

Bromsgrove District Council - Setting Quantity Standards

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

The local quantity standards have been devised from levels of satisfaction in the household survey. This method provides a realistic expectation for the provision of open space across the LDF period.

About Right / More than enough	50% or more residents satisfied – standard remains at current level
About Right / More than enough	40% or more residents satisfied – increase standard 2%
About Right / More than enough	30% or more residents satisfied – increase standard by 5%
About Right / More than enough	20% or more residents satisfied – increased standard by 10%
About Right / More than enough	10% or more residents satisfied – increase standard by 15%

BROMSGROVE DISTRICT COUNCIL– SETTING QUANTITY STANDARDS PROVISION OF PARKS AND GARDENS																																																
National Standards	No National Standards																																															
Current Provision hectares per 1,000 population (ha)	0.26 ha per 1000 population																																															
Existing Local Standards and strategic context	<p>Local Plan</p> <p>Policy RAT4 covers the retention of open space, stating that the council will seek to retain and enhance all public and privately owned open space of recreational and amenity value.</p> <p>Policy RAT6 refers to open space within housing developments and identifies that a housing development of over 0.4 hectares or above will be required to meet the minimum standard for children’s play space. Other types of open space should relate to the scale of the development.</p> <p>Policy S48 protects historic parks and gardens from development, stating that any development that will have an adverse effect on the character of and setting of historic parks and gardens will not be permitted.</p> <p>Policy RAT4 covers the retention of open space, stating that the council will seek to retain and enhance all public and privately owned open space of recreational and amenity value.</p> <p>Policy RAT6 refers to open space within housing developments and identifies that a housing development of over 0.4 hectares or above will be required to meet the minimum standard for children’s play space. Other types of open space should relate to the scale of the development.</p> <p>Sanders Park User Survey 2004</p> <p>Over 61% of respondents to the survey visit the park weekly or more than often.</p>																																															
	BENCHMARKING	<p>Telford – 44% about right</p> <p>Ryedale – 60% about right</p>	<p>Wyre Forest – 66% about right (Town), 54% about right (Local)</p> <p>Wychavon – 70% about right</p> <p>Shrewsbury – 59% about right</p> <p>York – 60% about right (City), 46% about right (Local)</p>																																													
Consultation (too much / about right / not enough)	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Analysis area</th> <th>More than enough</th> <th>About Right</th> <th>Nearly Enough</th> <th>Not Enough</th> <th>No Opinion</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Overall</td> <td>3%</td> <td>49%</td> <td>18%</td> <td>29%</td> <td>1%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Bromsgrove North</td> <td>9%</td> <td>52%</td> <td>16%</td> <td>21%</td> <td>2%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Bromsgrove West</td> <td>0%</td> <td>62%</td> <td>10%</td> <td>24%</td> <td>4%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Bromsgrove East</td> <td>0%</td> <td>46%</td> <td>18%</td> <td>36%</td> <td>0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Bromsgrove North East</td> <td>2%</td> <td>32%</td> <td>16%</td> <td>47%</td> <td>3%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Bromsgrove Central</td> <td>3%</td> <td>51%</td> <td>21%</td> <td>25%</td> <td>0%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>						Analysis area	More than enough	About Right	Nearly Enough	Not Enough	No Opinion	Overall	3%	49%	18%	29%	1%	Bromsgrove North	9%	52%	16%	21%	2%	Bromsgrove West	0%	62%	10%	24%	4%	Bromsgrove East	0%	46%	18%	36%	0%	Bromsgrove North East	2%	32%	16%	47%	3%	Bromsgrove Central	3%	51%	21%	25%	0%
	Analysis area	More than enough	About Right	Nearly Enough	Not Enough	No Opinion																																										
	Overall	3%	49%	18%	29%	1%																																										
	Bromsgrove North	9%	52%	16%	21%	2%																																										
	Bromsgrove West	0%	62%	10%	24%	4%																																										
	Bromsgrove East	0%	46%	18%	36%	0%																																										
	Bromsgrove North East	2%	32%	16%	47%	3%																																										
Bromsgrove Central	3%	51%	21%	25%	0%																																											

APPENDIX F – QUANTITY STANDARDS

	<p>Respondents to the household survey expressed an overall satisfaction with the provision of parks and gardens, with 52% of residents stating that provision is sufficient. However, 29% of residents indicated that provision was insufficient. This highlights the value of parks to residents.</p> <p>Findings within the individual analysis areas are consistent with the district wide results, with the majority of residents in four of the five analysis areas stating that provision is sufficient. The greatest level of dissatisfaction was portrayed in Bromsgrove North East, where the majority of residents indicate provision is insufficient (47%).</p>
<p>Consultation Comments (quantity)</p>	<p>14% of respondents to the IT Young People’s Survey identified going to the local park as their favourite activity and 33% of young people stated local parks are the place they meet their friends most often.</p> <p>38% of young people stated the provision of parks is sufficient. However, 29% of young people perceived the provision of parks to be insufficient.</p> <p>Drop in session attendees highlighted the value of parks and gardens in the district, identifying them as open spaces which are regularly used by residents. The provision of parks and gardens in Bromsgrove was perceived to be adequate by drop in session attendees.</p> <p>The provision of parks and gardens was perceived to be adequate by respondents to the elected members questionnaire. However, within the ward of Waseley it was stated that there are no parks or gardens in this area of the district.</p> <p>Despite some issues relating to quantity being identified, the majority of consultees focused on qualitative issues in relation to parks and gardens rather than quantitative issues.</p>
<p>PMP Recommendation (per 1,000 population)</p>	<p>0.26 ha per 1000 population</p>
<p>PMP Justification</p>	<p>Over half of the respondents to the household survey (52%) were satisfied with the current provision and parks and gardens. This highlights a high level of satisfaction with the current provision of this type of open space. Drop in session attendees and consultation with children and young people further reinforced this high level of satisfaction with the provision of parks and gardens.</p> <p>Local consultation focused on issues relating to quality rather than quantity of parks and gardens and therefore it is recommended that the local standard is set at the current level of provision. Setting the standard at the existing level of provision will allow the council to focus on enhancing the quality of existing parks and gardens in the district and combined with the application of the accessibility standard, will enable the identification of locational deficiencies.</p>

