# Table of Contents

**Headline findings of the evidence base for each sport** 1
**Football – AGP 3G Summary key issues** 5
**Current 3G Pitch Provision** 5
**Scenario 1 – The impact of all potential 3G pitch developments identified in the LFFP** 7
**Scenario 2 – Potential sites for 3G development – Waseley Hills High School** 10
**Scenario 3 – The impact of the development of WR22 compliant 3G AGP** 11
**Scenario 4 – Options for delivering new 3G provision to meet identified shortfalls in relevant sub-areas** 13
**3G Pitch Recommendations** 15
**Bromsgrove District Council PPS – Football (Grass) Stage D Findings** 15
**Football – Grass Pitch Summary Key Issues** 15
**Scenario 5 – All grass pitches to be improved by one quality increment to address future shortfalls of capacity for Youth 11v11, 9v9 and 7v7 pitches** 16
**Scenario 5.2 – Quality improvements on grass pitches identified in the LFFP and their impact on overall capacity** 23
**Scenario 6 – Loss of access to unsecured grass pitch sites used in 2021 season and the impact of the demand on overall capacity should it be displaced from the unsecure sites.** 25
**Scenario 7 – The impact of bringing Council owned disused sites back into use.** 30
**Scenario 8 – The impact on future capacity if latent demand predictions are not realised or only 50% realised.** 32
**Football Recommendations** 37
**Bromsgrove District Council PPS – Hockey Stage D Findings** 38
**Hockey Pitch Summary – key Issues** 38
**Scenario 9 – The loss of Bromsgrove Cricket, Hockey and Tennis Club** 38
**Scenario 10 – The impact of the loss of Woodrush Community Sports Centre AGP on Kings Heath Pickwick HC** 40
**Scenario 11 – The impact of further imported demand at Woodrush Community Sports Centre** 40
**Hockey Recommendations** 41
**Bromsgrove District Council PPS – Cricket Stage D Findings** 41
**Cricket – Grass Pitch Summary key issues** 41
**Scenario 12 – Addressing shortfalls in provision – wicket quality improvements** 42
**Scenario 13 – Addressing shortfalls in provision - The impact of all junior cricket moving to non-turf wickets** 45
**Scenario 14 – The impact of Dynamos and Allstars use of the outfield and its impact on training for other teams** 49
**Scenario 15 – The impact of club use of outgrounds and their suitability and security** 49
**Cricket Recommendations** 50
**Bromsgrove District Council PPS – Rugby Union Stage D Findings** 50

**Rugby Union Pitch Summary – Key Issues** **50**
**Scenario 16 – The additional of extra floodlit provision to address the mid-week training shortfall** **51**
**Scenario 17 – The impact on improved pitch maintenance regimes at Bromsgrove Rugby Club** **55**
**Scenario 18 – The installation of drainage systems at all rugby club sites** **58**
**Rugby Union Recommendations** **60**
**Bromsgrove District Council PPS – The loss of specific outdoor sports facilities** **61**
**Scenario 19 - Bromsgrove Cricket, Hockey and Tennis Club (BCHT)** **61**
**Scenario 20 – Barnsley Hall Playing Fields** **62**
**Bromsgrove District Council PPS – The impact of housing development on sporting provision** **63**
**Football** **65**
**3G Artificial Grass Pitches** **67**
**Rugby Union** **68**
**Cricket** **69**
**Hockey** **70**
**Priority Sites for Development to Meet Housing Development Demand** **70**

## Headline findings of the evidence base for each sport.

1.1. Table 1 highlights the quantitative headline shortfalls for the main pitch sports across Bromsgrove. The qualitative findings and site-specific findings are identified in the individual sections of this report.

