					

7. Do you have any additional comments to make concerning open space in the Borough of Runnymede:

Appendix 4 - Letter to Private Open Space Site Owners and Letter to Schools/Universities

Dear Sir or Madam,

Runnymede Borough Council is updating its Open Space Study. Parks, open spaces and recreation areas are important in helping create towns and villages that are attractive, and are also important to nature conservation and biodiversity.

Part of the study involves auditing the Open Space (open space, parks and play areas) in the Borough and reviewing the quality of the space. We have classified several different types of open space and one such category is private recreation areas which play an important role in providing such space for members of the public. We would therefore value your input and request that you provide us with the following information in order to assist us update our study.

I recognise that Runnymede Borough Council contacted you in 2010 for our 2010 Open Space Study, we are interested to know if anything has now changed at..... Please can you answer the following questions regarding the

- 1) How big in area is the site?
- 2) What is the spectator capacity at the site?
- 3) Who owns ...?
- 4) How many teams play at the ground and what are the age groups of the teams?
- 5) How often is the ground used?
- 6) What facilities are at the club, bins, lighting, CCTV cameras, eating facilities, parking spaces etc?
- 7) How long has the club been at the site?

The findings of the Open Space Study will feed in to the Council's Local Plan which will help to shape Runnymede over the next 20 years.

If you have any questions please contact me on the number below, or via email.

I look forward to your response.

Anna Murray

Dear Sir/Madam,

Runnymede Borough Council is updating its Open Space Study. Parks, open spaces and recreation areas are important in helping create towns and villages that are attractive, and are also important to nature conservation and biodiversity.

Part of the study involves auditing the Open Space (open space, parks and play areas) in the Borough and reviewing the quality of the space. We have classified several different types of open space and one such category is school playing fields which play an important role in providing such space for young people. We would therefore value your input and request that you provide us with the following information in order to assist us update our study.

1. What is the primary function of the open space(s) associated with the school? For example is it an open grass playing field and/or are sports pitches provided, is the land flat or more natural with trees?
2. What facilities are available such as basketball court/changing rooms/litter bins/seating?
3. Does the school let the playing field to any clubs or other bodies? If so who do you lease the land to and when?
4. Additionally, does the school have any other recreation space, such as an allotment, that the children can use?

The findings of the Open Space Study will feed in to the Council's Local Plan which will help to shape Runnymede over the next 20 years.

If you have any questions please contact me on the number below, or via email.

I look forward to your response.

Anna Murray

Appendix 5 - List of visual amenity sites

1. Brunel University Fields
2. Fernlands Open Space
3. Land between Southwood Avenue and Brox Lane Open Space
4. Pannells Farm
5. Runnymede Park
6. Simplemarsh Farm
7. Woodhaw Way Woodland
8. Weymanor Road

Appendix 6 List of sites that have been removed from the OSS

<u>Site</u>	<u>Justification for removal</u>
Addlestone Civic Centre	This open space has now been developed on by the new Civic Centre offices
Burcott Gardens	No public access – membership club.
Lasswade Court	No public access – part of a residential area.
Lubbock House	Planning permission for 89 residential units has been granted subject to consent with fencing around the perimeter restricting access
Oracle Park	Planning permission for 70 bed care home and extra care home apartments with fencing around the perimeter restricting access.
Royal Holloway Kingswood Campus Open Space	Site in development with fencing around the perimeter restricting access.
Slade Court Amenity Space	This site now contains 7 dwellings (3 terrace units and 2 pairs of semi-detached houses) with 7 parking spaces.