BROMSGROVE DISTRICT COUNCIL– SETTING QUANTITY STANDARDS PROVISION OF NATURAL AND SEMI-NATURAL	
National Standards	<p>English Nature Accessible Natural Greenspace Standard (ANGSt) recommends at least 2 ha of accessible natural greenspace per 1,000 people based on no-one living more than: 300m from nearest natural greenspace / 2km from a site of 20 ha / 5km from a site of 100 ha / 10km from a site of 500 ha</p> <p>English Nature Accessible Natural Greenspace Standard (ANGSt) recommends 1 ha of LNR per 1,000 population</p> <p>Rethinking Open Space Report - Average of all local authority applicable standards = 2 ha per 1,000 population - areas that promote biodiversity and nature conservation</p>
Current Provision hectares per 1,000 population (ha)	0.43 ha per 1000 population
Existing Local Standards and strategic context	<p>Local Plan</p> <p>Policy RAT4 covers the retention of open space, stating that the council will seek to retain and enhance all public and privately owned open space of recreational and amenity value.</p> <p>Policy RAT6 refers to open space within housing developments and identifies that a housing development of over 0.4 hectares or above will be required to meet the minimum standard for children’s play space. Other types of open space should relate to the scale of the development.</p> <p>Policy DS2 states that area designated as Green Belt will be protected from development except in special circumstances for the development of essential facilities for outdoor sport and recreation and cemeteries.</p> <p>Policy DS9 identifies that development proposals in Landscape Protection Areas (LPAs) will be evaluated against their potential impact on the landscape, ecology or individual site. Permission will only be given where the impact on the landscape or ecological site will be negligible.</p> <p>Policy S35 identifies a number of conservation areas that will be considered for designation.</p> <p>Policies C9 and C10 protect SSSI’s, NNR’s, SWR’s and LNR’s from development. Any proposal which would destroy or adversely affect any of these sites will not be permitted.</p> <p>Policy C12 protects major wildlife corners from development.</p> <p>Policy C18 refers to woodland and states that the council will seek to retain and enhance existing woodland.</p> <p>Local Development Framework (LDF) – Core Strategy Newsletter</p> <p>The protection of the natural environment was perceived to be important by residents.</p> <p>Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report</p> <p>Objectives of the strategy are to conserve and enhance the district’s biodiversity and protect the countryside and green belt.</p>

APPENDIX F – QUANTITY STANDARDS

BENCHMARKING	Telford – 44% about right	Wyre Forest – 56% about right	Shrewsbury – 53% about right			
	Ryedale – 54% about right	Wychavon – 46% about right	York – 44% about right			
Consultation (too much / about right / not enough)	Findings from the household survey reveal a split in opinion regarding the provision of natural and semi natural open space, with 45% of residents stating that provision is sufficient (more than enough/about right) and 52% insufficient.					
	Analysis area	More than enough	About Right	Nearly Enough	Not Enough	No Opinion
	Overall	5%	40%	16%	36%	3%
	Bromsgrove North	17%	40%	9%	29%	5%
	Bromsgrove West	6%	56%	15%	19%	4%
	Bromsgrove East	5%	49%	12%	34%	0%
	Bromsgrove North East	4%	36%	16%	44%	0%
Bromsgrove Central	4%	36%	18%	39%	3%	
	Within the geographical areas similar results are portrayed. However, within Bromsgrove West, the majority of residents indicate provision is sufficient (62%). The greatest level of dissatisfaction is found within Bromsgrove East, where 60% of residents feel provision is insufficient.					
Consultation Comments (quantity)	11% of respondents to the IT Young People’s Survey indicated the provision of a new woodland area would be the one new open space they would like. This was the second most popular response.					
	A number of residents at drop in session identified the need for the increased provision of publicly accessible natural and semi natural open space. This type of open space was seen as important for dog walkers and a number of residents referred to the lack of publicly accessible natural and semi natural sites.					
	General comments from respondents to the household survey focused on the protection of natural and semi natural open space. Specifically, Centenary Field in Clent was highlighted as a valuable open space to the community, containing an area of grassland, parkland and woodland. Although residents were in favour of the proposed development of a cricket pitch on this site there was concern with the threat of the development of housing on the remaining area of the site, with this woodland area identified as being particularly important to dog walkers. This site was also identified as having high ecological value, with much wildlife contained within the area. The importance of protecting natural and semi natural open space was further reinforced by attendees at drop in sessions.					
	A lack of natural and semi natural open space in the district was highlighted by respondents to the elected members questionnaire. Elected members specifically emphasised the importance of protecting this type of open space from development.					
PMP Recommendation (per 1,000	0.44 ha per 1000 population					

APPENDIX F – QUANTITY STANDARDS

population)	
PMP Justification	<p>A large proportion of respondents to the household survey were dissatisfied with the current provision of natural and semi natural open space (52%). Dissatisfaction with the current level of provision was further supported by elected members and drop in session attendees, who highlighted the need for the increased provision of this type of open space.</p> <p>In consideration of the high level of dissatisfaction with the current provision of natural and semi natural open space it is recommended that the local quantity standard is set slightly above the existing level of provision. This standard is reflective of the desire for increased provision and also considers the need to protect this type of open space.</p>