**Table 1: Headline Findings - Bromsgrove Shortfalls in Demand Football Grass Pitches, 3G AGP, Cricket, Hockey, Rugby League & Rugby Union**

| Sport | Current demand | | Future Demand 2040 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Analysis Sub Area | Shortfall in Provision | Analysis Sub Area | Shortfall in Provision |
| Football 3G AGPs | SA1 | 0 | SA1 | 0 |
| | SA2 | 1 | SA2 | 1.4 |
| | SA3 | 0 | SA3 | 0.6 |
| | SA4 | 1 | SA4 | 1.8 |
| | SA5 | 1 | SA5 | 1.3 |
| | **Bromsgrove Total** | **3** | **Bromsgrove Total** | **4 (with a 5th to be informed by additional analysis at Stage E)** |
| Football Grass Pitches (Adult 11 v 11) | SA1 | No current shortfall (2 MES spare) | SA1 | No shortfall (2 MES spare) |
| | SA2 | No current shortfall (1 MES spare) | SA2 | No shortfall (0.5 MES spare) |
| | SA3 | No current shortfall (2 MES spare) | SA3 | No shortfall (0.5 MES spare) |
| | SA4 | No current shortfall (0 MES spare) | SA4 | 1 MES |
| | SA5 | No current shortfall (3.5 MES spare) | SA5 | No shortfall (0.5 MES spare) |
| | **Bromsgrove Total** | **No current shortfall (8.5 MES spare)** | **Bromsgrove Total** | **No current shortfall (2.5 MES spare)** |
| Football Grass Pitches | SA1 | No current shortfall (0 MES spare) | SA1 | No shortfall (0 MES spare) |
| | SA2 | No current shortfall (0 MES spare) | SA2 | 3 MES |

| Sport | Current demand | | Future Demand 2040 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Analysis Sub Area** | **Shortfall in Provision** | **Analysis Sub Area** | **Shortfall in Provision** |
| **(Youth 11 v 11)** | SA3 | No current shortfall (1.5 MES spare) | SA3 | 1 MES |
| | SA4 | No current shortfall (2 MES spare) | SA4 | 1.5 MES |
| | SA5 | 1 MES | SA5 | 3 MES |
| | **Bromsgrove Total** | **No current shortfall (2.5 MES spare)** | **Bromsgrove Total** | **8.5 MES** |
| **Youth 9v9** | SA1 | No current shortfall (0 MES spare) | SA1 | No shortfall (0 MES spare) |
| | SA2 | 1 MES | SA2 | 3 MES |
| | SA3 | No current shortfall (0 MES spare) | SA3 | 2.5 MES |
| | SA4 | No current shortfall (0 MES spare) | SA4 | 3.5 MES |
| | SA5 | No current shortfall (0.5 MES spare) | SA5 | 2.5 MES |
| | **Bromsgrove Total** | **0.5 MES** | **Bromsgrove Total** | **11.5 MES** |
| **Youth 7v7** | SA1 | No current shortfall (0 MES spare) | SA1 | No shortfall (0 MES spare) |
| | SA2 | No current shortfall (0 MES spare) | SA2 | 2 MES |
| | SA3 | No current shortfall (2 MES spare) | SA3 | No shortfall (0 MES spare) |
| | SA4 | No current shortfall (4 MES spare) | SA4 | No shortfall (0.5 MES spare) |
| | SA5 | No current shortfall (2 MES spare) | SA5 | No shortfall (1 MES spare) |
| | **Bromsgrove Total** | **No current shortfall (8 MES spare)** | **Bromsgrove Total** | **0.5 MES** |
| **Youth 5v5** | SA1 | No current shortfall (0 MES spare) | SA1 | No shortfall (0 MES spare) |
| | SA2 | No current shortfall (0 MES spare) | SA2 | 0.5 MES |