List of sites that have been added to the OSS:

<u>Site</u>	<u>Classification</u>
Painesfield Drive	Amenity Green Spaces
Pretoria Road	Amenity Green Space

Appendix 7 – Table of questionnaire comments regarding open spaces

Respondent Number	Area of ward lives in	Comment
1	Chertsey South and Row Town	Cannot understand why Runnymede continues to try to sell off open spaces such as Marley Close and Palmers Crescent despite huge public opposition and effort to retain them. We need to keep the few parks and patches of green we have left. Build houses on brownfield sites not parks.
2	Chertsey South and Row Town	We need more small play areas for young children, we have a lot of SANGS which are needed but very few actual play areas.
3	Foxhills	Some of the apparatus in parks need attention.
4	Chertsey South and Row Town	Open space is very important for the community in general; it is my belief that there is increased importance in relation to natural, semi natural and amenity green space because it provides habitat for local wildlife. Open space that enhances wildlife is much more beneficial to the population than the relatively sterile highly managed areas that are intended purely for human use.
5	Englefield Green West	Very important to preserve open spaces – people need access to outside areas for leisure, relaxation and exercise. They are very important for physical and mental health.
6	Chertsey South and Row Town	Natural space is constantly under threat, and it is wearying trying to defend it against a council whose metric is money and whose goal is remorseless development. Natural space by its nature does not generate a case return, and by its location costs money to defend.
7	Virginia Water	I think there are many pleasant areas but not enough sports fields for games and track events. Also the traffic around these areas is causing too much pollution and sometimes children have to cross busy roads to access the facilities. Very important to get the children out of the house and active in safe environments. These spaces are vital for flowers and fauna and provide spaces to plant more trees.
8	Chertsey South and Row Town	Must be maintained, not developed.

9	Chertsey South and Row Town	More money needs to be directed towards preserving the NATURAL green spaces and corridors that exist and possible even creating new ones. Surrey is known for being the 'leafy' county and yet our open spaces and corridors are always up for development. We have some rare species in Surrey, some that are found almost nowhere else in England, the Council show be working with the public and wildlife trusts to help maintain the natural beauty of our area instead of turning it into housing, parks and playgrounds. More work also needs to be put into keeping vandalism of our green spaces to a minimum, whether it be reckless destruction, graffiti or the illegal use of horses and motor vehicles.
10	Chertsey South and Row Town	Please increase parks and play space for the growing number of children in the area
11	Chertsey South and Row Town	What we have is precious and should be retained, my own open space is used daily and provides a very special haven in the middle of a built up area. Vital for dog walkers, and kids to kick their balls around. We use for walking and for a peaceful place away from noise. Also accessible for one of us by motorised scooter as disabled. Totally invaluable.
12	New Haw	It's vitally important to have open spaces. The children's play areas are of a good standard, and there are more places for teenagers (skate parks). CCTV is important for safety.
13	New Haw	Facilities at parks are good, except toilets are often in a bad state of cleanliness. Great to be able to walk or cycle along the canal or river. Dog bins are emptied to a good standard (thank you). Altogether, well done Runnymede – and thank you!
14	Foxhills	Local park is a drive away as there is a busy main road to cross which isn't very safe with young children. Facilities are very dated and unsafe for younger children, although it is a nice big open space.
15	Chertsey South and Row Town	Need to tackle the problem of noisy teenagers behaving badly in the parks late at night.
16	Addlestone Bourneside	Not enough decent toilets, underfunded, far too much dog poo
17	Chertsey South and Row Town	All remaining open spaces are precious and that is why I moved to Runnymede. We need to cherish these pieces of land