BROMSGROVE DISTRICT COUNCIL– SETTING QUANTITY STANDARDS PROVISION FOR AMENITY GREEN SPACE																																													
National Standards	The NPFA six acre standard includes some elements of amenity green space.																																												
Current Provision hectares per 1,000 population (ha)	0.34 ha per 1000 population																																												
Existing Local Standards and strategic context	<p>Local Plan</p> <p>Policy RAT4 covers the retention of open space, stating that the council will seek to retain and enhance all public and privately owned open space of recreational and amenity value.</p> <p>Policy RAT6 refers to open space within housing developments and identifies that a housing development of over 0.4 hectares or above will be required to meet the minimum standard for children’s play space. Other types of open space should relate to the scale of the development.</p> <p>Blueprint for Bromsgrove - a Local Agenda 21 Action Plan for the District.</p> <p>An objective of the plan is to identify brownfield sites with potential amenity value.</p>																																												
BENCHMARKING	Telford – 32% not enough	Wyre Forest – 36% about right	Shrewsbury – 39% about right																																										
	Ryedale – 40% not enough	Wychavon – 39% about right	York – 39% about right																																										
Consultation (too much / about right / not enough)	<p>Respondents to the household survey demonstrated an overall dissatisfaction with the current provision of amenity green space, with 56% of residents indicating provision is insufficient compared to 32% that stated provision was sufficient.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Analysis area</th> <th>More than Enough</th> <th>About Right</th> <th>Nearly Enough</th> <th>Not Enough</th> <th>No Opinion</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Overall</td> <td>2%</td> <td>30%</td> <td>25%</td> <td>31%</td> <td>12%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Bromsgrove North</td> <td>0%</td> <td>43%</td> <td>23%</td> <td>26%</td> <td>8%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Bromsgrove West</td> <td>2%</td> <td>36%</td> <td>25%</td> <td>21%</td> <td>16%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Bromsgrove East</td> <td>6%</td> <td>22%</td> <td>28%</td> <td>30%</td> <td>14%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Bromsgrove North East</td> <td>2%</td> <td>31%</td> <td>11%</td> <td>44%</td> <td>12%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Bromsgrove Central</td> <td>2%</td> <td>28%</td> <td>29%</td> <td>30%</td> <td>11%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Findings within the individual analysis areas mirror the overall results, with the majority of respondents in each area indicating provision is insufficient. The greatest level of satisfaction with the provision of amenity green space was evident within Bromsgrove North, where 43% of residents stated provision was sufficient. Residents in Bromsgrove Central were the least satisfied (58% nearly enough / not enough).</p>			Analysis area	More than Enough	About Right	Nearly Enough	Not Enough	No Opinion	Overall	2%	30%	25%	31%	12%	Bromsgrove North	0%	43%	23%	26%	8%	Bromsgrove West	2%	36%	25%	21%	16%	Bromsgrove East	6%	22%	28%	30%	14%	Bromsgrove North East	2%	31%	11%	44%	12%	Bromsgrove Central	2%	28%	29%	30%	11%
Analysis area	More than Enough	About Right	Nearly Enough	Not Enough	No Opinion																																								
Overall	2%	30%	25%	31%	12%																																								
Bromsgrove North	0%	43%	23%	26%	8%																																								
Bromsgrove West	2%	36%	25%	21%	16%																																								
Bromsgrove East	6%	22%	28%	30%	14%																																								
Bromsgrove North East	2%	31%	11%	44%	12%																																								
Bromsgrove Central	2%	28%	29%	30%	11%																																								

APPENDIX F – QUANTITY STANDARDS

<p>Consultation Comments (quantity)</p>	<p>35% of respondents to the Children’s IT Survey identified they play at a grass area near the house most often, highlighting the value of local amenity green space to children. When asked about the quantity of grass areas near their home, the majority of children stated there are a lot (44%). However, 29% indicated that there are some but could be more.</p> <p>37% of respondents to the IT Young People’s Survey felt the provision of informal grass areas is sufficient. 14% of respondents stated provision is insufficient.</p> <p>A difference in opinion regarding the provision of amenity green space was highlighted by respondents to the elected members questionnaire. Within the ward of Hagley it was indicated that there was no amenity green space, however in the ward of Drakes Cross and Walkers Heath, provision was perceived to be more than adequate.</p>
<p>PMP Recommendation (per 1,000 population)</p>	<p>0.35 ha per 1000 population</p>
<p>PMP Justification</p>	<p>Respondents to the Children’s IT Survey highlighted the importance of open space to their age group, with 35% of respondents stating they play at an amenity green space site most often. With regard to the current provision of amenity green space, 56% of respondents to the household survey indicated provision was insufficient and 29% of respondents to the Children’s IT Survey felt that although there were some amenity green spaces there could be more. This highlights a significant level of dissatisfaction with the current provision of this type of open space.</p> <p>Due to the importance of amenity green space providing local informal recreation opportunities to children and the level of dissatisfaction with the current level of provision, it is recommended that the local quantity standard is set above the existing level of provision. Combined with the application of the accessibility standard, this will enable the identification of deficiencies within the District. As well as provide informal recreation opportunities, amenity green space can have an important landscaping function.</p>

BROMSROVE DISTRICT COUNCIL– SETTING QUANTITY STANDARDS PROVISION OF PLAY AREAS FOR CHILDREN	
National Standards	<p>Fields in Trust (NPFA) - 6 acre standard (2.43 ha) per 1,000 population for 'playing space' consisting of 2 acres (ie 0.81 ha per 1,000 population) for children's playing space - includes areas designated for children and young people and casual or informal playing space within housing areas</p> <p>Fields in Trust (NPFA) - in the past some local authorities have added 1 acre (0.4ha) arbitrary to cover 'amenity areas' and 'leisure areas' or something similar that mat not be covered within the NPFA standard. In almost all cases, this additional requirement is intended for residential areas and does not cover open spaces such as parks or allotments</p> <p>1) LAPs - aged 4-6; 1 min walk or 100m (60m in a straight line); min area size 100msq; LAPs typically have no play equipment and therefore could be considered as amenity greenspace</p> <p>(2) LEAPs - aged min 5; min area size 400msq; should be located 400 metres or 5 minutes walking time along pedestrian routes (240 metres in a straight line).</p>
Current Provision hectares per 1,000 population (ha)	0.027 ha per 1000 population
Existing Local Standards and strategic context	<p>Local Plan</p> <p>Policy RAT4 covers the retention of open space, stating that the council will seek to retain and enhance all public and privately owned open space of recreational and amenity value.</p> <p>Policy RAT5 states that the council will seek the provision of play space across the district in accordance with its standards of 0.2 – 0.3 hectares per 1000 population of equipped play areas.</p> <p>Policy RAT6 refers to open space within housing developments and identifies that a housing development of over 0.4 hectares or above will be required to meet the minimum standard for children’s play space. Other types of open space should relate to the scale of the development.</p> <p>Worcestershire Play Strategy 2007 – 2010</p> <p>The values underpinning the strategy are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • to contribute to the five outcomes for children and young people: being healthy; staying safe; enjoying and achieving; making a positive contribution; achieving economic well being • to recognise the importance of play for children and their families both in its own right and in relation to wider agendas such as health, social inclusion and community safety • to be prepared to offer challenge, whilst managing risk • to acknowledge that every child needs and has the right to play and that play is an essential part of growing up.

