



Tonbridge and Malling Borough Council

Open Space Evidence Base

Main Report

March 2018

Table of Contents

1.	INTRODUCTION	1
1.1.	WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF THIS PIECE OF WORK?	1
1.2.	WHAT IS THE CONTEXT?	1
2.	EXISTING PROVISION	6
2.1.	WHAT IS THE EXISTING PROVISION OF PUBLICLY ACCESSIBLE OPEN SPACE?	6
3.	OPTIONS FOR THE LOCAL PLAN	8
3.1.	WHAT IS A REASONABLE STARTING POINT FOR QUANTITATIVE STANDARDS IN THE NEW LOCAL PLAN?	8
3.2.	WHAT IS A REASONABLE STARTING POINT FOR DEALING WITH EXISTING OPEN SPACE PROVISION?.....	14
3.3.	WHAT IS A REASONABLE STARTING POINT FOR SETTING ACCESSIBILITY THRESHOLDS FOR OPEN SPACE PROVISION?.....	15
3.4.	WHAT IS A REASONABLE STARTING POINT FOR MINIMUM SPATIAL REQUIREMENTS?.....	15
3.5.	WHAT IS A REASONABLE STARTING POINT FOR DETERMINING HOW AND WHERE OPEN SPACE SHOULD BE PROVIDED?.....	16
3.6.	WHAT IS A REASONABLE STARTING POINT FOR CALCULATING DEVELOPER CONTRIBUTIONS?	16
3.7.	WHAT IS A REASONABLE STARTING POINT FOR ADDRESSING THE BIODIVERSITY DUTY WITHIN OPEN SPACE PROVISION?.....	19
4.	CONCLUSIONS	20
4.1.	WHAT ARE REASONABLE STARTING POINTS FOR THE OPEN SPACE POLICIES IN THE COUNCIL’S EMERGING LOCAL PLAN?.....	20
	Appendix A: Definition of open spaces.....	23
	Appendix B: FiT Recommended minimum sizes – formal outdoor space	25
	Appendix C: Comparison of Open Space Standards	27
	Appendix D: Qualitative assessment criteria	29
	Appendix E: Qualitative assessment of existing open spaces (2015)	35

1. Introduction

1.1. What is the purpose of this piece of work?

- 1.1.1. The purpose of this piece of work is to determine a reasonable starting point for the open space policies in the Council's emerging Local Plan.
- 1.1.2. Firstly, the paper outlines the planning policy expectations of the Government as well as national benchmark guidelines to understand the current context for open space provision.
- 1.1.3. Secondly, the paper sets out the outputs from the audit of publicly accessible open spaces in the borough to take stock of existing provision within Tonbridge and Malling.
- 1.1.4. Thirdly, the paper checks the existing open space provision in the borough against the benchmark guidelines, Government policy objectives and other relevant evidence.
- 1.1.5. The paper then concludes with a reasonable starting point for the open space policies in the emerging Local Plan, taking account of the outputs outlined above.

1.2. What is the context?

Government Policy – National Planning Policy Framework

- 1.2.1. The [National Planning Policy Framework](#) (NPPF) (2012) sets out the Government's planning policies for England and how these are expected to be applied.
- 1.2.2. In respect of open spaces, the NPPF recognises that they can make an important contribution to the health and well-being of communities ([para.73](#)). Furthermore, the expectation is that planning policies should be based on robust and up-to-date assessments of the need for open spaces, hence the reason for this piece of evidence. In addition, the NPPF seeks the protection of existing provision ([para.74](#)) requiring evidence to demonstrate that the open space is surplus to requirements or assurances that there will be no net loss with alternative provision being made elsewhere.
- 1.2.3. The NPPF also addresses the matters of viability and deliverability of developments. It makes clear that the sites and the scale of development identified in Local Plans should not be subject to such a scale of obligations

and policy burdens that their ability to be developed viably is threatened ([para.173](#)). The NPPF further stresses that the cumulative impact of local standards, of which open space is likely to be one, should not put implementation of the plan at serious risk. This economic dimension of open space provision is an important issue that plan-making needs to be mindful of.

Fields in Trust – Benchmark Guidelines

- 1.2.4. Fields in Trust (FiT) is the operating name of the National Playing Fields Association (NPFA). Its mission is to safeguard and improve protected space for future generations. As part of its protection work, FiT has prepared guidance for practitioners on open space provision and design known as the Six Acre Standard since the 1930 and most recently updated to Planning and Design for Outdoor Sport and Play (2008).
- 1.2.5. In 2015, FiT updated the benchmark guidelines following a survey of local planning authorities. These were documented in '**Guidance for Outdoor Sport and Play: Beyond the Six Acre Standard**'. The 2015 guidance retains the same headline quantitative rates in respect of Outdoor Sports and Equipped/Designated Play Areas (Local Area for Play (LAP); Local Equipped Area for Play (LEAP); and Neighbourhood Equipped Area for Play (NEAP)). In addition, benchmark guidelines were recommended for other outdoor provision including Multi-Use Games Areas (MUGAs) and Skateboard Parks. In respect of informal outdoor space, benchmark guidelines were set for 'Park and Gardens', 'Amenity Green Space' and 'Natural and Semi-Natural' open space. These are summarised in Tables 1 and 2 below:

Table 1: FiT Recommended Benchmark Guidelines – Formal Outdoor Space

Open space typology	QUANTITY GUIDELINE (hectares per 1,000 population)
All outdoor sports	1.60 (inc. a minimum of 1.2 ha for playing pitches)
Equipped/designated play areas	0.25
Other outdoor provision (MUGAs and skateboard parks)	0.30

Table 2: FiT Recommended Benchmark Guidelines – Informal Outdoor Space

Open space typology	QUANTITY GUIDELINE (hectares per 1,000 population)
Parks and Gardens	0.80
Amenity Green Space	0.60
Natural and Semi-Natural	1.80

1.2.6. Table 3 brings these recommended guidelines together so that it is possible to understand the total quantum. The full definition for each category of outdoor open space is set out in Appendix A.

Table 3: FiT Recommended Benchmark Guidelines – Formal and Informal Open Spaces

Open space typology	QUANTITY GUIDELINE (hectares per 1,000 population)
All outdoor sports	1.60 (inc. 1.2 ha for playing pitches)
Equipped/designated play areas	0.25
Other outdoor provision (MUGAs and skateboard parks)	0.30
Parks and Gardens	0.80
Amenity Green Space	0.60
Natural and Semi-Natural	1.80
Total	5.35

1.2.7. In addition to quantity guidelines, FIT also published recommended guidelines for accessibility. These are outlined in Table 4.

Table 4: FiT Recommended Benchmark Guidelines – Accessibility

Open space typology	WALKING GUIDELINE (walking distance: metres from dwellings)
All outdoor sports (inc. playing pitches)	1,200m
Equipped/designated play areas	LAPs – 100m LEAPs – 400m NEAPs – 1,000m
Other outdoor provision (MUGAs and skateboard parks)	700m
Parks and Gardens	710m
Amenity Green Space	480m
Natural and Semi-Natural	720m

1.2.8. FiT advise that the recommended benchmark guidelines should be provided on-site in accordance with the minimum sizes as set out in the 2015 document (see Appendix B).

Tonbridge & Malling Open Space Strategy (February 2009)

1.2.9. To inform the Council’s existing Development Plan, an Open Space Strategy (OSS) was prepared (2009). As part of the research for the OSS, a questionnaire survey was sent to members of the Residents’ Panel. The main conclusions were:

- Overall 50% of residents are satisfied with the amount of open space, only 8% recorded dissatisfaction
- Overall 52% are satisfied with the quality of open space, 5% are dissatisfied
- Overall 53% are satisfied with accessibility of open space, 7% are dissatisfied

Managing Development and the Environment DPD (April 2010)

1.2.10. The outcomes of the OSS questionnaire survey informed the formulation of open space policies in the Council's Managing Development and the Environment Development Plan Document (MDE DPD) (Adopted April 2010) (see below).

Table 5: Managing Development and the Environment DPD - Quantitative Standards

ha per 1,000	TYPE OF SETTLEMENT			
	Urban Tonbridge*	Urban Medway Gap*	Rural Service Centres**	Rural Settlements***
Parks and Gardens	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5
Children's and Young People's Play Areas	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.10
Outdoor Sports Facilities	2.05	2.05	2.05	2.05
Amenity Green Spaces	0.76	1.33	0.33	3.0/2.4****
Natural and Semi-Natural Green Spaces	0.73	2.8	1.83	

Source: Tonbridge and Malling Open Space Strategy (February 2009)

* as defined in Core Policy CP11 of the Core Strategy

** as listed in Core Policy CP12 of the Core Strategy

*** as listed in Core Policy CP13 of the Core Strategy

**** 3 ha per 1000 population for smaller rural settlements (up to 999 people) and 2.4 ha per 1000 population for rural settlements of 1000 people or more¹

Table 6: Accessibility Standards – actual direct distances from the perimeter of the development site

Open Space	Accessibility Threshold
Parks & Gardens	Borough-Wide - One park within 20 minute drive (= 6-8 km)
Amenity Green Spaces	Tonbridge Urban – One within 480m Medway Gap Urban – One within 480m Walderslade Urban – One within 480m Rural Service Centres - One within 480m Rural Settlements – One within or adjacent to the village confines
Outdoor Sports Facilities	Borough-Wide – One within 20 minutes drive-time (= 6-8 km)
Children's and Young People's Play Areas	Tonbridge Urban – One within 480m Medway Gap Urban – One within 480m Walderslade Urban – One within 480m Rural Service Centres - One within 480m Rural Settlements – One within 960m/1.5 km
Natural and Semi-Natural Green Spaces	Tonbridge Urban – One within 960m Medway Gap Urban – One within 960m Walderslade Urban – One within 480m Rural Service Centres - One within 960m Rural Settlements – One within or adjacent to the village confines

Source: Tonbridge and Malling Open Space Strategy (February 2009)