| Sport | Current demand | | Future Demand 2040 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Analysis Sub Area** | **Shortfall in Provision** | **Analysis Sub Area** | **Shortfall in Provision** |
| | SA3 | No current shortfall (0 MES spare) | SA3 | 2 MES |
| | SA4 | No current shortfall (6 MES spare) | SA4 | No shortfall (3 MES spare) |
| | SA5 | No current shortfall (3 MES spare) | SA5 | No shortfall (3 MES spare) |
| | **Bromsgrove Total** | **No current shortfall (9 MES spare)** | **Bromsgrove Total** | **No shortfall (3.5 MES spare)** |
| **Hockey (Sand AGPs** | SA1 | No provision | SA1 | No provision |
| | SA2 | No provision | SA2 | No provision |
| | SA3 | No spare capacity | SA3 | No spare capacity |
| | SA4 | 19.5 hours of spare capacity at Woodrush Sports Centre | SA4 | 19.5 hours of spare capacity at Woodrush Sports Centre |
| | SA5 | No community use | SA5 | No community use |
| | **Bromsgrove Total** | | **Bromsgrove Total** | |
| **Rugby Union (Grass)** | SA1 | No current shortfall (0 MES spare) | SA1 | No shortfall (0 MES spare) |
| | SA2 | Training – 5 MES / Matchplay – No shortfall | SA2 | Training – 8 MES / Matchplay – No shortfall |
| | SA3 | Training – 0 MES / Matchplay – No shortfall | SA3 | Training – 26 MES / Matchplay – No shortfall |
| | SA4 | Training – 1.5 MES / Matchplay – No shortfall | SA4 | Training – 8.5 MES / Matchplay – No shortfall |
| | SA5 | No shortfall | SA5 | No shortfall |
| | **Bromsgrove Total** | **Training – 6.5 MES / Matchplay – No shortfall (18 MES Spare)** | **Bromsgrove Total** | **Training – 42.5 MES / Matchplay – No shortfall (1 MES spare)** |

| Sport | Current demand | | Future Demand 2040 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Analysis Sub Area | Shortfall in Provision | Analysis Sub Area | Shortfall in Provision |
| | | | | |
| Cricket (adult) | SA1 | No current shortfall (0 MPS spare) | SA1 | No shortfall (0 MPS spare) |
| | SA2 | 15 MPS | SA2 | 197 MPS |
| | SA3 | No current shortfall (126 MPS spare) | SA3 | No shortfall (38 MPS spare) |
| | SA4 | No current shortfall (0 MPS spare) | SA4 | No shortfall (0 MPS spare) |
| | SA5 | 33 MPS | SA5 | 105 MPS |
| | **Bromsgrove Total** | **No current shortfall (78 MPS spare)** | **Bromsgrove Total** | **264 MPS** |

1.2. To develop the recommendations/actions and to understand their potential impact, several relevant scenarios are tested against the key issues in this section for each playing pitch sport.

## Football – AGP 3G Summary key issues

1. There are currently 2 full-size 3G AGPs in Bromsgrove, neither of which are World Rugby compliant, located at Hayes Playing Field and South Bromsgrove High School
2. Across the District there is a current deficit of 3 full size 3G AGP pitches for community football usage. This deficit is split equally between SA2, SA4 and SA5.
3. New population growth and latent demand will result in a further demand for 3G AGP pitches. By 2040 there will be a need for an additional 4 full-size 3G pitches.
4. The need for a 5th additional full size 3G pitch will be established through further analysis at Stage E of the PPS.

## Current 3G Pitch Provision

1.3. Table 2 below highlights the current 3G AGP provision in Bromsgrove.

1.4. There are currently two full size 3G AGPs across Bromsgrove, both of which are available to the community. South Bromsgrove School is an education site with no community use during the day, Monday to Friday, whilst Hayes Playing Field is a recently developed 3G pitch that's main use is to cater for demand from Alvechurch FC.

1.5. Neither of the current 3G pitches are World Rugby Compliant, and therefore cannot cater for any formal rugby activity.

**Table 2: Summary of all current 3G AGP provision in Bromsgrove**

| Site Name | Sub Area | Postcode | Availability | Security of Use | Surface Type | FA 3G Pitch Register | WR22 | Size | Pitch Dimensions (m) | Age of Surface | Floodlit | Pitch Rating |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Hayes Playing Field / Alvechurch FC | SA3 | B38 9EL | Available | Secured | 3G | Yes | No | Full | 105x70 | 2021 | Yes | Good |
| South Bromsgrove School | SA5 | B60 3NL | Available | Secured | 3G | Yes | No | Full | 100x60 | 2016 | Yes | Good |