APPENDIX F – QUANTITY STANDARDS

	<p>The four outcomes of the strategy are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • children and young people to have increased opportunity to access and enjoy a variety of play • increased inclusive play opportunities • a greater understanding of the importance of play • children and young people are involved in the design and delivery of play. 																																												
BENCHMARKING	Telford – 46% not enough	Wyre Forest - 34% about right	Shrewsbury – 35% about right																																										
	Ryedale – 39% not enough	Wychavon – 39% about right	York – 38% not enough																																										
Consultation (too much / about right / not enough)	<p>58% of respondents to the household survey indicated that the provision of children’s play areas was insufficient, highlighting a perceived lack of provision. In contrast, 36% of residents stated provision was sufficient.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="651 531 1615 818"> <thead> <tr> <th>Analysis area</th> <th>More than Enough</th> <th>About Right</th> <th>Nearly Enough</th> <th>Not Enough</th> <th>No Opinion</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Overall</td> <td>4%</td> <td>32%</td> <td>22%</td> <td>36%</td> <td>6%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Bromsgrove North</td> <td>7%</td> <td>32%</td> <td>22%</td> <td>32%</td> <td>7%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Bromsgrove West</td> <td>4%</td> <td>44%</td> <td>23%</td> <td>21%</td> <td>8%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Bromsgrove East</td> <td>7%</td> <td>32%</td> <td>27%</td> <td>29%</td> <td>5%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Bromsgrove North East</td> <td>4%</td> <td>25%</td> <td>12%</td> <td>54%</td> <td>5%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Bromsgrove Central</td> <td>4%</td> <td>30%</td> <td>24%</td> <td>36%</td> <td>6%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Findings across the geographical areas support the overall results within the majority of residents in each area indicating provision is insufficient. The greatest level of dissatisfaction with the provision of children’s play areas was portrayed in Bromsgrove North East, where 66% of residents stated provision was insufficient. Residents living in Bromsgrove West exhibited the highest levels of satisfaction (48%).</p> <p>When analysing the responses given by young respondents to the household survey a clear level of dissatisfaction is evident, with 85% of respondents aged under 16 stating that the current provision of children’s play areas is insufficient.</p>			Analysis area	More than Enough	About Right	Nearly Enough	Not Enough	No Opinion	Overall	4%	32%	22%	36%	6%	Bromsgrove North	7%	32%	22%	32%	7%	Bromsgrove West	4%	44%	23%	21%	8%	Bromsgrove East	7%	32%	27%	29%	5%	Bromsgrove North East	4%	25%	12%	54%	5%	Bromsgrove Central	4%	30%	24%	36%	6%
Analysis area	More than Enough	About Right	Nearly Enough	Not Enough	No Opinion																																								
Overall	4%	32%	22%	36%	6%																																								
Bromsgrove North	7%	32%	22%	32%	7%																																								
Bromsgrove West	4%	44%	23%	21%	8%																																								
Bromsgrove East	7%	32%	27%	29%	5%																																								
Bromsgrove North East	4%	25%	12%	54%	5%																																								
Bromsgrove Central	4%	30%	24%	36%	6%																																								
Consultation Comments (quantity)	<p>45% of respondents to the Children’s IT Survey stated that although there are some play areas near their home they could do with more. 43% of children identified the provision of play areas as sufficient. However, only 8% of children identified play areas as their favourite open space. This suggests that there are variations in the opinion of children. This may arise for a number of reasons.</p> <p>Drop in session attendees felt that although there was a good level of provision contained within larger facilities, such as parks and gardens, there was a lack of children’s play areas across the district.</p>																																												

APPENDIX F – QUANTITY STANDARDS

	<p>General comments by respondents to the household survey supported the perceived lack of facilities for children. In particular, a number of residents highlighted the need for increased provision within Alvechurch, Wythall and Stoke Heath. Residents further stated that not all children were provided for, emphasising that there was a lack of facilities for older children (ages 10+). This crosses over with opinions expressed in relation to provision for young people.</p> <p>Respondents to the Elected Members questionnaire stated that the provision of children’s play areas was insufficient to meet demand. Elected members identified that although there are some play areas there is a requirement for more.</p> <p>Both quantitative and qualitative comments were received throughout consultation, however more emphasis was placed on the quantity rather than quality of children’s play areas.</p>
<p>PMP Recommendation (per 1,000 population)</p>	<p>0.027 ha per 1000 population</p>
<p>PMP Justification</p>	<p>A high level of dissatisfaction with the current provision of children’s play areas was evident throughout the programme of local consultation. 58% of overall respondents to the household survey, together with 85% of those under 16 years, stated that existing provision was insufficient. In addition 45% of respondents to the Children’s IT Survey highlighted the need for more children’s play facilities.</p> <p>Further research into the reasons behind the dissatisfaction indicated that perceptions on the quantity of provision were mixed with those on the quality. The recent Council policy is to provide larger, higher quality facilities in strategic locations and to move away from low quality, small facilities which experience limited use.</p> <p>In light of this, the standard has been set at the existing level of provision. Setting the standard at this level will still highlight the need for additional facilities in some areas and when combined with the application of the accessibility standard enable identification of localised deficiencies. It was also enable the achievement of the goal of providing higher quality strategically located sites which are of the quality that residents aspire to.</p>

BROMSGROVE DISTRICT COUNCIL– SETTING QUANTITY STANDARDS PROVISION FOR YOUNG PEOPLE	
National Standards	<p>Fields in Trust (NPFA) - 6 acre standard (2.43 ha) per 1,000 population for 'playing space' consisting of 2 acres (ie 0.81 ha per 1,000 population) for children's playing space - includes areas designated for children and young people and casual or informal playing space within housing areas.</p> <p>Fields in Trust (NPFA) - in the past some local authorities have added 1 acre (0.4 ha) arbitrary to cover 'amenity areas' and 'leisure areas' or something similar that may not be covered within the NPFA standard. In almost all cases, this additional requirement is intended for residential areas and does not cover open spaces such as parks or allotments</p> <p>(2) LEAPs - aged min 5; min area size 400msq; should be located 400 metres or 5 minutes walking time along pedestrian routes (240 metres in a straight line).</p>
Current Provision hectares per 1,000 population (ha)	0.026 ha per 1000 population
Existing Local Standards and strategic context	<p>Local Plan</p> <p>Policy RAT4 covers the retention of open space, stating that the council will seek to retain and enhance all public and privately owned open space of recreational and amenity value.</p> <p>Policy RAT6 refers to open space within housing developments and identifies that a housing development of over 0.4 hectares or above will be required to meet the minimum standard for children's play space. Other types of open space should relate to the scale of the development.</p> <p>Worcestershire Play Strategy 2007 – 2010</p> <p>The values underpinning the strategy are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • to contribute to the five outcomes for children and young people: being healthy; staying safe; enjoying and achieving; making a positive contribution; achieving economic well being • to recognise the importance of play for children and their families both in its own right and in relation to wider agendas such as health, social inclusion and community safety • to be prepared to offer challenge, whilst managing risk • to acknowledge that every child needs and has the right to play and that play is an essential part of growing up. <p>The four outcomes of the strategy are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • children and young people to have increased opportunity to access and enjoy a variety of play • increased inclusive play opportunities • a greater understanding of the importance of play • children and young people are involved in the design and delivery of play.