		and not build on them.
18	Addlestone Bourneside	The Green Belt areas should be safeguarded at all costs
19	Addlestone North	As we live in North Addlestone our nearest Park and Garden and Natural and Semi Natural grassland and Green Corridors are Chertsey Meads, so to that are we are referring.
20	Englefield Green West	I think we are lucky to have as much in the Borough but it is sad that people do not look after it leaving litter everywhere. Houses of multiple occupations should be provided with larger refuse bins because the students are filling up the public ones available with their rubbish because the landlords will not pay for larger bins!!
21	Addlestone North	Parks and Gardens and Green Corridors are being mis-used and poorly maintained.
22	Foxhills	I am strongly opposed to the removal of any open space.
23	Virginia Water	The space needs to be safeguarded.
24	Foxhills	Open spaces are very important for everyone and should be retained and other made available.
25	Egham Town	Respect Greenbelt at Longcross site. Local roads are totally unable to cope and Chobham Common will be seriously affected.
26	Foxhills	Open spaces are vital when planning restrictions create such small gardens.
27	Chertsey South and Row Town	That it should be protected at all costs.
28	Don't know	Would happily see more housing built at the expense of some less well used open spaces.
29	Foxhills	True green open spaces and green belt land should be preserved for current and future public use. They cannot just be manufactured or reproduced when those valuable resources have been destroyed.
30	Foxhills	We have a lot of wooden land, which needs protection because of its psychology/ sociological benefits.
31	Addlestone North	Retain a peaceful, tranquil environment with no industrial or commercial interference, no caravan or motor cross to pollute either noise or emissions. TO protect listed sites e.g. Historic Woburn Hill Park and Garden and reduce the Treylen Enterprises encampment/storage facility.

32	Egham Town	I am waiting for the public consultation for the Runnymede Pleasure Grounds and how it will affect local residents.
33	Chertsey Meads	I am very concerned about the eyesore which is the Traylen encampment which is a blot on the landscape.
34	Chertsey South and Row Town	Children from toddler to ten years old should have local green space to play, where possible within sight of their own and neighbours' home. Where such places already exist, they should be free of the danger of being built on!! Planning applications for multiple houses should be refused where such a provision is not available.
35	Virginia Water	Some smaller spaces should be used for affordable rental housing
36	Chertsey Meads	Important to balance community needs in the short term with tomorrow's needs. Environmental protection an important constraint.
37	New Haw	The amount of open space available to the public varies by ward. New Haw on the Byfleet Road side of the ward has no designated open space or parks etc. There is access to a field from Wey Navigation and from Byfleet Road. This is the only open amenity to residents in that area and should be preserved for recreational use as it has been for very many years.

Appendix 8 – Full list of open space sites identified

	Name of Open Space
1	Abbey Field Recreation Ground
2	Abbey Field Recreation Ground play area
3	Abbey House Grounds
4	Abbey Lake Complex
5	Abbeymoor Golf Club
6	Addlestone Bourne at Birch and Hoyt Wood
7	Addlestone Cemetery
8	Aviator Park Recreation Ground
9	Aviator Park Recreation Ground Skate ramp
10	Barrow Hills Golf Course
11	Barrsbrook Allotments
12	Barrsbrook Farm
13	Barton Close and Ongar Place
14	Basingstoke Canal
15	Basingstoke Canal, Scotland Bridge to River Wey
16	Beechtree Avenue
17	Bell Weir Lock
18	Beomonds Play Area
19	Birch Wood and Hoyt Wood
20	Bishops Way Recreation Ground
21	Bishops Way Recreation Ground play area
22	Bishopsgate School Fields
23	Bittams Lane Open Space also known as St. Peter's
24	Bond Street Allotments
25	Boshers Allotments
26	Bourne Meadow Park
27	Bowes Road Open Space
28	Brackendene Open Space
29	Brookside Play Area
30	Brunel University Fields
31	Byfleet Road Open Space (New Haw Lock)
32	Cabrera Avenue Playing Field
33	Cabrera Avenue Playing Field play area
34	Caddies Field Paddocks
35	Callow Hill to Prune Hill also known as The Dell
36	Camping and Caravanning Club
37	Canford Drive Open Space
38	Caselden Close Open Space
39	Charta Road Recreation Ground
40	Charta Road Recreation Ground play area
41	Chaworth Copse
42	Cherrywood Avenue Play Area
43	Chertsey Bourne at Abbey Lake Complex