¹ As identified in the Open Space Strategy – Technical Study

2. Existing Provision

2.1. What is the existing provision of publicly accessible open space?

- 2.1.1. In the summer of 2015, an audit of existing publicly accessible open spaces in Tonbridge & Malling borough was undertaken. This built upon the field work that fed into the OSS in 2009.
- 2.1.2. The 2015 audit assessed the quantity and quality of existing publicly accessible open spaces. The criteria used to assess the quality of the various types of open spaces are set out in Appendix C. Again, these used, as a starting point, the criteria deployed in the assessments that fed into the OSS 2009. The subtle difference being that in assessing the provision of certain facilities, eg fencing or bins, a qualitative judgement was made on the appropriateness of these given the size and function of the open space. This judgement was absent from the previous assessment so where a site lacked certain facilities it was scored poorly. The outcome is that the quality assessment has changed. Appendix D provides a summary of the qualitative assessment. It is considered that the 2015 qualitative assessment results could represent a reasonable piece of evidence to inform decision-making on future open space provision as part of development proposals in terms of which facilities could be enhanced.
- 2.1.3. In terms of the quantity of publicly accessible open space, the position in 2015, and how this compares to the position in the OSS 2009, is summarised in Table 7 below:

Table 7: Borough-Wide Publicly Accessible Open Space – Comparison of Quantity (2015 with 2009)

Please Note: It is assumed that those school playing fields that were publicly accessible in 2009 are still publicly accessible in 2015

Category	2015	2009	Difference	Difference
	Area (ha)	Area (ha)	Area (ha)	% Change
Allotments (A)*	24.93	23.03	1.90	8.24
Amenity Green Space (AGS)	92.53	98.87	-6.34	-6.41
Children's and Young People's Play (CYP) (Total)	8.54	8.29	0.25	3.05
Natural Green Spaces (NG)	424.58	422.39	2.19	0.52
Outdoor Sports Facilities (OSF) (Total)#	284.44	219.15	65.29	29.79
Parks and Gardens (PG)	266.83	268.37	-1.54	-0.57
TOTAL	1101.86	1040.10	61.76	5.94

Please Note: The quantity for OSF in 2015 includes Kings Hill Sports Park (12.51 ha) and Kings Hill Cricket Park (1.95 ha)

* Please note: the provision for allotments has been discounted because the Council does not have existing standards for this category due to the fact that allotment provision is not needs based but demand driven

2.1.4. Table 8 highlights how this quantity translates to provision per 1,000 population.

Table 8: Comparison of Quantity Provision (2015 with 2009)

Category	2015	2009	Difference
	Ha per 1000*	Ha per 1000**	Ha per 1000
Allotments (A)~	0.20	0.21	-0.01
Amenity Green Space (AGS)	0.74	0.92	-0.18
Children's and Young People's Play (CYP) (Total)	0.07	0.08	-0.01
Natural Green Spaces (NG)	3.38	3.93	-0.55
Outdoor Sports Facilities (OSF) (Total)	2.26	2.05	0.21
Parks and Gardens (PG)	2.12	2.49	-0.37
TOTAL	8.76	9.68	-0.92

* Based on Borough-Wide population of 125,713 (mid-2015 Population Estimate, Source ONS)

** Based on Borough-Wide population of 107,561 (Census 2001)

~ Please note: the provision for allotments has been discounted because the Council does not have existing standards for this category due to the fact that allotment provision is not needs based but demand driven

2.1.5. Analysis of this data has identified the following headlines:

- Overall open space provision has increased by 61.76 ha (+6%)
- Greatest increase in provision is for Outdoor Sports Facilities (OSF). A significant proportion of this (22%) is attributed to new facilities at Kings Hill Sports Park (12.51 ha) and Kings Hill Cricket Ground (1.95 ha). It should be noted that these were secured under a planning permission that was in place prior to the open space standards in the Council's MDE DPD.
- Greatest loss in provision is for Amenity Green Space (-6.4%)
- Quantity provision per 1000 population has gone down marginally for all categories except OSF. This is primarily a reflection of the population change rather than a reduction in quantity. Back in 2006/7, when the initial audit was undertaken, the data on population available at that time was taken from the 2001 Census (107,561 Borough population). In 2015, more population data is available online which means a current mid-year estimate (2015: 125,713) has been utilised. The difference in the population from 2001 to 2015 is +18,152 (+16.9%).

2.1.6. The outcomes of this analysis provide a useful input for the consideration of options for open space policies in the new Local Plan which is explored in more detail in section 3 of this report.

3. Options for the Local Plan

3.1. What is a reasonable starting point for quantitative standards in the new Local Plan?

3.1.1. In order to reach a reasonable starting point for quantitative standards in the new Local Plan it is necessary to consider various options and assess their merits.

3.1.2. This section outlines the following options:

- Option 1: Current provision translated into standards
- Option 2: FiT benchmark guidelines
- Option 3: Refinement of current provision taking account of Fit benchmark guidelines
- Option 4: Do-nothing – no open space standards

Option1: Current provision translated into standards

3.1.3. If the Council translates the current provision to a standard of hectares per 1,000 population to create a set of borough-wide standards the overall ‘ask’ would be 8.57 ha per 1000 population. This is summarised in Table 9 below.

Table 9: Option 1 – Current provision translated into standards

Open space typology	Area	Standard (ha per 1000 pop.)
Outdoor Sports Facilities (sports pitches, tennis, athletics, bowls)	Borough-Wide	2.26
Children’s and Young People’s Play Areas (equipped play areas, skate parks, ball courts, informal play space)	Borough-Wide	0.07
Amenity Green Spaces	Borough-Wide	0.74
Natural Green Spaces	Borough-Wide	3.38
Parks and Gardens	Borough-Wide	2.12
Total		8.57

- 3.1.4. Please note: the provision for allotments has been discounted because the Council does not have existing standards for this category due to the fact that allotment provision is not needs based but demand driven.
- 3.1.5. To put this set of standards into context, the total 'ask' is 60.2% higher than the total ask of the FiT benchmark guidelines. In the context of the NPPF, it is questionable whether this (translating existing provision to a set of standards) is a reasonable option to include in the new Local Plan, given the expectations of the Government that the viability of developments should not be threatened by policy burdens.

Option 2: FiT benchmark guidelines

- 3.1.6. The second option that could be tested is the simple application of the FiT benchmark guidelines locally. These guidelines are current (2015) and have been informed by survey work of local planning authorities in England. A summary of the formal and informal open space benchmark guidelines is set out in Table 3.
- 3.1.7. Table 10 (below) compares the FiT benchmark guidelines with the current provision in Tonbridge & Malling translated to a standard (see option 1 above – ha per 1,000 population).

Table 10: Comparison of FiT guideline with option 1

Open space typology	FiT guideline*	Local provision*	Difference**
Outdoor Sports (all)	1.6	2.26	-0.66
Children's and Young People's Play Areas (equipped play areas, skate parks, ball courts, informal play space, MUGAs)	0.55	0.07	+0.48
Parks and Gardens	0.8	2.12	-1.32
Natural and Semi-Natural Green Spaces	1.8	3.38	-1.58
Amenity Green Spaces	0.6	0.74	-0.14
Total	5.35	8.57	-3.22

*hectares per 1,000 population, **FiT guideline compared with local provision

- 3.1.8. It is evident that simply applying the FiT guidelines locally would result in the securing, overall, of less open space than the application of a current provision derived standard (3.22 ha per 1000 population less). However, in

terms of individual categories, the FiT guidelines would secure significantly more children's and young people's play areas, nearly seven times the quantity that a local provision derived standard would deliver. Evidently there is some divergence between the two sets of standards. This will be explored and analysed in more detail later in this report.

- 3.1.9. Whilst the FiT guidelines represent a benchmark, there is no local dimension to the standards. When considering the application of this particular option, it is important to consider that during the evidence gathering for the Open Space Strategy in 2009, at least half the people surveyed were satisfied with the quantity of open space in the borough. However, it is also important to consider that the FiT guidelines are national benchmarks that are current and have been informed by practice across the country. With this in mind, there is a need to assess a third option, which involves the refinement of current provision as a standard, taking account of the FiT guidelines. As with option 1, the application of the FiT guidelines could be viability tested during the plan-making process.

Option 3: Refinement of current provision taking account of FiT guidelines

- 3.1.10. Before considering the refinement of the current provision so that it better aligns with the FiT guidelines, it is important to take stock of the Government's objective of delivering open space. Para. 73 in the NPPF states:

"...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..."

- 3.1.11. In respect of improving the health of the local community, it is not unreasonable to argue that certain types of open space, i.e. outdoor sports facilities, equipped children play areas and country parks are likely to make a more significant contribution to meeting this objective than amenity green space and some forms of natural green space. On the matter of natural and semi-natural greenspace, it is also important to appreciate that Tonbridge and Malling borough is predominantly rural in character with an extensive network of public rights of way across the countryside. This means that many forms of natural greenspace are readily accessible to a significant proportion of the community. In terms of amenity green space, this is more design-led, i.e. it contributes to the attractiveness of a development, than needs driven.

3.1.12. In this context, Table 11 proposes a refined option for future open space provision.

Table 11: Refined open space provision

Type	Area	Standard (ha per 1000 pop.)
Outdoor Sports Facilities (sports pitches, tennis, athletics, bowls)	Borough-Wide	1.6 (of which a minimum of 1.2 is for playing pitches)
Children's and Young People's Play Areas (equipped play areas, skate parks, ball courts, informal play space and MUGAs)	Borough-Wide	0.55 (of which a minimum of 0.25 is for equipped/designated play areas)
Parks and Gardens	Borough-Wide	2.2
Natural and Semi-Natural Greenspaces	Borough-Wide	1.0
Amenity Green Spaces	Borough-Wide	No standard - The provision of amenity greenspace will be design-led rather than prescribed and will be addressed in other policies seeking to achieve a high quality environment.
Total Requirement		5.35

3.1.13. As highlighted previously, it is important that any local provision pursued through the Local Plan is checked against benchmarks at the national level and takes account of local evidence and local characteristics.

3.1.14. With this in mind, Table 11 proposes a set of standards which has a total 'ask' that is equal to the FiT benchmark guidelines (5.35 ha per 1,000 population). Whilst the overall 'ask' matches the FiT guidelines, there is some slight variation for certain categories taking account of the points raised in para. 3.1.13.

3.1.15. **Outdoor Sports Facilities** – It is considered that it would be reasonable to align with the FiT guidelines for this category because not only does this reflect current practice across England but it is also reflects a long standing benchmark that has been advocated for many years by Fields in Trust, dating back to the six acre standard. It is well established and commonly accepted as a fair requirement.