APPENDIX F – QUANTITY STANDARDS

BENCHMARKING	Telford – 65% not enough	Wyre Forest – 65% not enough	Shrewsbury – 57% not enough			
	Ryedale – 51% not enough	Wychavon – 62% not enough	York – 59% not enough			
Consultation (too much / about right / not enough)	Responses from the household survey indicate that the majority of residents (76%) feel the provision of open space for young people is insufficient. Only 13% of respondents stated provision was sufficient, supporting the view that there are insufficient facilities in Bromsgrove. The high level of dissatisfaction with provision for young people is the most conclusive of all types of open space in the district. Some comments made in relation to the provision for children, indicating that there are limited opportunities for older children, further reinforce this perception.					
	Analysis area	More than enough	About Right	Nearly Enough	Not Enough	No Opinion
	Overall	3%	10%	11%	65%	7%
	Bromsgrove North	7%	9%	16%	59%	9%
	Bromsgrove West	2%	12%	10%	72%	4%
	Bromsgrove East	5%	9%	7%	74%	5%
	Bromsgrove North East	0%	12%	7%	77%	4%
Bromsgrove Central	3%	8%	12%	68%	9%	
Consultation Comments (quantity)	Findings within the individual analysis areas are consistent with the overall results, with over 75% of residents in each area stating that provision is insufficient. The greatest level of dissatisfaction with provision for young people was located in Bromsgrove North East, where 84% of residents indicated provision was insufficient.					
	When analysing the responses given by young respondents to the household survey a clear level of dissatisfaction is evident, with 77% of respondents aged under 16 stating the current quantity of young people’s facilities is poor.					
	30% of respondents to the IT Young People’s Survey identified that there are some facilities for young people but there could be more. 18% of young people stated that there are no facilities where they live. This supports the perception of a lack of provision for young people in Bromsgrove. The provision of a new skatepark was highlighted as the most popular new facility young people would like (17%).					
Consultation Comments (quantity)	The need for the increased provision of young people’s facilities was also a key theme at drop in sessions. Many residents highlighted the lack of provision in the area and specifically it was stated that there was no facility for young people in Wythall. Although residents stated there was a need to increase the provision of facilities for young people, they highlighted the importance of providing a range of activities for this age group. Specifically it was suggested that there is a need for more youth clubs offering a range of activities for young people, teen shelters were also referred to as an important facility where young people could meet.					
	General comments from respondents to the household survey further reinforced the lack of provision for young people in Bromsgrove. The need for increased provision in all areas of the district was highlighted, including Wythall,					

APPENDIX F – QUANTITY STANDARDS

	<p>Alvechurch and Hagley. Elected member respondents emphasised that there are a lack of facilities for young people. It was stated that within the ward of Hagley, the Parish Council was seeking funding to provide a facility for young people.</p>
PMP Recommendation (per 1,000 population)	0.030 ha per 1000 population
PMP Justification	<p>The lack of provision for young people was the deficiency most strongly identified across all typologies. 76% of overall household survey respondents and 77% of those under the age of 16 stated that current provision was insufficient. 30% of respondents to the Young People’s IT Survey highlighted the need for increased provision and this was also a recurring theme at community drop in sessions.</p> <p>In light of the above the local quantity standard has been set above the existing level of provision. Setting the standard at this level is reflective of the high level of dissatisfaction expressed throughout the consultation and will allow the Council to focus on increasing provision for young people in the District. It will be essential to ensure that a range of facilities is provided to best meet local need.</p>

BROMSGROVE DISTRICT COUNCIL– SETTING QUANTITY STANDARDS OUTDOOR SPORTS FACILITIES	
National Standards	<p>Fields in Trust (formally known as NPFA) - 6 acre standard (2.43 ha) per 1,000 population for 'playing space' consisting of 4 acres (i.e. 1.62 per 1,000 population) for outdoor sport - includes pitches, athletics tracks, bowling greens, tennis courts, training areas and croquet lawns.</p>
Existing Local Standards and strategic context	<p>Local Plan</p> <p>Policy RAT4 covers the retention of open space, stating that the council will seek to retain and enhance all public and privately owned open space of recreational and amenity value.</p> <p>Policy RAT5 states that the council will seek the provision of play space across the district in accordance with its standards of 1.2 hectares per 1000 population of sports pitches.</p> <p>Policy RAT6 refers to open space within housing developments and identifies that a housing development of over 0.4 hectares or above will be required to meet the minimum standard for children’s play space. Other types of open space should relate to the scale of the development.</p> <p>Policy S31 protects school sports facilities from development stating that development proposals at educational sites which result in the loss of open space and/or sports facilities will not be permitted.</p> <p>Policy S32 refers to sports pitches of all ownership and identifies that proposals leading to the loss of private playing fields, school playing fields and other public or private sports facilities will not be permitted unless:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • there is sufficient provision of playing fields (council standard) • there is alternative local provision • there is an alternative replacement site that could be provided in a suitable location • the scheme would lead to an improvement in the facilities elsewhere available on site. <p>Policy RAT1 refers to development in the Green Belt for outdoor sport or recreation stating it will be directed to areas of low quality agricultural land.</p> <p>Policy RAT2 supports the development of outdoor sport and recreation facilities in the Green Belt as long as: the development is within a reasonable walking distance of public transport, there is adequate car parking, the development does not have an adverse impact on ecological or environmental interests or an unrelieved concentration of pitches is created.</p>