**Table 3: Current and future total demand for 3G AGP (Football) across Bromsgrove**

| Sub Area | Current Number of Teams | Full Size 3G AGP required (1:38) | Existing Available Full Size 3G AGPs | Current Shortfall | Future Number of Teams – Population Growth | Future Shortfall – Population Growth | Future Number of Teams – Latent Demand | Future Shortfall – Latent Demand |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SA1 | 2 | 0.1 | 0 | -0.1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SA2 | 37 | 0.9 | 0 | -0.9 | 5 | 0.1 | 11 | 0.3 |
| SA3 | 42 | 1.1 | 1 | -0.1 | 3 | 0 | 18 | 0.5 |
| SA4 | 48 | 1.2 | 0 | -1.2 | 8 | 0.2 | 21 | 0.6 |
| SA5 | 82 | 2.2 | 1 | -1.2 | 11 | 0.3 | 7 | 0.2 |
| **Total** | **211** | **5.5** | **2** | **-3** | **27** | **0.6** | **57** | **1.5** |

1.6. Table 3 above highlights the current and future shortfalls of full size 3G AGP pitches in Bromsgrove. There are currently two full size 3G AGPs in Bromsgrove. When applying the 1:38 team ratio for full size provision, there is a current Bromsgrove-wide deficit of 3.5 AGPs. As in the Stage C analysis, this has been rounded down to 3. The majority of this shortfall is located in the SA2, SA4 and SA5.

1.7. By 2040, the current shortfall is predicted to increase to 2.1 across Bromsgrove, if both population growth and latent demand are considered. However, through consultation with Sport England, the Football Foundation and the FA, it is agreed that only the larger of the two deficits will be considered initially.

Therefore, the deficit of 1.5 full size 3G pitches created by latent demand predictions will be taken into account. As a result, by 2040 we can assume there will be a deficit of **4 full size 3G pitches**, with the need for a 5th being informed by further analysis at Stage E.

1.8. Growth due to latent demand predictions is highest in the SA3 and SA4 areas, therefore the development of any additional 3G pitch to help meet future demand should be focussed here.

1.9. Based on the summary above, the following scenarios will be considered within this section of the report:

- **3G AGP scenarios:**

1. The impact of all potential 3G pitch developments identified in the LFFP.
2. The identification of potential sites for 3G development and the impact of these
3. Impact of a WR22 compliant 3G pitch and its impact on Rugby and Football (Rugby priority use)
4. Options for delivering new 3G provision to meet identified shortfalls in relevant sub-areas.

- **Grass pitch scenarios:**

5. All grass pitches to be improved by one quality increment to address future shortfalls of capacity for 11v11, 9v9 and 7v7.
    - Sub-set of the above to consider only improvements to sites identified in the LFFP.
6. Loss of access to unsecured grass pitch sites presently used by clubs for community football, and the impact of this demand on overall capacity balance should it be displaced from these unsecured sites.
7. The impact of bringing Council owned disused sites back into use to support demand.
8. The impact on capacity if latent demand growth is not realised.
    - The impact on capacity if only half of latent demand growth is realised.

## Scenario 1 – The impact of all potential 3G pitch developments identified in the LFFP.

1.10. This scenario analyses the development of the additional 3G AGPs that are highlighted in the Bromsgrove LFFP. It will also be broken down into two smaller sections; one considering all sizes of 3G AGPs and one only taking into account full size 3G pitch provision.

1.11. The Bromsgrove LFFP highlights 3 potential sites for 3G development: Barnsley Hall, Hayes Playing Fields and Bromsgrove & District Bowls Club. However, the 3G pitch at Hayes Playing Fields has already been developed and therefore will not be explored in this scenario.

1.12. The development of additional 3G pitches should work towards alleviating the shortfall for training Monday – Friday and then consider match play on a Saturday and Sunday, as well as providing recreational and informal opportunities. All of these programmes support the sustainability of the pitches and provide relevant income needed for an appropriate sink fund for pitch refurbishments after 10 years.

1.13. Currently, there is a deficit of 3 full size 3G AGPs in Bromsgrove, with the need for an additional 1 to cater for demand due to population growth and latent demand by 2040. This is highlighted in table 3 and further detail can be found in paragraph 1.7.