- 3.1.16. **Children's and Young People's Play Areas** – In light of the FiT guidelines and the positive contribution this type of open space can make to the health and therefore well-being of younger members of the community, a significant adjustment to the local provision has been proposed. It is considered that it would be reasonable to align with the combined FiT standard for equipped/designated play areas + other outdoor provision (MUGAs and skateboard parks), i.e. 0.55 ha per 1,000 population. The current provision derived standard of 0.07 ha per 1,000 population is insufficient when checked against the relevant national benchmarks.
- 3.1.17. **Parks and Gardens** – The opportunities for sports and recreational activities at places such as country parks are significant, which means that this category of open space can make a positive contribution to the Government's objectives. Furthermore, the survey that fed into the OSS found that the type of open space visited by the greatest proportion of residents was a country park where 93% of residents used them, 60% at least monthly. Country parks scored 4.7 out of a possible 5 in terms of their benefit to the local community with 91% of respondents seeing them as beneficial. This type of open space is clearly valued by the local community and it can make a positive contribution to people's health and well-being. In addition, parks and gardens provide genuine opportunities for habitat creation to help strengthen the network of green infrastructure through sensitive management regimes, thereby allowing the Council to deliver on its Biodiversity Duty (see section 3.7). For these reasons, it is considered that it would be unwise for the local provision standard to be reduced significantly to the level of the new national benchmark guideline. With this in mind, 2.2 ha per 1,000 population is suggested as a reasonable requirement.
- 3.1.18. **Natural and Semi-Natural Greenspaces** – A rationalisation of the local provision standard is considered appropriate, reflecting the local characteristics of Tonbridge & Malling and the primary function of this form of open space. Most of the borough is rural in character criss-crossed with an extensive network of public rights of way, meaning that many natural and semi-natural greenspaces are within reasonable access to the majority of the local community. This local context needs to be reflected in the standards. Furthermore, one of the primary purposes of natural and semi-natural greenspaces is to support habitat creation to help enhance and strengthen the Green Infrastructure and Ecological Network². It is considered that this function is not unique to this category of open space and that it can be

² As set out in the Tonbridge and Malling Green Infrastructure Report (December 2017)

addressed, where feasible, in the provision of other forms of open space, including amenity green spaces and parks and gardens, through sensitive management regimes. With this in mind a standard of 1.0 ha per 1,000 population is considered reasonable.

- 3.1.19. **Amenity Green Spaces** – It is considered that amenity green spaces are an integral part of a well-designed layout and therefore no standard is proposed for this category. The size and character of amenity green spaces means the opportunities to undertake meaningful activities to help improve one's health, which is a key objective of the Government, are limited. More and better opportunities for sport and recreation can be secured through the provision of other types of open space, as outlined above. This is not to say that amenity green spaces do not make an important contribution to the quality and enjoyment of a development. With this in mind, it is considered that the Local Plan will need to ensure that it recognises the importance of amenity green spaces to achieving a high quality environment. As is the case for natural and semi-natural greenspaces, amenity green spaces can have a potential role to play in enhancing and strengthening the Green Infrastructure and Ecological Network, having regard to the habitat and species of the Biodiversity Opportunity Areas³.

Option 4: Do-nothing – no open space standards

- 3.1.20. The option of having no open space standards in the new Local Plan has to be raised if, for no other reason, for it to be discounted. This would mean that in processing planning applications the Council would have no minimum requirements for any open space provision, so any open space that is secured would be that which is promoted by the developer. Whilst the NPPF is cautious about the level of local standards that should be burdened upon developments (see para.173 in the NPPF), it clearly acknowledges 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 (para.73). Given that one of the soundness tests for the new Local Plan at examination is consistency with national policy, i.e. the NPPF, 'do nothing' is not a genuine option because of the objectives in para.73.

³ See the Tonbridge and Malling Green Infrastructure Report (December 2017) for more details

Options: Conclusion

- 3.1.21. In conclusion, it is considered that option 3 would represent a reasonable starting point for quantitative open space standards in the emerging Tonbridge & Malling Borough Local Plan. This option would contribute positively to the Government's objectives, reflect local characteristics and views and align, overall, with the FiT guidelines which are current and take account of practice across England. For these reasons, option 3 should be viability tested, alongside other local standards, to determine if the implementation of the development strategy would be put at risk. As part of this exercise, options 1 and 2 (outlined above) could also be considered for testing to understand what impact they might have and whether the risks would be greater/smaller.
- 3.1.22. For context, Appendix C sets out how this proposed set of standards compares to the FiT guidelines, the current provision translated to a standard and the current requirements of the Borough Council's existing Development Plan.

3.2. What is a reasonable starting point for dealing with existing open space provision?

- 3.2.1. Para. 74 in the NPPF states:

Existing open space, sports and recreational buildings and land, including playing fields, should not be built on unless:

- *an assessment has been undertaken which has clearly shown the open space, buildings or land to be surplus to requirements; or*
- *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; or*
- *the development is for alternative sports and recreational provision, the needs for which clearly outweigh the loss.*

- 3.2.2. This Government policy is very clear, emphasising the importance of looking after existing provision. Furthermore it addresses the value and contribution of open spaces, recognising that they can be built on if an assessment identifies that they are surplus to requirements. It is considered that this would represent a reasonable starting point for dealing with existing open space provision in the new Local Plan.

3.3. What is a reasonable starting point for setting accessibility thresholds for open space provision?

- 3.3.1. Accessibility thresholds are important because they provide the basis for determining suitable locations for off-site provision and, where this is not possible, for the identification of existing open spaces that could be enhanced through developer contributions.
- 3.3.2. The accessibility thresholds applied through the Council's adopted Development Plan are set out in Table 6. These were achieved through market research (Residents' Panel Survey) that was undertaken as part of the evidence for the Open Space Strategy. This concluded that over half of those surveyed were satisfied with existing access to publicly accessible open spaces. In terms of preparing the new Local Plan, the concern is about the currency and therefore relevancy of these standards in light of national policy and national benchmarks.
- 3.3.3. Table 4 in this report sets out the FiT walking guidelines. These were produced at the same time as the quantity guidelines (2015) and were informed by research of existing practice in England. Indicative walking distances can be determined from the accessibility guidelines as set out below:
- 250m = 2-3 minutes' walk
 - 400m = 5 minutes' walk
 - 800m = 10 minutes' walk
 - 1,200m = 15 minutes' walk
 - 1,600m = 20 minutes' walk
- 3.3.4. Given that the FiT guidelines are current benchmarks that have been informed by recent research of existing practice and have been recommended in light of Government policy, it is considered that they would represent a more reasonable starting point for accessibility thresholds in the emerging Local Plan.

3.4. What is a reasonable starting point for minimum spatial requirements?

- 3.4.1. Appendix B to this report sets out the FiT recommended minimum sizes for formal open spaces, i.e. playing pitches, other outdoor (non-pitch) sports, equipped/designated play areas and other outdoor provision (MUGAs and skateboard parks). Given that these are current national benchmarks, there

is no reason why they should not represent a reasonable starting point for the minimum spatial requirements for new open space provision in the emerging Local Plan.

3.5. What is a reasonable starting point for determining how and where open space should be provided?

- 3.5.1. Figure 1 (overleaf) is a decision-making flow-chart that could represent a reasonable starting point for determining how and where open space should be provided through the new Local Plan.
- 3.5.2. This chart is a rationalisation of the chart that features in the Council's adopted Development Plan, reflecting the current national planning policy context.

3.6. What is a reasonable starting point for calculating developer contributions?

- 3.6.1. In order to calculate the level of developer contributions, the quantity standard needs to be translated to a requirement that relates to the size (number of dwellings) of the development and how many people are likely to occupy the properties.
- 3.6.2. Initially this involves translating the quantity standard to sq. metres per person. This is a simple calculation that involves multiplying the hectare figure by 10,000. This figure is then divided by 1,000 to calculate the area per person. In effect, the quantity standard (hectares) can simply be multiplied by 10 to achieve the same outcome (sq. metres) per person.
- 3.6.3. Once the standard has been converted to sq. metres per person, the next task is to calculate how many people are likely to occupy the development.
- 3.6.4. The source of the information used in the Council's existing Development Plan was 'The New Build Survey' undertaken by Kent County Council in 2005. In the absence of a more current survey, it is considered that this represents a reasonable data source because it reflects what has happened locally, albeit back in 2005. Table 12 (overleaf) sets out the average household sizes per dwelling from the survey.

Figure 1: Decision-making flow chart for determining how and where open space should be provided

STEP 1	Q. Will the type of development generate a need for open space?	
	⇩ Yes ⇩	No. Decision – No provision required.
STEP 2	Q. What level of open space need will be generated by the development proposal?	
STEP 3	Q. Can new on-site open space provision be made, fit-for-purpose, in accordance with the standards?	
	⇩ Yes ⇩	⇩ No ⇩
	Decision – Provide open space on-site in accordance with the standards.	
STEP 4	Q. Can new off-site open space provision be made, fit-for-purpose, within the relevant accessibility threshold?	
	⇩ Yes ⇩	⇩ No ⇩
	Decision – Provide open space off-site (directly or indirectly via developer contributions) in accordance with the standards.	Decision - Secure developer contributions to enhance existing open spaces in proximity to the development site.

Table 12: Average household size per dwelling

Dwelling Size	Av. Household Size (persons)
1 bed Flat	1.25
2 bed Flat	1.64
3+ bed Flat	2.17
1 bed House	1.30
2 bed House	2.11
3 bed House	2.62
4+ bed House	3.25

Source: The New Build Survey 2005 (Kent County Council)

- 3.6.5. With these two sets of figures, it is possible to calculate the area of open space (sq. metres) a development should provide. This involves multiplying the sq.metre figure per person by the total number of people that are likely to occupy the properties.

Developer contributions

- 3.6.6. Figure 1 sets out the methodology for determining when, how and where open space should be provided. The starting position is that new open space should be provided on-site where the need is generated, followed by off-site provision within the relevant accessibility thresholds if on-site provision is not achievable. However, there will be some instances when these two options are not feasible due to constraints. In these instances a contribution would need to be sought in-lieu of provision.
- 3.6.7. To calculate the level of contribution, it is important to understand the typical costs of providing each type of open space. It is considered that evidence from recently completed schemes in the borough as well as data from the most current **Spon's Price Book** represent reasonable starting points for this piece of work. This is the approach that was adopted for the Council's existing Development Plan and there is no reason why it should not represent a sound and transparent way of determining open space contributions for the emerging Local Plan. Calculating the actual contribution will involve multiplying the typical cost per sq. metre – that will need to be documented - by the area of open space required.