APPENDIX F – QUANTITY STANDARDS

	<p>Policy RAT8 states that the council will seek the provision of dual use school sports facilities where:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the proposed scheme can meet demand • there is adequate car parking • the site is accessible by public and private transport • external floodlighting and increased vehicle movement do not affect residential areas. <p>Policy RAT21 states that the development of golf courses will be considered against a number of criteria.</p> <p>Worcestershire Playing Pitch Strategy 2002</p> <p>The ratio of pitches to adults in Bromsgrove is 1:1165. This is significantly below the national average.</p> <p>Within Bromsgrove there is a shortfall of 13.6 junior football pitches, 8.5 junior rugby pitches and 4.9 hockey pitches. Based on future population projections, there will also be a small shortfall of cricket pitches (0.4) by 2009.</p>		
<p>Current Provision hectares per 1,000 population (ha)</p>	<p>1.66 ha per 1000 population</p>		
<p>Consultation (too much / about right / not enough)</p>	<p>Grass Pitches: 7% more than enough 36% about right 12% nearly enough 28% not enough 17% no opinion</p>	<p>Synthetic Turf Pitches: 2% more than enough 21% about right 7% nearly enough 35% not enough 34% no opinion</p>	<p>Tennis Courts: 3% more than enough 23% about right 12% nearly enough 42% not enough 20% no opinion</p>
	<p>Bowling Greens: 4% more than enough 26% about right 10% nearly enough 28% not enough 32% no opinion</p>	<p>Golf Courses: 9% more than enough 41% about right 10% nearly enough 14% not enough 26% no opinion</p>	<p>Athletics: 2% more than enough 16% about right 12% nearly enough 38% not enough 32% no opinion</p>

APPENDIX F – QUANTITY STANDARDS

<p>Consultation Comments</p>	<p>Grass Pitches: Findings within four of the five individual analysis areas indicate the provision of grass pitches is sufficient. However, residents in Bromsgrove Central feel provision is insufficient (47%).</p>	<p>Synthetic Turf Pitches: Results from the individual analysis areas support the perception that there is not enough provision of synthetic turf pitches. However, the majority of residents in Bromsgrove North East indicate the provision of synthetic turf pitches is sufficient (50%).</p>	<p>Tennis Courts: The majority of residents in four of the five analysis areas indicate the provision of tennis courts is insufficient. Only residents in Bromsgrove North East feel the provision of tennis courts is sufficient (54%).</p>
	<p>Bowling Greens: Within the analysis areas there is a clear perception of insufficient provision in all areas except Bromsgrove North East. The greatest level of dissatisfaction is portrayed in Bromsgrove East, where 53% of respondents stated provision was insufficient.</p>	<p>Golf Courses: The majority of respondents in four of the five analysis area felt the provision of golf courses is sufficient. However, residents in Bromsgrove East stated provision was insufficient (43%).</p>	<p>Athletics: Results within the geographical areas support the district wide perception of insufficient provision, with the majority of residents in each analysis area indicating provision is insufficient. The greatest level of dissatisfaction is portrayed in Bromsgrove North East, where 62% of residents state provision is insufficient.</p>
<p>Consultation Comments (quantity)</p>	<p>Outdoor sports facilities are very much demand led and the outdoor sports facility typology encompasses a wide variety of different facilities including grass pitches, golf courses and bowling greens. This means the standards should be applied for broad planning need only.</p> <p>Of the six facility types surveyed, dissatisfaction was shown with the provision of synthetic turf pitches, tennis courts, bowling greens and athletics. However, the quantity of grass pitches (43%) and golf courses (50%) was perceived to be sufficient. The greatest level of dissatisfaction was shown with the provision of tennis courts, with 54% of residents indicating that provision is insufficient.</p> <p>Across the individual analysis areas residents in Bromsgrove North East portrayed the greatest level of satisfaction with the provision of synthetic turf pitches, tennis courts and bowling greens. The greatest level of satisfaction with grass pitches and golf courses was found in Bromsgrove North.</p> <p>Residents in Bromsgrove North also showed the greatest level of dissatisfaction with the provision of tennis courts, bowling greens, synthetic turf pitches and golf courses.</p> <p>33% of respondents to the IT Young People’s Survey identified playing sport outdoors as their favourite activity, making it the second most popular activity for young people.</p>		

APPENDIX F – QUANTITY STANDARDS

	<p>A large proportion of young people (86%) stated that they participate in sport. Of these people, swimming (30%), football (25%) and cricket (20%) were identified as the sports they participate in most.</p> <p>Levels of regular participation in sport for young people were encouraging with the majority of young people participating in sport two to three times a week (40%) and 38% participating more than three times a week. This suggests there is a good level of participation in sport by young people in Bromsgrove. These findings reinforce the need to ensure that adequate facilities are provided, particularly in light of the relationship between participation in sport and physical activity and health.</p> <p>38% of young people identified the provision of outdoor sports facilities in Bromsgrove as insufficient. Sports pitches were highlighted as the second most popular facility for young people in Bromsgrove (16%).</p> <p>Attendees at the BECAN discussion session highlighted a lack of publicly accessible synthetic turf pitches in Bromsgrove. It was indicated that there are only two publicly accessible sites (Woodrush and Bromsgrove High School) and that these sites only offer community access after 6pm. This reinforces the findings of the household survey.</p> <p>Attendees at the sports club discussion session emphasised a lack of grass pitches in the area, contradicting the findings from the household survey. It was highlighted that six football pitches had been lost in recent years and that around 80% of league teams have to travel outside of the District to access a pitch. Droitwich Leisure Centre football pitches were identified as pitches that were used by many clubs in the football league.</p> <p>Elected member consultees highlighted the limited provision of outdoor sports facilities in Bromsgrove. Many elected members stated that provision was insufficient and that the majority of facilities were located on school sites.</p>
PMP Recommendation (per 1000 population)	1.67 ha per 1000 population of which 0.96 ha should be dedicated to community pitches

APPENDIX F – QUANTITY STANDARDS

PMP Justification

Overall there is general dissatisfaction with the current level of provision, with respondents to the household survey indicating there is insufficient provision of four of the six outdoor sports facility types. General comments from residents further emphasised a lack of outdoor sports facilities in Bromsgrove. Attendees at the sports club workshop highlighted a lack of grass pitches in the District, stating that six sites have been lost to development in recent years and that around 80% of clubs in the football league have to travel outside Bromsgrove to access a football pitch. Application of the playing pitch methodology highlights that while there are sufficient adult football pitches to meet demand, there are shortfalls in cricket and rugby pitches. 0.81 ha per 1000 will be sufficient to meet projected demand as well as provide a 10% strategic reserve allowing the rest and recovery of pitches.