1.14. Table 4 outlines the two proposed 3G developments, both of which are located in SA5.

**Table 4: 3G AGP developments identified in the Bromsgrove LFFP**

| Site Name | Sub Area | Size | Community Use available in hours | Clubs currently using this facility | Proportion of teams that can use facility | Number of teams potentially serviced by this facility |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Barnsley Hall | SA5 | 11v11 | 34 | 0 (new) | 100% | 38 |
| Bromsgrove & District Bowls Club | SA5 | 5v5 | 34 | 0 (new) | 17% | 7 |

1.15. A new development at Barnsley Hall would include a full size, floodlit 3G surface. However, this may involve the loss of one or more existing grass pitches. The site is currently utilised by Bromsgrove Sporting Colts who have 20 teams from U5 to U18. There is existing ancillary and changing facilities on site which would support the AGP development.

1.16. Bromsgrove & District Bowls Club is an indoor bowls facility with a disused artificial outdoor bowls green. The proposed LFFP development would include a floodlit 5v5 3G AGP on the site of the disused outdoor green. There is no current football use of the site, and potential users could use nearby ancillary facilities at Charford Recreation Ground. However, these facilities are in a very poor condition and would need investment to bring them up to a suitable standard.

**Table 5: Current and future total demand for 3G AGP (Football) across Bromsgrove**

| Sub Area | Current Number of Teams | Full Size 3G AGP required (1:38) | Existing Available Full Size 3G AGPs | Current Shortfall | Future Number of Teams – Population Growth | Future Shortfall – Population Growth | Future Number of Teams – Latent Demand | Future Shortfall – Latent Demand |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SA5 | 82 | 2.2 | 1 | -1.2 | 11 | 0.3 | 7 | 0.2 |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Total - Bromsgrove** | **211** | **5.5** | **2** | **-3** | **27** | **0.6** | **57** | **1.5** |

1.17. Table 5 outlines the current deficit of 3G AGPs in SA5 and the total across Bromsgrove. There are 82 teams currently playing the SA5, where there is currently only 1 full size 3G AGP. This means that 38 of these teams are theoretically catered for if the Football Foundations 1:38 model is used. As a result, there are 44 teams in SA5 who cannot access 3G provision.

1.18. As a result of population growth and latent demand there is a potential future growth of 18 teams, taking the total number in SA5 by 2040 to 100.

**Table 6: Impact of proposed 3G developments on the current and future deficit**

| Site Name | Sub Area | Potential Teams Catered For (incl existing provision | Updated Current Capacity | Updated Future Capacity – Population Growth and Latent Demand |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Barnsley Hall | SA5 | 76 | -0.2 | -0.6 |
| Bromsgrove & District Bowls Club | SA5 | 55 | -0.7 | -1.1 |
| **Both** | SA5 | 93 | 0.3 (Spare Capacity) | -0.2 |

1.19. The development of a full size 3G at Barnsley Hall could cater for an addition 38 teams, meaning that only 6 teams in SA5 would not be serviced by 3G facilities, equating to a deficit of -0.2.

1.20. When considering future growth of teams in the sub-area, there would be 24 teams unable to be serviced after development of the 3G AGP at Barnsley Hall. This creates a deficit of -0.6 full size AGPs.

1.21. As the proposed AGP development at Bromsgrove & District Bowls Club is likely to be a 5v5, it can only theoretically cater for 17 teams. If only this development was realised then a total of 55 teams could be catered for in the sub-area, leaving a current deficit of -0.7 full size AGPs. When adding in future growth, this would result in a deficit of -1.1 in SA5.

1.22. If both Barnsley Hall and Bromsgrove & District Bowls Club developments were realised, then a total of 93 teams could be catered for in the sub-area. This would create a small level of spare capacity on 3G pitches in SA5 based on current team numbers. However, if all population growth and latent demand predictions are accurate, then there would still remain a small deficit of -0.2 full size 3G AGPs in SA5 by 2040.