On-going Management

- 3.6.8. In addition to securing open space provision, it is also important to ensure an effective management regime is in place. Effective, sensitive management is important for the continued enjoyment of the open space as well as being important for nature conservation and biodiversity (see section 3.7 of this report). It is considered that this needs to be highlighted early in the process, possibly through the relevant open space policy in the Local Plan, because it is likely to impact on the cost and therefore viability of the development. The objective would be to secure a management regime for the lifetime of the open space. If this is not realistically achievable through a single organisation, then binding commitments would need to be made regarding the transfer of the management regime after a reasonable period of time to another party to continue the maintenance programme.

3.7. What is a reasonable starting point for addressing the biodiversity duty within open space provision?

- 3.7.1. This report has emphasised throughout that open spaces can make an important contribution to the health and well-being of communities. In preparing relevant policies in the Local Plan, it is also important to be mindful of other functions that open spaces can perform. Open spaces can, through effective sensitive management, perform a useful role in the strengthening of the network of green infrastructure across the borough by providing opportunities for habitat protection and creation to allow species to migrate to and along. Given that there is a legal duty upon local planning authorities to address and deliver measures to protect and strengthen biodiversity, the Local Plan should, where feasible, consider the benefits that open spaces could achieve not just for local communities but also for the natural environment.

4. Conclusions

4.1. What are reasonable starting points for the open space policies in the Council's emerging Local Plan?

- 4.1.1. The purpose of this piece of work is to establish reasonable starting points for the open space policies in the Council's new Local Plan for Tonbridge and Malling.
- 4.1.2. Sections 2 and 3 of this report considered each aspect of the open space policies in turn, proposing a reasonable starting point that was informed and shaped by national benchmarks (FiT guidelines), national planning policy and local evidence. The conclusion is that Option 3: 'Refinement of current provision taking account of Fit benchmark guidelines', would represent a reasonable starting point for quantitative open space standards in the emerging Tonbridge & Malling Borough Local Plan.
- 4.1.3. In summary the reasonable starting points are:
- the 2015 qualitative assessment results could represent a reasonable piece of evidence to inform decision-making on future open space provision as part of development proposals in terms of which existing facilities could be enhanced;
 - a set of quantity standards which is a refinement of current provision (hectares per 1,000 population) that aligns, in total, with FiT benchmark guidelines (see Table 11);
 - the Government's policy on protecting and resisting the net loss of existing open spaces (see para. 74 in the NPPF);
 - FiT walking guidelines for the accessibility thresholds;
 - FiT recommended minimum dimensions for formal outdoor open space;
 - a decision-making flow-chart for determining when, how and where open space should be provided (see Figure 1); and
 - evidence from recently completed schemes in the borough and data from the most current Spon's Price Book for calculating developer contributions for open space in-lieu of on-site/off-site provision.

- Consider opportunities, particularly through the provision of natural and semi-natural greenspaces and amenity green spaces, for habitat protection and creation to enhance and strengthen the Green Infrastructure and Ecological Network having regard to the habit and species of the Biodiversity Opportunity Areas (BOAs)⁴.

⁴ See the Tonbridge and Malling Green Infrastructure Report (December 2017) for more details

Appendix A: Definition of open spaces

Open space typology	Definition
Outdoor Sports	Pitch sports including football, rugby, hockey and cricket. Courts and greens including tennis courts, bowling greens and athletic tracks. School playing fields where there are local agreements for community use.
Children's and Young People's Play Areas	Designated play areas comprising Local Areas for Play (LAP), Local Equipped Areas for Play (LEAP) and Neighbourhood Equipped Areas for Play (NEAP). Other outdoor provision including skateboard parks and Multi Use Games Areas (MUGAs).
Parks and Gardens	Formal green spaces including urban parks, country parks, forest parks and formal gardens.
Natural and Semi-Natural	Woodland, scrub, grassland, wetlands, open and running water, and open access land.
Amenity Green Space	Informal recreation spaces in and around housing, and village greens.

Appendix B: FiT Recommended minimum sizes – formal outdoor space

Open space typology	Minimum sizes	Minimum dimensions	Buffer zones	
Playing pitches	<u>Association football</u> Adult soccer	0.74ha	106 x 70 metres	-
	Mini soccer U7/U8 pitch	0.14ha	43 x 33 metres	-
	Mini soccer U9/U10 pitch	0.25ha	60 x 42 metres	-
	<u>Rugby Union</u>	0.70ha	100 x 70 metres	-
	<u>Hockey</u> Mini Hockey	0.31ha	65 x 48 metres	-
	<u>Lacrosse</u>	0.66ha	100 x 60 metres	-
Other outdoor (non-pitch) sports	<u>Cricket</u> Senior recreational 12 pitch	1.43ha	111.56 x 128.04 metres	-
	<u>Athletics</u> 6 lane track	1.51ha	172.03 x 87.64 metres	-
	<u>Tennis courts</u> 1 recreational court	0.06ha	34.75 x 17.07 metres	-
	2 recreational courts	0.11ha	34.75 x 31.70 metres	-
	For each adjacent court	0.05ha	34.75 x 14.63 metres	-
	<u>Bowling greens</u> Flat green	0.12ha	34.4 x 34.4 metres	-
Crown green	0.08ha	27.4 x 27.4 metres	-	
Equipped/designated play areas	<u>LAP</u>	0.01ha	10 x 10 metres (minimum activity zone of 100sqm)	5m minimum separation between activity zone and the boundary of dwellings
	<u>LEAP</u>	0.04ha	20 x 20 metres (minimum activity zone of 400sqm)	20m minimum separation between activity zone and the habitable room façade of dwellings
	<u>NEAP</u>	0.1ha	31.6 x 31.6 metres (minimum activity zone of 1,000sqm comprising an area for play equipment and structures & a hard surfaced area of at least 465sqm (the minimum needed to play five-a-side football))	30m minimum separation between activity zone and the boundary of dwellings
Other outdoor provision (MUGAs and skateboard parks)	<u>MUGA</u>	0.1ha	40 x 20 metres	30m minimum separation between activity zone and the boundary of dwellings

Appendix C: Comparison of Open Space Standards

Please Note: These standards are expressed as hectares (ha) per 1,000 population.

The Managing Development and the Environment Development Plan Document (MDE DPD) standards are the Borough Council's existing Development Plan requirements.

'Local provision' is a standard that reflects the current level of supply in the borough and takes account of the existing population.

The 'Preferred Option (Option 3)' is the suggested starting point for open space quantity standards in the new Local Plan.

The 'FiT guidelines' are the Fields in Trust national benchmark figures.

Open space typology	MDE DPD (2010)	Local provision	Preferred Option (Option 3)	FiT guideline
Outdoor Sports (all)	2.05	2.26	1.6	1.6
Children's and Young People's Play Areas (equipped play areas, skate parks, ball courts, informal play space, MUGAs)	0.1	0.07	0.55	0.55
Parks and Gardens	2.5	2.12	2.2	0.8
Natural and Semi-Natural Green Spaces	0.73-1.83	3.38	1.0	1.8
Amenity Green Spaces	0.33-1.33	0.74	Design-led	0.6
Total	6.76*	8.57	5.35	5.35

*Calculated using mid-point of provision for 'Natural and Semi-Natural Green Spaces' and 'Amenity Green Spaces'

Appendix D: Qualitative assessment criteria

OPEN SPACE SITE ASSESSMENT – OUTDOOR SPORTS FACILITIES

Explanatory Notes:

Scoring system: Based on a scale of 1-5. 5 = high/excellent and 1= low/poor.

Set out below is an Outdoor Sports Facility that would score the maximum 5 for each category. This should be used as a reference point for the audit.

Scoring – The starting point is a score of 5 for each category. Deduct points according to how poorly the site performs against the factors in the table.

Parish:	
Site Name:	
Site Ref:	
Date of Survey:	
Weather Conditions:	

Category	Factors	Score
Accessibility (of site)	Into and around - clear and inviting, well maintained + good access for disabled users	
Cleanliness	No evidence of litter, graffiti, dog fouling	
Grass Cover	Good coverage (i.e. no bare patches), colour and length of grass	
Pitch Qualities	Even surface, flat (non-sloping), well drained playing pitch	
Changing Facilities (exterior)	Appropriate well-maintained and secure changing facilities/pavilion	
Enclosure	Appropriate fences and gates in good repair	
Safety	Appropriately lit + high level of natural surveillance (eg from pedestrian routes and nearby buildings)	
Signage	Appropriate clear signage for safe use	
Equipment (ancillary)	Adequate supply of, and well maintained seats, litter bins, dog bins, parking and toilets	
TOTAL (Maximum 45)		

OPEN SPACE SITE ASSESSMENT – CHILDREN’S AND YOUNG PEOPLE’S PLAY AREAS

Explanatory Notes:

Scoring system: Based on a scale of 1-5. 5 = high/excellent and 1= low/poor.

Set out below is a Children’s and Young People’s Play Area that would score the maximum 5 for each category. This should be used as a reference point for the audit.

Scoring – The starting point is a score of 5 for each category. Deduct points according to how poorly the site performs against the factors in the table.

Parish:	
Site Name:	
Site Ref:	
Date of Survey:	
Weather Conditions:	

Category	Factors	Score
Accessibility (of site)	Into and around - clear and inviting, well maintained + good access for disabled users	
Attractiveness	Well cared for (landscaping) and visually appealing	
Cleanliness	No evidence of litter, graffiti, dog fouling	
Grass Cover	Appropriate and good coverage (i.e. no bare patches) and colour of grass	
Enclosure	Appropriate fences and gates in good repair	
Safety	High level of natural surveillance (eg from pedestrian routes and nearby buildings)	
Signage	Appropriate clear signage for safe use and management (eg dog exclusion)	
Equipment (primary)	Variety and well maintained (including surfaces under equipment) + good access for disabled users. Variety: (Swinging, sliding, rocking, climbing, social play) Local Equipped Area of Play = 5 Neighbourhood Equipped Area of Play = 8	
Equipment (ancillary)	Appropriate well maintained seats, litter bins, parking and toilets	
Total (Maximum 45)		

OPEN SPACE SITE ASSESSMENT – PARKS AND GARDENS

Explanatory Notes:

Scoring system: Based on a scale of 1-5. 5 = high/excellent and 1= low/poor.