In light of the above evidence it is recommended that the local standard is set above the existing level of provision. Setting the standard above the existing level of provision will enable the Council to identify any areas deficient in the provision of outdoor sports facilities and, combined with the application of the accessibility standard, enable the identification of locational deficiencies as well as the provision of new facilities to meet increased demand.

BROMSGROVE DISTRICT COUNCIL– SETTING QUANTITY STANDARDS PROVISION OF ALLOTMENTS			
National Standards	<p>National Society of Allotment and Leisure Gardeners - 20 allotment plots per 1,000 households (ie 20 allotments plots per 2,200 people (2.2 people per house) or 1 allotment plot per 200 people. With an average allotment plot of 250 sq/m this equates to 0.125 ha per 1,000 population</p> <p>1970 Thorpe Report suggested 0.2 ha per 1,000 population</p>		
Current Provision hectares per 1,000 population (ha)	0.17 ha per 10000 population		
Existing Local Standards and strategic context	<p>Local Plan</p> <p>Policy RAT4 covers the retention of open space, stating that the council will seek to retain and enhance all public and privately owned open space of recreational and amenity value.</p> <p>Policy RAT6 refers to open space within housing developments and identifies that a housing development of over 0.4 hectares or above will be required to meet the minimum standard for children’s play space. Other types of open space should relate to the scale of the development.</p> <p>Policy RAT9 protects allotment site from development indicating that development will not be permitted unless it can be demonstrated that demand does not justify retention or adequate replacement allotments are provided.</p> <p>Blueprint for Bromsgrove - a Local Agenda 21 Action Plan for the District</p> <p>An objective of the open space, countryside and wildlife theme is to ensure allotment land remains in leisure use.</p> <p>Current allotment waiting lists:</p> <p>Newton Rd - 5 Watt Close - 7 Pool furlong - 7 Rigby Lane - 38 Stoke Rd - 38 Roundhill - 20 Stoneybridge - 8 Stourbridge - 23</p>		
BENCHMARKING	Telford – 35% not enough	Wyre Forest – 66% not enough	Shrewsbury – 28% about right
	Ryedale – 28% about right	Wychavon – 31% about right	York – 36% about right

APPENDIX F – QUANTITY STANDARDS

<p>Consultation (too much / about right / not enough)</p>	<p>Findings from the household survey reveal the majority of respondents to the household survey feel the provision of allotments is insufficient (47%). 26% of residents state the provision of allotments is sufficient.</p>																																									
	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Analysis area</th> <th>More than Enough</th> <th>About Right</th> <th>Nearly Enough</th> <th>Not Enough</th> <th>No Opinion</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Overall</td> <td>2%</td> <td>24%</td> <td>11%</td> <td>36%</td> <td>27%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Bromsgrove North</td> <td>0%</td> <td>21%</td> <td>17%</td> <td>36%</td> <td>26%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Bromsgrove West</td> <td>4%</td> <td>27%</td> <td>18%</td> <td>31%</td> <td>20%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Bromsgrove East</td> <td>0%</td> <td>7%</td> <td>0%</td> <td>71%</td> <td>22%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Bromsgrove North East</td> <td>2%</td> <td>30%</td> <td>9%</td> <td>30%</td> <td>29%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Bromsgrove Central</td> <td>2%</td> <td>25%</td> <td>11%</td> <td>32%</td> <td>30%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Analysis area	More than Enough	About Right	Nearly Enough	Not Enough	No Opinion	Overall	2%	24%	11%	36%	27%	Bromsgrove North	0%	21%	17%	36%	26%	Bromsgrove West	4%	27%	18%	31%	20%	Bromsgrove East	0%	7%	0%	71%	22%	Bromsgrove North East	2%	30%	9%	30%	29%	Bromsgrove Central	2%	25%	11%	32%
Analysis area	More than Enough	About Right	Nearly Enough	Not Enough	No Opinion																																					
Overall	2%	24%	11%	36%	27%																																					
Bromsgrove North	0%	21%	17%	36%	26%																																					
Bromsgrove West	4%	27%	18%	31%	20%																																					
Bromsgrove East	0%	7%	0%	71%	22%																																					
Bromsgrove North East	2%	30%	9%	30%	29%																																					
Bromsgrove Central	2%	25%	11%	32%	30%																																					
<p>Consultation comments (quantity)</p>	<p>Within the individual analysis areas a similar perception is evident. However, residents in Bromsgrove East indicated a far greater level of dissatisfaction, with 71% of residents stating provision was insufficient.</p> <p>Council records show that there are waiting lists at all council owned allotments in the district. The largest waiting lists are found at Rigby Lane Allotments (38) and Stoke Road Allotments (38). This reinforces the view that there is insufficient provision to meet local need.</p>																																									
	<p>The recreational opportunities allotments provide for elderly residents in Bromsgrove were widely recognised by residents. General comments from respondents to the household survey emphasised the need to protect allotments from development and highlighted the community benefits this type of open space provides. The general consensus from residents was that there was a lack of allotments in Bromsgrove, particularly in Alvechurch. Many residents commented on the need to increase the provision of allotments in the district.</p> <p>The main focus of the allotments user group discussion session was on the quality of allotments, however, a number of comments regarding the quantity of allotments were received. Although allotment users were aware of large waiting lists at a number of sites in Bromsgrove they stated that plots were available on their sites. It was perceived that inaccurate waiting lists and unusable allotment plots was a key issue. Many attendees stated that much of the current waiting lists could be met through the correction of waiting lists and making unusable plots useable. This indicates that issues are not focused solely on the quantity of provision.</p> <p>A lack of provision of allotments was evident from respondents to the elected members questionnaire.</p>																																									
<p>PMP Recommendation (per 1,000 population)</p>	<p>0.19 ha per 1000 population</p>																																									
<p>PMP Justification</p>	<p>A standard set above the existing level of provision is recommended to address the demand for increased provision of allotments in Bromsgrove. Clear levels of dissatisfaction with the current provision of allotments were evident throughout consultation and current waiting lists highlight a level of demand for allotments in the district.</p> <p>Setting the standard above the current level of provision will allow the Council to focus on increasing provision in areas of deficiency, but also consider the enhancement of the quality of allotments, which was a key theme raised by allotments users.</p>																																									