1.23. A 3G development Barnsley Hall Playing Fields, would support demand mainly from the youth and community sections of Bromsgrove Sporting FC, and scores highly on deliverability in the LFFP. However, it should be noted that the club are continuing to develop the Victoria Ground, which is home to their 1st team, who play in at Step 3 of the National League system. Through consultation with the FF, it is apparent that the club feel their current facilities are halting their growth and as such aspire to develop a 3G pitch at the Victoria Ground. Although this option could still cater for community and youth team usage and would not result in the loss of grass pitches at Barnsley Hall, further work is required to identify the most likely site for 3G development in SA5.

## Scenario 2 – Potential sites for 3G development – Waseley Hills High School

1.24. Any development at Waseley Hills High School in SA1 will include 1 full size 3G AGP. Although still aspirational, the 3G is likely to provide for community football activity during peak hours and cater for curriculum demand during mid-week 8am – 5pm during term-time. Currently the school site consists of 1x adult 11v11, 1x youth 11v11 and 1x 7v7 pitches, all of standard quality. There is no community use of the grass pitches.

1.25. There is currently a very small shortfall of 0.1 in the SA1 sub area, which is not expected to worsen in the future due to latent demand and population growth. When considering Bromsgrove as a whole, there is a current deficit of 3, rising to 4 by 2040.

1.26. This scenario demonstrates the impact of the proposed full-size 3G AGPs, with full community use during peak times (5-9pm Mon-Thur, 5-7pm Fri and 9-5pm weekends)

**Table 7: Impact of proposed full size 3G pitch at Waseley Hills High School**

| Site Name | Sub Area | Current Capacity in Sub-area | Nett Gain of 3G | Capacity after Development | Future Capacity After Development |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Waseley Hills High School | SA1 | -0.1 | 1 | 0.9 | 0.9 |
| | Bromsgrove | -3 | 1 | -2 | -3 |

1.27. **SA1 impact –** when only considering the SA1 sub area where the potential development is located, there are 2 teams and no AGP facilities, resulting in a deficit of 0.1 full size 3G pitches. By developing the proposed 3G pitch at Waseley Hills High School, 38 additional teams could be provided for. This would create significant spare capacity in the sub area (0.9 full size 3G AGPs). However, the impact of the development may benefit the SA2 and SA5 areas which it borders, where there are deficits of -0.9 and -1.2 respectively. Waseley Hills High School also sits on the border of Birmingham City area, and would have the potential to cater for some imported demand.

1.28. **All 3G Pitch Sizes (District Wide) –** when taking into account the Bromsgrove as a whole study area, there is a current deficit of -3 full size 3G AGPs, rising to 4 by 2040. By developing the proposed 3G at Waseley Hills High School, this current deficit would reduce to -2 and the future deficit to -3.

1.29. Through consultation with the FF and Waseley Hills School, it is apparent that any AGP development on site would result in the initial loss of 1 youth 11v11 pitch. As mentioned above, there is no community use of the grass pitches so there would be no impact on football activity, with the current capacity analysis for SA1 remaining at 0 MES for youth 11v11 pitches.

1.30. However, the school have indicated that it would be possible to reconfigure the remaining grass space to replace the pitch, and they are likely to do so with a good quality facility. If this is the case, then the overall capacity for grass pitches on site would increase.

1.31. The school also aspire to develop 4 new floodlit tennis courts alongside the 3G AGP, and use the grass, artificial and tennis facilities to deliver a community sports hub.

1.32. Further analysis for the need for 3G provision at Waseley Hills School would need to be carried out to fully determine the impact of any development. Although the club have held initial conversations with clubs, in particular West Hagley FC, a full programme of use would need to be established to determine the sustainability of the AGP. Consideration of other existing and potential 3G developments, both in the surrounding sub-areas and in neighbouring authorities, would be required to ensure there was no over-provision of 3G pitches.

## Scenario 3 – The impact of the development of WR22 compliant 3G AGP

1.33. Due to the sporting nature of Bromsgrove, this scenario will also consider the shared usage of the potential 3G pitch between Rugby Union and Football. The scenario will prioritise rugby union and any additional capacity will be filled by football demand.