Set out below is a Park/Garden that would score the maximum 5 for each category. This should be used as a reference point for the audit.

Scoring – The starting point is a score of 5 for each category. Deduct points according to how poorly the site performs against the factors in the table.

Parish:	
Site Name:	
Site Ref:	
Date of Survey:	
Weather Conditions:	

Category	Factors	Score
Accessibility (of site)	Into and around - clear and inviting, well maintained + good access for disabled users	
Attractiveness	Well cared for (landscaping) and visually appealing + tranquil environment	
Cleanliness	No evidence of litter, graffiti, dog fouling	
Grass Cover	Appropriate good coverage (i.e. no bare patches) and colour of grass	
Enclosure	Appropriate fences and gates in good repair	
Safety	High level of natural surveillance (eg from pedestrian routes and nearby buildings)	
Signage	Appropriate clear signage for safe use (including for any water features)	
Equipment (ancillary)	Appropriate supply of, and well maintained seats, litter bins, dog bins, parking and toilets	
Total (Maximum 40)		

OPEN SPACE SITE ASSESSMENT - NATURAL GREEN SPACES

Explanatory Notes:

Scoring system: Based on a scale of 1-5. 5 = high/excellent and 1= low/poor.

Set out below is a Natural Green Space that would score the maximum 5 for each category. This should be used as a reference point for the audit.

Scoring – The starting point is a score of 5 for each category. Deduct points according to how poorly the site performs against the factors in the table.

Parish:	
Site Name:	
Site Ref:	
Date of Survey:	
Weather Conditions:	

Category	Factors	Score
Accessibility (of site)	Into and around - clear and inviting, well maintained + good access	
Attractiveness	Well cared for (i.e. management of trees/meadows/watercourses) and visually appealing + tranquil environment	
Cleanliness	No evidence of litter, graffiti, dog fouling	
Enclosure	Appropriate fences and gates in good repair	
Safety	Appropriate level of natural surveillance (eg from pedestrian routes)	
Signage	Appropriate clear signage for safe use	
Equipment (ancillary)	Appropriate well maintained seats, litter bins and parking	
TOTAL SCORE (Maximum 35)		

OPEN SPACE SITE ASSESSMENT – AMENITY GREEN SPACES

Explanatory Notes:

Scoring system: Based on a scale of 1-5. 5 = high/excellent and 1= low/poor.

Set out below is an Amenity Green Space that would score the maximum 5 for each category. This should be used as a reference point for the audit.

Scoring – The starting point is a score of 5 for each category. Deduct points according to how poorly the site performs against the factors in the table.

Parish:	
Site Name:	
Site Ref:	
Date of Survey:	
Weather Conditions:	

Category	Factors	Score
Accessibility (of site)	Into and around - clear and inviting, well maintained + good access	
Attractiveness	Well cared for (landscaping) and visually appealing + tranquil environment	
Cleanliness	No evidence of litter, graffiti, dog fouling	
Grass Cover	Good coverage (i.e. no bare patches) and colour of grass	
Enclosure	Appropriate fences and gates in good repair	
Safety	High level of natural surveillance (eg from pedestrian routes and nearby buildings)	
Signage	Appropriate clear signage for safe use	
Equipment (ancillary)	Appropriate well maintained seats, litter bins and dog bins	
Total (Maximum 40)		

Appendix E: Qualitative assessment of existing open spaces (2015)

**Open Space Assessment
Comparison of Scores (2015 & 2009)**

RAG Analysis			
	Green	Amber	Red
Parks	66%+	50%+	49%+
AGS	65%+	50%+	49%+
CYP	70%+	55%+	49%+
OSF	70%+	55%+	54%+
NG	65%+	50%+	49%+

Comparison with '09
>24 '09 score
0-24 '09 score
Same as '09
Worse than '09

Notes: Playing Pitches - facilities that featured in the Council's Playing Pitch Strategy were scored 1-5 with 5 being excellent

Parks and Gardens

Site No:	Type	Name	Location	Parish /Town	Score '09 %	Score '15 %
801	PG	Leybourne Lakes Country Park	Leybourne Way	EM&L	85	90
800	PG	Haysden Country Park	Lower Haysden Lane	TO	84	100
805	PG	Tonbridge Castle	High Street	TO	80	100
802	PG	Manor Park Country Park	Leonard's Street	WM	78	85
804	PG	Trosley Country Park	Harvel Road	TR	75	85
807	PG	Memorial Garden	River Walk	TO	62	95
806	PG	ST Leonard's Tower	St Leonard's Street	WM	60	85
803	PG	Nevill Park	Ham Hill	SN	57	75
808	PG	Holborough Park	A228	SN	57	65
809	PG	Heath Farm	Kings Hill	EM&L		88

Comparison with '09 Score
5
16
20
7
10
33
25
18
8
88

Notes

Significant recent improvements assisted by developer contributions
OSS 2009 audit scored 0 for seats, litter bins, dog bins and toilets

Amenity Green Spaces

Site No:	Type	Name	Location	Parish /Town	Score '09 %	Score '15 %
176	AGS	Riverside		WO	81	58
180	AGS	Addington Green	Addington	AD	80	93
959	AGS	Ferryfield Recreation Ground		AY	80	76
189	AGS	Westwood Green	East Peckham	EP	78	93
178	AGS	The Green	West Peckham	WP	77	90
146	AGS	Pilgrims View	St Benedict Road	SN	73	83
185	AGS	Pippin Way	Kings Hill	KH	73	90
147	AGS	Ostlers Paddock/Cosgrave Field	Church Road	O	72	88
191	AGS	Signpost Recreation Field	Kelcher's Lane	HA	71	88
157	AGS	Upper Haysden Lane		TO	71	98
121	AGS	Teston Rd, Playing Fields	Rose Terrace	O	69	80

Comparison with '09 Score
-23
13
-4
15
13
10
17
16
17
27
11

OSS 2009 audit scored 0 for information and 2 for litter bins

145	AGS	War Memorial & Garden	Stansted	ST	69	98	29	OSS 2009 audit scored 0 for seats, litter bins, dog bins and information
161	AGS	Village Green	Mount Pleasant	HI	69	75	6	
173	AGS	Bradbourne Park Road		EM&L	69	90	21	
159	AGS	Yardley Park Road	The Haydens	TO	68	98	30	OSS 2009 audit scored 0 for bins and information
187	AGS	Garner Drive		EM&L	68	90	22	
140	AGS	New Road		EM&L	67	55	-12	
166	AGS	Columbine Road		EM&L	67	65	-2	
183	AGS	Cage Green	Royal West Kent Av	TO	67	100	33	OSS 2009 audit scored 0 for seats and information and 2 for dog litter bins
163	AGS	Lime Crescent		EM&L	66	78	12	
186	AGS	Village Green	High Street	WM	66	93	27	OSS 2009 audit scored 0 for dog bins and information and 3 for accessibility (around the site) and litter bins
104	AGS	Carnation Crescent		EM&L	65		-65	No access
113	AGS	Crow Hill	Crow Hill Road	BG	65	83	18	
153	AGS	Scotchers Field	Romney Way	TO	65	93	28	OSS 2009 audit scored 0 for dog bins and information, 1 for seats and 2 for litter bins
171	AGS	Marlowe Road		EM&L	65	73	8	
192	AGS	Budds Green		SH	65	90	25	OSS 2009 audit scored 0 for seats, litter bins and dog bins and 2 for information and safety
119	AGS	Willow Mead	Oxley Shaw Lane	L	64	98	34	OSS 2009 audit scored 0 for seats, dog bins and information and 3 for maintenance (landscaping) and litter bins
131	AGS	The Green	Covey Hall Road	SN	64	90	26	OSS 2009 audit scored 0 for seats, dog bins and information and 1 for litter bins
150	AGS	St Marks Green	Alma Road, Eccles	AY	64	75	11	
958	AGS	Old Saw Mill		PT	64	85	21	
103	AGS	Whimbrel Green	Plover Road	EM&L	63	83	20	
158	AGS	Brook Street		TO	63	95	32	OSS 2009 audit scored 0 for seats and information and 2 for litter and dog bins
177	AGS	Village Green	East Malling	EM&L	63	85	22	
955	AGS	Salisbury Road		TO	63	100	37	OSS 2009 audit scored 0 for seats, litter bins and information
965	AGS	River Walk	Tonbridge	TO	62	75	13	OSS 2009 audit scored 0 for toilets and information
149	AGS	The Green	Alma Road, Eccles	AY	62	70	8	
179	AGS	Village Green	New Road	D	62	90	28	OSS 2009 audit scored 0 for dog bins and information and 3 for accessibility, cleanliness (dog fouling), seats and litter bins
194	AGS	Grass Area	Green Lane	TR	62	88	26	OSS 2009 audit scored 0 for seats, litter bins, dog bins, toilets, information and parking
123	AGS	The Bomb Hole	Oxley Shaw Lane	L	61	93	32	OSS 2009 audit scored 0 for seats, litter bins and information and 3 for cleanliness (litter and dog fouling) and dog bins
182	AGS	Village Green Potash Lane	Boneash Lane	PT	61	88	27	OSS 2009 audit scored 0 for seats, litter bins, dog bins and information
953	AGS	Bickmore Way		TO	61	100	39	OSS 2009 audit scored 0 for seats, litter bins, dog bins and information and 2 for cleanliness (graffiti)
957	AGS	Hadlow Stair Rd/Cornwallis Av		TO	61	90	29	OSS 2009 audit scored 0 for seats, litter bins and information and 2 for boundaries and access around the site
120	AGS	Augers Field	St Benedict Road	SN	60	83	23	
132	AGS	Willow Side	Holborough Road	SN	60	70	10	
138	AGS	The Green	Anson Avenue	KH	60	85	25	OSS 2009 audit scored 0 for seats, litter bins, dog bins and information
162	AGS	Offham Village Green	Offham Road	O	60	85	25	OSS 2009 audit scored 0 for seats, litter bins, dog bins and information
101	AGS	Bishops Oak Ride	Trench Wood	TO	59	95	36	OSS 2009 audit scored 0 for seats, litter bins and information and 2 for cleanliness (graffiti)
106	AGS	London Road		AY	59	50	-9	
148	AGS	Blue Bell Hill Picnic Area	Common Road	AY	59	78	19	
124	AGS	Lillieburn open space	Castle Way	L	59	80	21	