44	Chertsey Bourne at Chertsey Meads
45	Chertsey Bridge Ground (previously known as West End of Chertsey Bridge)
46	Chertsey Cemetery
47	Chertsey Cricket Club
48	Chertsey Meads
49	Chertsey Meads Play Area
50	Chertsey Recreation Ground
51	Chertsey Recreation Ground play area
52	Chertsey Town Football Club
53	Chertsey Water Works
54	Christ Church
55	Christ Church C of E School Fields
56	Christchurch School
57	Church Road Memorial Gardens
58	Clarendon Gate
59	Coopers Hill Recreation Ground
60	Coronation Playing Field
61	Coxes Lock
62	Coxes Lock Millpond
63	Coxes Lock Open Space
64	Crockford Bridge Farm
65	Crockford Park Open Space
66	Crouch Oak Green Open Spaces
67	Darley Dene School
68	Dudley close
69	Edgell Close Play Area
70	Egham Cricket Club
71	Egham Sports Centre
72	Egham Town Football Club
73	Egham Youth Centre
74	Elmbank Play area
75	Englefield Green
76	Englefield Green Cemetery also known as St. Jude's Cemetery
77	Englefield Green Infant School Field
78	Englefield Green play area
79	Ether Hill
80	Fan Grove
81	Fernlands Close
82	Fernlands Open Space
83	Fordwater Road
84	Fountain outside Egham Tesco
85	Foxhills Country Club
86	Frank Muir Memorial Field
87	Frank Muir Memorial Field play area

88	Free Prae Road Playing field
89	Fullbrook School Field
90	Gogmore Farm Park
91	Gogmore Farm Park Play area
92	Hall's Farm Wood and Grassland 211/1
93	Hamm Court Amenity Space
94	Hamm Moor Playing Field
95	Hamm Moor Playing Field play area
96	Hardwick Court Farm Fields
97	Hare Hill Open Space
98	Harrow Bottom Road Lake
99	Heathervale Recreation Ground
100	Heathervale Recreation Ground play area
101	Herondale Playground
102	Holy Family RC Primary School Field
103	Holy Trinity Church
104	Homewood Park
105	Hythe Park
106	Hythe Park play area one
107	Hythe Park play area two
108	Hythe Primary School Field
109	Hythe Social Centre Recreation Ground
110	Jubilee High School
111	King George V Playing Field
112	King George V Playing Field play ground
113	Kings Lane Allotments
114	Kings Lane Sports Field and Open Space
115	Kings Lane Sports Field and Open Space rec area
116	Kingthorpe Gardens
117	Knowle Grove
118	Laleham Burlay Golf Course
119	Land between Southwood Ave and Brox Lane Open Space
120	Langham Pond
121	Ledger Drive Open Space
122	Longcross Churchyard
123	Longside Lake
124	Longside Open Space
125	Lyne and Longcross School Field
126	Lyne Recreation Ground
127	Lyne Recreation Ground play area
128	Magna Carta School Field
129	Malus Drive Open Space
130	Manorcrofts Open Space
131	Manorcrofts Recreational Ground
132	Manorcrofts Recreational Ground play area

133	Meadowcroft School Field
134	Meadowview Open Space
135	Meads Playing Field
136	Meath School Fields
137	Memorial Kiosks
138	Moated Farm Open Space
139	Monks Walk North and West
140	Murray House Open Space
141	Ongar Place School Field
142	Ottershaw Chase
143	Ottershaw Memorial field
144	Ottershaw Memorial field play area
145	Painesfield Drive
146	Pannells Farm
147	Park Wood
148	Phoenix plaza
149	Pinewood Avenue Allotments
150	Pooley Green Recreation Ground
151	Pooley Green Recreation Ground play area
152	Pretoria Road
153	Pycroft Grange Primary school fields
154	Queenwood Golf Club
155	Queenwood Golf Course (includes Stonehill Field, Stonehill Wood and Queenwood Farm Field 2 and Coach House Field)
156	Queenwood
157	RAF Memorial
158	Rickman Crescent
159	River Park Avenue Open Space (Thameside Open Space)
160	River Thames
161	River Wey
162	Riverbank at Runnymede
163	Riversdell Close
164	Riverside Walk, Chertsey (Concept cars)
165	Riverside Walk, Chertsey (Genets site)
166	Riverside Walk, Chertsey (new site)-now part of Two Bridges
167	Riverside Walk, Virginia Water
168	Rose Park, Rowtown Open Space
169	Rosemary Lane Open Space
170	Royal Holloway University Fields
171	Runnymede and Coopers Hill East
172	Runnymede and Coopers Hill West
173	Runnymede Meadows (part)
174	Runnymede Park
175	Runnymede Pleasure Grounds
176	Runnymede Pleasure Grounds play area