1.34. There are currently no rugby compliant 3G pitches in Bromsgrove, therefore no formal rugby demand can be catered for.

1.35. Table 8 highlights the deficit of rugby provision in each study area. Across Bromsgrove, there is a current deficit of -9.5 MES for training, which is predicted to rise to -45.5 MES by 2040 due to latent demand and population growth.

**Table 8: Impact of proposed full size 3G pitch at Waseley Hills High School**

| Sport | Current demand | | Future Demand 2040 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Analysis Sub Area | Shortfall in Provision | Analysis Sub Area | Shortfall in Provision |
| | SA1 | No current shortfall (0 MES spare) | SA1 | No shortfall (0 MES spare) |

| Sport | Current demand | | Future Demand 2040 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Analysis Sub Area** | **Shortfall in Provision** | **Analysis Sub Area** | **Shortfall in Provision** |
| **Rugby Union (Grass)** | SA2 | Training – 5 MES / Matchplay – No shortfall | SA2 | Training – 8 MES / Matchplay – No shortfall |
| | SA3 | Training – 0 MES / Matchplay – No shortfall | SA3 | Training – 26 MES / Matchplay – No shortfall |
| | SA4 | Training – 1.5 MES / Matchplay – No shortfall | SA4 | Training – 8.5 MES / Matchplay – No shortfall |
| | SA5 | No shortfall | SA5 | No shortfall |
| | **Bromsgrove Total** | **Training – 6.5 MES / Matchplay – No shortfall (18 MES Spare)** | **Bromsgrove Total** | **Training – 42.5 MES / Matchplay – No shortfall (1 MES spare)** |

1.36. Table 9 shows the current number of rugby teams in each sub-area, and how population growth, latent demand and the growth of the female game will affect these by 2040.

**Table 9: Rugby team numbers by sub-area.**

| Sub-area | Current Team Numbers | Future Team Numbers - 2040 |
|---|---|---|
| SA1 | 0 | 0 |
| SA2 | 24 | 27 |
| SA3 | 39 | 65 |
| SA4 | 13 | 18 |
| SA5 | 0 | 0 |
| Bromsgrove | 76 | 110 |

1.37. Typically, rugby union clubs prefer to train on their own existing grass pitches, rather than use 3G facilities that result in additional cost and in many cases the loss of secondary spend opportunities on site. For this reason, the first approach to reducing the shortfalls of grass pitch provision in

Bromsgrove should focus on pitch quality improvements by installing drainage solutions and improving maintenance, and the potential installation of floodlights.

1.38. As highlighted in scenario 16, to meet the current training demand, and additional 6 grass pitches would require floodlighting in Bromsgrove (2 in SA2, 1 in SA4 and 3 in SA3). However, when considering the future shortfall of training opportunities, an additional 15 grass pitches would need to be floodlit, which is not realistic.

1.39. Scenarios 17 finds that as maintenance regimes in at clubs in Bromsgrove are already of a high standard, any further improvement would have little impact in reducing the deficit for training. Scenario 18 also suggests that drainage installation at all sites in Bromsgrove would have a similarly minimal impact.

1.40. As a result of these findings, it could be suggested that there is a need for a WR22 compliant 3G pitch in Bromsgrove. As the majority of clubs are located in SA3, this sub area should be the preferred location. However, further analysis on the specific site should be carried out to fully examine the sustainability of the project, establish a full programme of use and explore the potential for some football demand to also be met on site.

1.41. Any 3G development should not be located at an existing rugby union ground, or involve the loss of any grass pitches. A potential development could cater for future training demand from rugby union clubs, but must also provide multi-sport benefits by also catering for football training and match play. This would ensure the viability and sustainability for any 3G development.

## Scenario 4 – Options for delivering new 3G provision to meet identified shortfalls in relevant sub-areas.

1.42. Scenario 4 will identify potential ways for the current deficits of 3G provision to be reduced in each sub-area. Table 12 provides an overview of the current and future position for 3G AGPs in Bromsgrove.