956	AGS	Hunt Road/Knight Road		TO	59	100
125	AGS	Castle Way		L	58	98
168	AGS	Rear of Leisure Centre	New Hythe Lane	EM&L	58	55
188	AGS	Parkway	Hopgarden Road	TO	58	85
951	AGS	Snodland Recreation Ground	Malling Road	SN	58	80
193	AGS	Dunks Green		SH	57	78
100	AGS	Playing Field	Lunsford Lane	EM&L	56	78
114	AGS	Whitegate Field	Wrotham Road	WR	56	68
117	AGS	Church Green	Stansted	ST	56	75
130	AGS	Lee Road	Covey Hall Road	SN	55	88
133	AGS	Keats Road	Lunsford Lane	EM&L	55	70
156	AGS	Lodge Oak Lane		TO	55	98
165	AGS	Russett Close		AY	55	88
170	AGS	Clare Avenue		TO	55	98
174	AGS	Village Hall Grounds	Burham	BU	55	90
115	AGS	Northwood Road		TO	54	98
135	AGS	Waveney Road		TO	54	100
167	AGS	Lunsford Lane		EM&L	54	70
169	AGS	Alders Meadow		TO	54	100
141	AGS	Ashbee Close		SN	53	80
137	AGS	Barleycorn	Oxley Shaw/	L	52	98
143	AGS	East of Kingfisher Lakes	Rich Road	SN	51	65
136	AGS	Brungers Walk	Darenth Avenue	TO	51	95
184	AGS	Quincewood Gardens		TO	51	63
954	AGS	Dernier Road		TO	51	100
116	AGS	Bishops Oak Ride	Trench Wood	TO	50	98
127	AGS	Long Mead Way	Darenth Avenue	TO	50	90
129	AGS	Pond	St Benedict Road	SN	49	65
122	AGS	Willow Road	Castle Way	L	48	78
126	AGS	Rear of Hamble Road	Tonbridge	TO	48	75
118	AGS	Off Javelin Road	Mereworth	M	47	90
172	AGS	Land in Glebe Meadow		WA	47	70
195	AGS	East Street Green	East Street	AD	46	83
199	AGS	Field adj. to Wrotham School	Wrotham Road	WR	45	
190	AGS	Access land to Riverside	The Old Bridge	AY	43	75
151	AGS	Quarry Wood Industrial Estate	Hermitage Lane	AY	42	58
952	AGS	Coronation Gardens	Aylesford Square	AY	42	

41
40
-3
27
22
21
22
12
19
33
15
43
33
43
35
44
46
16
46
27
46
14
44
12
49
48
40
16
30
27
43
23
37
-45
32
16
-42

OSS 2009 audit scored 0 for seats and information and 2 for cleanliness (litter) and dog bins

OSS 2009 audit scored 0 for litter bins, dog bins and information and 3 for cleanliness (litter and dog fouling) and seats

OSS 2009 audit scored 0 for seats, litter bins, dog bins and information

OSS 2009 audit scored 0 for seats, 1 for litter bins and dog bins and 2 for information

OSS 2009 audit scored 0 for seats, litter bins, dog bins and information

OSS 2009 audit scored 0 for litter bins and information, 1 for seats and 2 for landscaping

OSS 2009 audit scored 0 for seats, litter bins, dog bins and information

OSS 2009 audit scored 0 for seats, litter bins, dog bins and information

OSS 2009 audit scored 0 for seats, litter bins, dog bins and information

OSS 2009 audit scored 0 for seats, litter bins and information

OSS 2009 audit scored 0 for seats, litter bins, dog bins and information

OSS 2009 audit scored 0 for seats, litter bins, dog bins and information

OSS 2009 audit scored 0 for seats, litter bins, dog bins and information and 2 for cleanliness (litter)

OSS 2009 audit scored 0 for seats, litter bins and information and 2 for cleanliness (litter + dog fouling)

OSS 2009 audit scored 0 for seats, litter bins, dog bins and information and 2 for cleanliness (litter + dog fouling)

OSS 2009 audit scored 0 for seats, litter bins, dog bins and information

OSS 2009 audit scored 0 for seats, litter bins, dog bins and information and 1 for cleanliness (dog fouling)

OSS 2009 audit scored 0 for seats, litter bins, dog bins and information and 2 for cleanliness (litter and dog fouling)

OSS 2009 audit scored 1 for cleanliness (litter) and 3 for each of the other comparable criteria

OSS 2009 audit scored 0 for maintenance (landscaping), dog bins and information, 1 for cleanliness (litter) and 2 for cleanliness (dog fouling) and seats

OSS 2009 audit scored 0 for seats, litter bins, dog bins and information and 2 for safety

No access

OSS 2009 audit scored 0 for litter bins, 1 for information and cleanliness (dog fouling) and 2 for accessibility, cleanliness (litter) and landscaping

No public access

196	AGS	Brionne Gardens		TO	41	90
110	AGS	Baywell	Oxley Shaw Lane	L	40	83
197	AGS	Cannon Lane		TO	38	80
102	AGS	Silver Close	South Tonbridge	TO	35	85
107	AGS	Hill Top		TO	34	85
108	AGS	Parallel with M20	Station Road	D	27	48
963	AGS	Heath Farm	Kings Hill	EM&L		88
960	AGS	Tower View	Kings Hill	KH		73
962	AGS	Bancroft Lane	Kings Hill	KH		73
961	AGS	Braeburn Way	Kings Hill	KH		96
964	AGS	Garratt Memorial Land	Plaxtol	PX		88
181	AGS	Spoute Recreation Ground	Plaxtol	PX		78

49
43
42
50
51
21
88
73
73
96
88
78

OSS 2009 audit scored 0 for seats, litter bins, dog bins and information and 2 for accessibility (into the site)

OSS 2009 audit scored 0 for seats, litter bins, dog bins and information and 2 for accessibility, cleanliness (litter) and maintenance

OSS 2009 audit scored 0 for seats, litter bins and dog bins, 1 for cleanliness (graffiti) and 2 for cleanliness (dog fouling) and information

OSS 2009 audit scored 0 for seats, litter bins, dog bins and information, 1 for accessibility and 1 for cleanliness (litter)

OSS 2009 audit scored 0 for seats, litter bins and information and 1 for cleanliness (litter), accessibility and landscaping

Children's and Young People's Play Areas

Site No:	Type	Name	Location	Parish/Town	Score '09 %	Score '15 %
348	CYP	Racecourse Sports Ground	Tonbridge Castle	TO	91	98
372	CYP	Gibson Drive	Kings Hill	KH	88	93
309	CYP	Ferryfield Recreation Ground	Station Road	AY	86	93
336	CYP	Ryarsh Village Hall	Birling Road	R	84	96
312	CYP	Signpost Recreation Field	Kelcher's Lane	HA	82	89
327	CYP	Arundel Close Play Area	Tonbridge	TO	80	82
345	CYP	Farthingfield Recreation Ground	Old London Road	WR	79	89
318	CYP	Stonehouse Field Play Area	Long Mill Lane	PT	78	82
350	CYP	Haysden Country Park	Lower Haysden Lane	TO	78	96
338	CYP	William Field Recreation Field	Marshall Gardens	HA	76	82
333	CYP	Borough Green Rec. Ground	Maidstone Road	BG	75	91
307	CYP	The Green	Anson Avenue	KH	75	87
380	CYP	Potyns Play Area	Paddlesworth Road	SN	72	82
310	CYP	East Peckham Recreation Ground	Pippin Road	EP	71	93
322	CYP	Pippin Way	Kings Hill	KH	71	96
349	CYP	Forstal Road	Aylesford	AY	71	91
328	CYP	Ditton Community Centre	Kiln Barn Road	D	71	100
332	CYP	Teston Road Playground	Rose Terrace	O	71	84
301	CYP	Wateringbury Fields	Fields Lane	W	70	82
320	CYP	Recreation Ground	Knowle Road	WO	70	89
329	CYP	Recreation Ground	New Hythe Lane	EM&L	70	89
325	CYP	Frog Bridge Playground	Stream Side	TO	70	80
323	CYP	Burham Recreation Ground	Rochester Road	BU	68	91
321	CYP	Adventure Recreation Ground	Malling Road	SN	66	73
334	CYP	Ightham Recreation Ground	Sevenoaks Road	I	65	87
304	CYP	Recreation Ground	Butchers Lane	M	63	78

Comparison with '09 Score
7
5
7
12
7
2
10
4
18
6
16
12
10
22
25
20
29
13
12
19
19
10
23
7
22
15

OSS 2009 audit scored 0 for litter bins, dog bins and toilets and 3 for accessibility (into site), maintenance (landscaping) and seats

OSS 2009 audit scored 0 for maintenance (landscaping and grassed areas) and dog bins

330	CYP	East Malling Recreation Ground	New Road	EM&L	64	91
352	CYP	Tunbury Avenue Recreation Gr.	Tunbury Avenue	AY	62	91
316	CYP	Recreation Ground	Riding Lane	HI	62	84
311	CYP	Trottiscliffe Play Area	Old School Cottage	TR	60	91
331	CYP	Playground	Masefield Road	EM&L	59	78
313	CYP	Recreation Ground	Malling Road	SN	59	
351	CYP	Eccles Recreation Ground	Bull Lane	AY	59	80
305	CYP	School Lane Recreation Ground	Plaxtol	PX	58	67
342	CYP	West Malling Village Hall	Norman Road	WM	55	89
317	CYP	Tonbridge Farm Playground	Darenth Avenue	TO	55	82
306	CYP	Scotchers Field	Romney Way	TO	56	89
308	CYP	Brindles Field	Tonbridge	TO	56	89
343	CYP	Blake Drive	Larkfield	EM&L	56	78
344	CYP	Park Road	Addington	AD	54	62
324	CYP	Vigo Road	Fairseat	ST	54	64
335	CYP	The Hollows	Green Acres	AY	51	87
314	CYP	West Wood	Tonbridge Road	HI	52	84
302	CYP	Saltings Road	Snodland	SN	51	71
319	CYP	Play Area	Lysander Road	M	50	91
326	CYP	Ditton Recreation Ground	Ditton Place	D	49	87
347	CYP	Malthouse Road	Stansted	ST	49	87
300	CYP	Plaxtol Spoute Recreation Ground	Long Mill Lane	PX	49	51
376	CYP	Tilton Road/Staley's Acre	Borough Green	BG	45	78
379	CYP	Upper Castle Field	The Slade	TO	44	58
340	CYP	Playground Nevill Park	Ham Hill	SN	44	73
341	CYP	Manor Park Country Park	St Leonard's Street	WM	11	98
377	CYP	Hop Bine Close	East Peckham	EP	33	31
NEW	CYP	Royal West Kent		TO		100
* Hop Bine Close is an uncovered play area; 1 half height goal post						
BALL COURTS						
353	CYP BC	William Field Recreation Ground	Marshall Garden	HA	4	
354	CYP BC	Borough Green Rec. Ground	Maidstone Road	BG	4	
357	CYP BC	West Malling Primary School	West Street	WM	5	
358	CYP BC	Ditton Community Centre	Kiln Barn Road	D	4	