BROMSGROVE DISTRICT COUNCIL– SETTING QUANTITY STANDARDS PROVISION OF CIVIC SPACES																																											
National Standards	None.																																										
Existing local and strategic context	<p>Local Plan</p> <p>Policy RAT4 covers the retention of open space, stating that the council will seek to retain and enhance all public and privately owned open space of recreational and amenity value.</p> <p>Policy RAT6 refers to open space within housing developments and identifies that a housing development of over 0.4 hectares or above will be required to meet the minimum standard for children’s play space. Other types of open space should relate to the scale of the development.</p>																																										
Consultation (too much / about right / not enough)	<p>52% of respondents to the household survey state the provision of civic spaces are insufficient. 27% of residents feel provision is sufficient.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Analysis area</th> <th>More than Enough</th> <th>About Right</th> <th>Nearly Enough</th> <th>Not Enough</th> <th>No Opinion</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Overall</td> <td>2%</td> <td>25%</td> <td>18%</td> <td>34%</td> <td>21%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Bromsgrove North</td> <td>0%</td> <td>22%</td> <td>19%</td> <td>32%</td> <td>27%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Bromsgrove West</td> <td>2%</td> <td>30%</td> <td>18%</td> <td>18%</td> <td>32%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Bromsgrove East</td> <td>0%</td> <td>32%</td> <td>18%</td> <td>29%</td> <td>21%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Bromsgrove North East</td> <td>0%</td> <td>23%</td> <td>11%</td> <td>38%</td> <td>29%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Bromsgrove Central</td> <td>3%</td> <td>24%</td> <td>19%</td> <td>38%</td> <td>16%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Findings within the individual analysis areas are consistent with the district wide results, with the majority of residents in each analysis area stating provision is insufficient.</p>	Analysis area	More than Enough	About Right	Nearly Enough	Not Enough	No Opinion	Overall	2%	25%	18%	34%	21%	Bromsgrove North	0%	22%	19%	32%	27%	Bromsgrove West	2%	30%	18%	18%	32%	Bromsgrove East	0%	32%	18%	29%	21%	Bromsgrove North East	0%	23%	11%	38%	29%	Bromsgrove Central	3%	24%	19%	38%	16%
Analysis area	More than Enough	About Right	Nearly Enough	Not Enough	No Opinion																																						
Overall	2%	25%	18%	34%	21%																																						
Bromsgrove North	0%	22%	19%	32%	27%																																						
Bromsgrove West	2%	30%	18%	18%	32%																																						
Bromsgrove East	0%	32%	18%	29%	21%																																						
Bromsgrove North East	0%	23%	11%	38%	29%																																						
Bromsgrove Central	3%	24%	19%	38%	16%																																						
PMP Justification	As a result of the nature of civic spaces, PPG17 recommends that it is inappropriate to set local quantity standards. It is therefore suggested that these spaces are considered in terms of their overall quality and distribution across the district.																																										

BROMSGROVE DISTRICT COUNCIL– SETTING QUANTITY STANDARDS GREEN CORRIDORS																																											
National Standards	None.																																										
Existing local and strategic context	<p>Local Plan</p> <p>Policy RAT4 covers the retention of open space, stating that the council will seek to retain and enhance all public and privately owned open space of recreational and amenity value.</p> <p>Policy RAT6 refers to open space within housing developments and identifies that a housing development of over 0.4 hectares or above will be required to meet the minimum standard for children’s play space. Other types of open space should relate to the scale of the development.</p>																																										
Consultation (too much / about right / not enough)	<p>Overall, 56% of respondents feel the provision of green corridors is insufficient. However, 39% of residents indicate the provision of green corridors is sufficient.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Analysis area</th> <th>More than Enough</th> <th>About Right</th> <th>Nearly Enough</th> <th>Not Enough</th> <th>No Opinion</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Overall</td> <td>2%</td> <td>37%</td> <td>22%</td> <td>34%</td> <td>5%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Bromsgrove North</td> <td>2%</td> <td>33%</td> <td>24%</td> <td>31%</td> <td>10%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Bromsgrove West</td> <td>2%</td> <td>34%</td> <td>22%</td> <td>36%</td> <td>6%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Bromsgrove East</td> <td>5%</td> <td>36%</td> <td>16%</td> <td>33%</td> <td>10%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Bromsgrove North East</td> <td>0%</td> <td>33%</td> <td>28%</td> <td>37%</td> <td>2%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Bromsgrove Central</td> <td>2%</td> <td>39%</td> <td>22%</td> <td>33%</td> <td>4%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Across the geographical areas residents highlight a similar opinion, with over 49% of residents in each analysis area stating provision is insufficient.</p>	Analysis area	More than Enough	About Right	Nearly Enough	Not Enough	No Opinion	Overall	2%	37%	22%	34%	5%	Bromsgrove North	2%	33%	24%	31%	10%	Bromsgrove West	2%	34%	22%	36%	6%	Bromsgrove East	5%	36%	16%	33%	10%	Bromsgrove North East	0%	33%	28%	37%	2%	Bromsgrove Central	2%	39%	22%	33%	4%
Analysis area	More than Enough	About Right	Nearly Enough	Not Enough	No Opinion																																						
Overall	2%	37%	22%	34%	5%																																						
Bromsgrove North	2%	33%	24%	31%	10%																																						
Bromsgrove West	2%	34%	22%	36%	6%																																						
Bromsgrove East	5%	36%	16%	33%	10%																																						
Bromsgrove North East	0%	33%	28%	37%	2%																																						
Bromsgrove Central	2%	39%	22%	33%	4%																																						
PMP Justification	As a result of the nature of green corridors, PPG17 recommends that it is inappropriate to set local quantity standards. It is therefore suggested that these spaces are considered in terms of their overall quality and distribution across the district.																																										