177	Runnymede Youth Motorcycle Club (RYMC)
178	Salesians Playing Fields
179	Salesians School Field
180	Sandgates
181	Sandy Road Open Space
182	Savill Garden
183	Sawpit Green
184	Sayes Court Allotments
185	Sayes Court Open Space
186	Sayes Court Open Space Playground (Brookhurst)
187	Sayes Court School Field
188	Sayes Woods
189	Simplemarsh Farm
190	Sir William Perkins School Fields
191	South Grove
192	Spinney Hill
193	Spinney Wood
194	Spring Rise Play Area
195	St. Annes R.C. School Fields
196	St. Ann's Heath Junior School
197	St. Ann's Hill
198	St. Anns Road Allotments
199	St. Augustine's Green Open Space
200	St. Cuthberts School Field
201	St. George's College
202	St. John the Baptist's Church
203	St. Judes Road Amenity Area
204	St. Judes School Field
205	St. Mary's Parish Church
206	St. Pauls School
207	St. Stephen's Chapel
208	Staines Lane Open Space
209	Staines Lane Open Space play area
210	Stroude Road Allotments previously known as The Lane Allotments
211	Stroude's College Field
212	Sumner Place Play Area (The Limes) (St. Paul's)
213	Surrey Golf and Fitness
214	Surrey Towers play area
215	Sussex Court play area
216	The Boathouse
217	The Grange County School
218	The Hythe Open Space
219	The Knoll open spaces
220	The Moat, Woodcock Farm
221	The Orchard Public Gardens

222	Thorpe Allotments
223	Thorpe C of E Infant School Field
224	Thorpe Cemetery
225	Thorpe Green
226	Thorpe Green Play area
227	Thorpe Hay Meadow
228	Thorpe Lea Open Space
229	Thorpe Lea Road
230	Thorpe Park
231	Thorpe Village Hall play area
232	Thorpe Waterski/including Thorpe Park No.1 Gravel Pit
233	Timber Hill
234	Trumps Green School Field
235	Trumps Mill
236	Trumps Mill Lane
237	Truss's Island
238	Two Bridges
239	Tyler Gardens
240	Vicarage Road Allotments
241	Victory Park
242	Victory Park play area
243	Virginia Water Lake
244	Virginia Water Memorial Gardens
245	Walnut Tree Gardens
246	Walton Leigh Recreation Ground
247	Walton Leigh Recreation Ground play area
248	Warwick Ave Playing Field
249	Wendover Place Allotments
250	Wendover Place Play Area
251	Wentworth Golf Club
252	Wentworth Golf Courses – Duke's Copse and Wentworth Pond
253	Wentworth Golf Courses – Fish Pond
254	Wentworth Golf Courses – Knowle Hill
255	Wentworth Golf Courses - Valley Wood
256	Wey Navigation
257	Weybridge Road
258	Weybridge Road (Lock) Open Space
259	Weymanor Road
260	Windsor Park
261	Woburn Park Stream
262	Woodham Lane Allotments
263	Woodham Lock
264	Woodham Lodge Open Space
265	Woodham Lodge Open Space play area
266	Woodhaw Way Woodland



All enquiries about this paper should be directed to:

Policy & Strategy Team
Planning Business Centre

Runnymede Borough Council
The Civic Centre
Station Road
Addlestone
Surrey KT15 2AH

Tel 01932 838383

Further copies of this publication can be obtained from the above address,
or email: planning@runnymede.gov.uk

www.runnymede.gov.uk

2016