27
29
22
31
19
-59
21
9
34
27
33
33
22
8
10
36
32
20
41
38
38
2
33
14
29
87
-2
100

OSS 2009 audit scored 0 for dog bins, and information and 2 for litter bins and seats

OSS 2009 audit scored 0 for information, 3 for cleanliness (litter and dog fouling), landscaping and dog bins

OSS 2009 audit scored 0 for litter bins, dog bins and toilets and 2 for cleanliness (litter) and safety

Remains of Play Area

OSS 2009 audit scored 0 for maintenance (boundaries), litter bins, dog bins, toilets and information

OSS 2009 audit scored 0 for boundaries and dog bins, 1 for cleanliness (graffiti) and 2 for safety

OSS 2009 audit scored 0 for litter bins and dog bins and 2 for cleanliness (litter and graffiti) and landscaping

OSS 2009 audit scored 0 for dog bins and 1 for cleanliness (graffiti) and boundaries

OSS 2009 audit scored 0 for information, 1 for seats, and 2 for landscaping, litter bins and dog bins

OSS 2009 audit scored 0 for maintenance (landscaping and grassed areas), seats, dog bins and toilets and 2 for safety

OSS 2009 audit scored 0 for maintenance (landscaping), dog bins, toilets and information, 1 for cleanliness (litter) and 2 for cleanliness (dog fouling) and seats

OSS 2009 audit scored 0 for litter bins, dog bins and information and 1 for seats

OSS 2009 audit scored 0 for maintenance (boundaries), seats, litter bins, dog bins and information

OSS 2009 audit scored 0 for seats, litter bins and dog bins

OSS 2009 audit scored 0 for maintenance (boundaries), seats, litter bins, dog bins, toilets and information,

OSS 2009 audit scored 0 for maintenance (boundaries), dog bins, information and toilets and 1 for cleanliness (graffiti), maintenance (landscaping) and parking

OSS 2009 audit scored 0 for cleanliness, maintenance, seats, litter bins, dog bins, toilets, information, parking and safety

New CYP

359	CYP BC	Hildenborough Recreation Ground	Riding Lane	HI	5
360	CYP BC	Burham Recreation Ground	Rochester Road	BU	4
361	CYP BC	Farthingfield Recreation Ground	Old London Road	WR	5
362	CYP BC	Tonbridge Farm Sportsground	Darenth Avenue	TO	4
364	CYP BC	Pippin Road Recreation Ground	East Peckham	EP	5
365	CYP BC	Stonehouse Field	Long Mill Lane	P	5
370	CYP BC	Leybourne PC Ball Court	Oxley Shaw Lane	L	4
373	CYP BC	Gibson Drive	Kings Hill	KH	4
374	CYP BC	Recreation Ground	New Road	EM&L	5
375	CYP BC	Recreation Ground	New Hythe Lane	EM&L	4
378	CYP BC	Potyns Sportsground	Paddlesworth Road	SN	5
SKATE PARKS					
366	CYP SKP	Tonbridge Farm Sportsground	Darenth Avenue	TO	5
367	CYP SKP	Burham Recreation Ground	Rochester Road	BU	5
368	CYP SKP	Eccles Recreation Ground	Bull lane	AY	3
369	CYP SKP	Wateringbury Fields	Fields Lane	W	2
371	CYP SKP	Whitegate Field	Wrotham Road	WR	5

Outdoor Sports Facilities

Site No:	Type	Name	Location	Parish/ Town	Score '09	Score '15
693	OSF	Offham Cricket Ground	Church Road	O	82	89
697	OSF	Playing Fields	Russett Road	EP	80	87
670	OSF	Poplar Meadow Cricket	Darenth Avenue	TO	78	96
627	OSF	Kilnbarn Recreation Ground	Kiln Barn Road	D	75	89
656	OSF	Blue Bell Hill Cricket Field	Common Road	AY	75	82
664	Private OSF	Aylesford Rugby Club	Hall Road	AY	70	91
714	OSF	Holborough Park Cricket Ground	A228 Holborough Park	SN	70	76
717	OSF BG	Bowls Club	Darenth Avenue	TO	5	96
718	OSF BG	Riverside Bowls Club	Tonbridge Castle	TO	5	78
720	OSF BG	Hadlow Bowling Green	Dray Court	HA	5	
723	OSF BG	Ditton Bowls Club	Kiln Barn Road	D	5	
661	OSF GC	Poult Wood Golf Course	Ashes Lane	TO	70	80
651	OSF TC	Trottscliffe Tennis Courts	Church Lane	TR	5	98
743	OSF TC	Recreation Ground	Riding Lane	HI	5	87
730	OSF TC	Tennis Courts	Gibson Drive	KH	5	84
732	OSF TC	Tennis Courts	The Green	O	5	91
733	OSF TC	Ightham Hard Courts Recreation	Sevenoaks Road	I	5	93
725	OSF NC	Aylesford Rugby Club/Netball Ct	Station Road	AY	5	93
726	STP & AT	Tonbridge School	Havelock Road	TO	5	
613	OSF	Shipbourne Cricket Club & Pitch	Ightham Road	SH	69	
643	OSF	Ryarsh Recreation Ground	Birling Road	R	67	87
645	OSF	Cricket Green Sports Ground	Eccles	AY	67	69
635	OSF	Recreation Ground	Forstal Road	AY	66	91
640	OSF	Tonbridge Angels Football Club	Darenth Avenue	TO	66	
602	OSF	Plaxtol Cricket Club	School Lane	PX	65	82
609	OSF	Hadlow College Playing Fields	Hadlow Road	HA	65	87

Comparison with '09 Score
7
7
18
14
7
21
6
91
73
-5
-5
10
93
82
79
86
88
88
-5
-69
20
2
25
-66
17
22

Private club
Private club

School facility - not assessed
Private club

OSS 2009 audit scored 66% in the Playing Pitch Strategy (site ref: 1)
Private club

677	OSF	Recreation Ground	Riding Lane	HI	65	82	17	
679	OSF	Ightham Cricket Club Ground	Tonbridge Road	I	65	89	24	
722	OSF BG	Bowling Green	Maidstone Road	BG	4	98	94	
727	OSF TC SO	Holmesdale Technology School	Malling Road	SN	4		-4	School facility - not assessed
746	OSF TC	Shipbourne & Plaxtol Tennis Club	The Common	SH	4	91	87	
738	OSF NC	Weald of Kent Grammar School (G)	Tudeley Lane	TO	4		-4	School facility - not assessed
612	OSF	Hadlow Cricket Ground	Common Road	HA	64	89	25	OSS 2009 audit scored 64% in the Playing Pitch Strategy (site ref: 51)
630	OSF	New Road Recreation Ground	Ditton Place	D	64	73	9	
647	OSF	Tonbridge Farm Sportsground	Darenth Avenue	TO	64	89	25	OSS 2009 audit scored 64% in the Playing Pitch Strategy (site ref: 29)
633	OSF	Recreation Ground	Park Road	AD	63	87	24	
648	OSF	Swanmead Sportsground	Swanmead Way	TO	63	87	24	
700	OSF	Stone House Field	Long Mill Lane	PT	63	82	19	
620	OSF	Racecourse Sportsground	Tonbridge Castle	TO	62	93	31	OSS 2009 audit scored 62% in the Playing Pitch Strategy (site ref: 28)
623	OSF	King George's Field	Minters Orchard	PT	62	76	14	
636	OSF	Cricket Ground	High Street	WR	62	93	31	OSS 2009 audit scored 62% in the Playing Pitch Strategy (site ref: 85)
685	OSF	Frog Bridge Playing Fields	Shipbourne Road	TO	62	71	9	
715	OSF	Recreation Ground	Maidstone Road	BG	62	80	18	
600	OSF	Wateringbury Sports & Rec Field	Bow Road	WA	60	82	22	
625	OSF	East Malling Recreation Ground	New Road	EM&L	60	62	2	
628	OSF	Norman Road Playing Fields	Norman Road	WM	60	89	29	Not in Playing Pitch Strategy. OSS 2009 audit scored 0 for litter bins, toilets and information and 3 for dog bins
631	OSF	Wrotham School	Borough Green Road	WR	60		-60	School facility - not assessed
642	OSF	Ryarsh County Primary School	Birling Road	R	60		-60	School facility - not assessed
646	OSF	Horse & Groom Football Pitch	London Road A20	ST	60		-60	Private club
674	OSF	Ditton CE Primary School	New Road	D	60		-60	School facility - not assessed
694	OSF	Leybourne Grange	Birling Road	L	60	71	11	
695	OSF	Sports Field	Kings Hill Avenue	KH	60		-60	See site 754 - East Malling & Larkfield
701	Private OSF	Larkfield Sports Ground	New Hythe Lane	EM&L	60		-60	Private
713	OSF	Cricket Meadow (Old County Gr)	Norman Road	WM	60	91	31	OSS 2009 audit scored 60% in the Playing Pitch Strategy (site ref: 83)
634	OSF	Primary School/Cricket Club	Oxley Shaw Lane	L	59		-59	School facility - not assessed
639	OSF	Farthingfield Recreation Ground	Old London Road	WR	59	76	17	
616	OSF	Mereworth Playing Field	Butchers Lane	M	58	87	29	OSS 2009 audit scored 58% in the Playing Pitch Strategy (site ref: 53)
621	OSF	Brookfield School	Swallow Road	EM&L	58		-58	School facility - not assessed
665	OSF	Potters Mede Sports Ground	A227	WR	58	91	33	OSS 2009 audit scored 58% in the Playing Pitch Strategy (site ref: 12)
690	OSF	The Malling School	Blacklands	EM&L	58		-58	School facility - not assessed
704	OSF	Tunbury School Playing Field	Tunbury Avenue	AY	58		-58	School facility - not assessed
705	OSF	Tunbury Recreation Ground	Fostington Way	AY	58	78	20	
751	OSF	Leybourne Primary School Play	Oxley Shaw lane	L	58		-58	School facility - not assessed
654	OSF	Potyns Sports Field	Paddlesworth Road	SN	57	73	16	
611	OSF	Williams Field Recreation Area	Marshall Garden	HA	55	82	27	OSS 2009 audit scored 55% in the Playing Pitch Strategy (site ref: 50)
644	OSF	Trottscliffe Rec.	School Lane	TR	55	87	32	OSS 2009 audit scored 55% in the Playing Pitch Strategy (site ref: 42)
676	OSF	Mereworth C.P. School	The Street	M	55		-55	School facility - not assessed
680	OSF	Hayesbrook School	Brook Street	TO	55		-55	School facility - not assessed
707	OSF	Blue Bell Hill Recreation Ground	A229	AY	55	67	12	
711	OSF	Snodland CE Primary School	Roberts Road	SN	55		-55	School facility - not assessed
712	OSF	Wouldham Recreation Ground	Knowle Road	WO	55	76	21	
729	OSF TC	Tennis Courts	Maidstone Road	BG	3	84	81	
734	OSF TC	Norman Rd Tennis Courts	Norman Road	WM	3	82	79	

735	OSF TC	Hugh Christie Sports Ground	White Cottage	TO	3			
740	OSF TC	RCS Tennis Courts	Tonbridge Castle	TO	3	96		
741	OSF TC	East Malling Recreation Ground	New Road	EM&L	3	69		
742	OSF TC	Tennis Courts Russet Road	Pippin Road	EP	3	69		
731	OSF STP	Potyns Synthetic Turf Pitch	Paddlesworth Road	SN	3	87		
748	OSF STP	Synthetic Turf Pitch (All weather)	Darenth Avenue	TO	3	100		
618	OSF	Ightham Recreation Ground	Sevenoaks Road	I	50	73		
655	OSF	Stansted Recreation Ground	Malthouse Road	ST	50	89		
678	OSF	Sackville School Playing Field	Tonbridge Road	HI	50			
632	OSF	Aylesford Senior School	Teapot Lane	AY	49			
617	OSF	Aylesford Primary School	Teapot Lane	AY	49			
702	OSF	Eccles Recreation Ground	Bull Lane	AY	49	84		
604	OSF	Fairseat Recreation Ground	Vigo Road, Fairseat	ST	45	76		
622	OSF	Borough Green Primary School	Griggs Way	BG	45			
650	OSF	Holmesdale Technology School	Malling Road	SN	45			
668	OSF	Burham P.R. (Cof E) School	Bell Lane	BU	45			
667	OSF	Burham Rec Ground	Rochester Road	BU	39	71		
673	OSF	Long Mead County Primary School	Waveney Road	TO	30			
619	OSF	Platt CE Primary School	Grange Road	PT	29			
689	OSF	Former Mill Stream Primary School	Mill Street	EM&L	29			
652	OSF	Snodland Cricket Meadow	Rocfort Road	SN	28	89		
747	OSF TC	Tennis Courts	Forstal Road	AY	1			
754	OSF	Kings Hill Sports Park	Kings Hill	EM&L		96		
755	OSF	Kings Hill Cricket Pitch	Kings Hill	KH		91		

School facility - not assessed

OSS 2009 audit scored 50% in the Playing Pitch Strategy (site ref: 41)

School facility - not assessed

School facility - not assessed

School facility - not assessed

OSS 2009 audit scored 60% in the Playing Pitch Strategy (site ref: 65)

Not in Playing Pitch Strategy. OSS 2009 audit scored 0 for litter bins, dog bins, toilets and information and 2 for maintenance, seats and parking

School facility - not assessed

School facility - not assessed

School facility - not assessed

OSS 2009 audit scored 39% in the Playing Pitch Strategy (site ref: 21)

School facility - not assessed

School facility - not assessed

School facility - not assessed

OSS 2009 audit scored 28% in the Playing Pitch Strategy (site ref: 78)

Under repair/construction

Natural Greenspaces

Site No:	Type	Name	Location	Parish /Town	Score '09 %	Score '15 %	Comparison with '09 Score
549	NG	The Shipbourne Common	Shipbourne	SH	79	89	10
560	NG	Basted Mill Open Space	Basted Lane	BG	77	83	6
567	NG	Shoulder of Mutton Wood	Wouldham	WO	75	66	-9
516	NG	Bridge Gardens	Station Rd/Forstal Rd	AY	75	94	19
539	NG	Platt Woods	Platt Common	PT	73	83	10
523	NG	Nature Area	Bradbourne Lane	D	72		-72
529	NG	Council Office Greenspace	Gibson Drive	KH	71	77	6
538	NG	Council Office Greenspace	Gibson Drive	KH	71	54	-17
537	NG	Scathes Wood	Ightham Mote	I	69	89	20
500	NG	Hoad Common	Shipbourne	SH	67	57	-10
505	NG	West Wood	Tonbridge Road	HI	64	63	-1
546	NG	Dene Park	Puttenden Road	SH	64	89	25
533	NG	The Napps	Platt	PT	63	69	6
544	NG	Oldbury Hill National Trust	Sevenoaks Road	I	63	80	17
512	NG	Woodland & Woodland Walk	Lambourne Drive	KH	62	77	15
568	NG	Podkin Meadow	Robin Hood Lane	AY	61	80	19
506	NG	Frogbridge Wood	Shipbourne Road	TO	60	43	-17
507	NG	Kate Reed Wood Walk	Anson Avenue	KH	60	63	3

Not publicly accessible

OSS 2009 audit scored 0 for seats, litter bins and dog bins and 2 for cleanliness (litter and dog fouling) and safety

508	NG	Macey's Meadow	Norman Road	WM	60	91
552	NG	Kate Reed Wood	Russett Road	M	60	77
534	NG	Roughway	Dunk's Green	SH	56	
504	NG	Woodland Walk	Romney Way	TO	54	77
521	NG	Nature Area	Ditton Court Quarry	D	54	83
545	NG	Clare Park	Clare Lane	EM&L	54	
517	NG	Little Ryarsh Wood	Ryarsh	R	52	100
541	NG	Barleycorn	London Road	L	52	86
553	NG	Leybourne Grange		L	52	89
535	NG	Butts Hill Wood	Old London Road A20	WR	51	51
548	NG	Wetlands Wildlife Area	Church Lane	TR	51	86
554	NG	Priory Wood		TO	51	86
559	NG	Holly Hill Wood		SN	51	77
566	NG	Brookland Lake		SN	50	69
501	NG	Tunbury Wood	Tunbury Avenue	AY	48	77
509	NG	Holborough Road	A228	SN	48	66
514	NG	Part Flood retention ground	Forstal Road	AY	48	71
510	NG	Taddington Woods	Taddington Wood Lane	AY	47	69
502	NG	Crow Hill	Sandyridge	BG	46	63
515	NG	Nature Area, Church Farm	New Hythe Lane	EM&L	46	40
547	NG	Podkin Wood	Walderslade Woods	AY	46	60
520	NG	Orchard Road		EP	42	71
565	NG	Hollow Lane		SN	41	89
562	NG	Common Land	Smithers Lane	EP	41	51
550	NG	East Street North	East Street	RY	40	66
557	NG	Wouldham Common	Hill Road	WO	39	49
542	NG	Quarry Hill Wood	A21	TO	38	60
531	NG	Leybourne Wood	London Road A20	L	36	71
503	NG	Waveney Road Woods		TO	34	66
530	NG	Yoakley Land	Forstal Road	AY	33	57
551	NG	Pinneys open Space	East Street	AD	32	63
513	NG	East Peckham Ponds	Off Branbridges Road	EP	30	51

31
17
-56
23
29
-54
48
34
37
0
35
35
26
19
29
18
23
22
17
-6
14
29
48
10
26
10
22
35
32
24
31
21

OSS 2009 audit scored 0 for seats, litter bins, dog bins, information and parking and 2 for accessibility

No access

OSS 2009 audit scored 0 for seats, litter bins, dog bins and information and 2 for accessibility (around the site) and safety

No access

OSS 2009 audit scored 0 for maintenance (landscaping), seats, litter bins, dog bins, information and safety and 2 for accessibility (around the site)

OSS 2009 audit scored 0 for seats, litter bins, dog bins, information and parking and 2 for cleanliness (litter) and maintenance (grassed areas, boundaries)

OSS 2009 audit scored 0 for seats, litter bins, dog bins, information, safety and parking and 1 for cleanliness (graffiti)

OSS 2009 audit scored 0 for maintenance, seats, litter bins, information and parking and 1 for safety

OSS 2009 audit scored 0 for information, 1 for safety (surveillance) and 2 for boundaries, seats and parking

OSS 2009 audit scored 0 for dog bins, 1 for seats and safety and 2 for accessibility, cleanliness (litter and dog fouling) and maintenance (grassed areas)

OSS 2009 audit scored 0 for landscaping, seats, litter bins, dog bins and information

OSS 2009 audit scored 0 for seats and information, 1 for accessibility (into the site), cleanliness (dog fouling), safety and parking

OSS 2009 audit scored 0 for seats, litter bins, dog bins, information and parking and 1 for accessibility, maintenance (boundaries) and safety

OSS 2009 audit scored 0 for seats, litter bins, dog bins, information, safety and parking and 1 for accessibility (into and around the site)

OSS 2009 audit scored 0 for seats, litter bins, dog bins, information and safety and 1 for cleanliness (litter, dog fouling) and parking

OSS 2009 audit scored 0 for seats, litter bins, dog bins, information, parking, safety and maintenance (landscaping) and 1 for cleanliness (litter)

OSS 2009 audit scored 0 for seats, litter bins, dog bins, information, parking and safety and 1 for cleanliness (litter), access and maintenance (landscaping)

525	NG	London Road	East Malling	EM&L	30	66
556	NG	Spitfire Wood	Spitfire Road	M	30	49
563	NG	Horse Paddock	Pratling Street	AY	NA	69
561	NG	Welland Road		TO	NA	
558	NG	Hildenborough Church Grounds		HI		83
573	NG	Downlands Walk	Wrotham	WR		89

36
19
83
89

OSS 2009 audit scored 0 for seats, litter bins, dog bins and information and 1 for cleanliness (litter and graffiti), landscaping and safety