**Table 12: Current and future total demand for 3G AGP (Football) across Bromsgrove**

| Sub Area | Current Number of Teams | Full Size 3G AGP required (1:38) | Existing Available Full Size 3G AGPs | Current Shortfall | Future Number of Teams – Population Growth | Future Shortfall – Population Growth | Future Number of Teams – Latent Demand | Future Shortfall – Latent Demand |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SA1 | 2 | 0.1 | 0 | -0.1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SA2 | 37 | 0.9 | 0 | -0.9 | 5 | 0.1 | 11 | 0.3 |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SA3 | 42 | 1.1 | 1 | -0.1 | 3 | 0 | 18 | 0.5 |
| SA4 | 48 | 1.2 | 0 | -1.2 | 8 | 0.2 | 21 | 0.6 |
| SA5 | 82 | 2.2 | 1 | -1.2 | 11 | 0.3 | 7 | 0.2 |
| **Total** | **211** | **5.5** | **2** | **-3** | **27** | **0.6** | **57** | **1.5** |

1.43. Although table 12 outlines the shortfall in AGP provision in specific sub areas, it is unfeasible to develop that number of pitches. To minimise the current shortfall of 3 3G AGPs, the development of 1 full size 3G pitch in each of SA2, SA4 and SA5 should be considered. This would eradicate the current deficit and focus on those sub-areas with the largest unmet demand.

1.44. **SA2 –** The LFFP and consultation identified no sites in SA2, that are suitable or where there is a desire to develop 3G provision. However, as highlighted in scenario 2, Waseley Hills School in neighbouring SA1 has the potential to cater for unmet demand from SA1 and SA2. The site has aspirations to become a community sports hub, with the additional development of tennis courts and improved grass pitches.

1.45. **SA4 –** The need for additional 3G development in SA4 could be met through development on a number of sites. Although not highlighted in the LFFP, Bay Tree Farm, The Holloway, and Wythall Park all currently support significant amounts of community football usage, but may result in the minimal loss of grass pitch provision.

1.46. **SA5 –** Barnsley Hall is highlighted in the LFFP as a priority site for 3G development. However, Bromsgrove Sporting FC who occupy the site, are also located at The Victoria Ground, and have outlined their aspirations to turn the site into a stadia 3G which also supports community football. Further consultation with the FF, FA and the club is needed to explore both options.

1.47. When considering catering for future unmet demand, 1 full size 3G pitch should be developed in either SA3 or SA4, as these sub-areas have the highest levels of team growth. Although only 1 full size 3G pitch may be required initially, the need for an extra AGP to meet future demand should be informed by further analysis at Stage E.

1.48. As suggested in scenario 3, there may be the need for a WR22 compliant 3G in the SA3 sub area. As there is only a current deficit of 0.1 full size equivalent 3G AGPs for football in SA3, it may be possible for the two sports to organise shared usage of any development. Due to the larger demand from Rugby, any development should be located at either Five Ways Old Edwardians, Bromsgrove Rugby Club or Kings Norton RFC.

## 3G Pitch Recommendations

1. Protect the existing stock of 3G pitches, ensuring community use is kept.
2. Development of 1 additional full size 3G AGP in each of SA2, SA4 and SA5 to help reduce the current deficit. Waseley Hills High (SA1), Barnsley Hall (SA5), The Victoria Ground (SA5), Bay Tree Farm (SA4), The Holloway (SA4) and Wythall Park (SA4) should all be considered as potential sites.
3. Development of 1 full size 3G pitch in SA3. This should be WR22 compliant and be located at Bromsgrove RFC, Five Ways Old Edwardians or Kings Norton RFC.
4. Further analysis at Stage E to ascertain the need for the development of a 5th additional full size 3G AGP.

## Bromsgrove District Council PPS – Football (Grass) Stage D Findings

## Football – Grass Pitch Summary Key Issues

- There are 87 grass football pitches across 32 sites that are available for community use.
- 73% of pitches in Bromsgrove provide secured community use access (i.e., pitches owned or leased by local authorities or clubs/associations). 27% pitches are unsecured community use pitches.
- Woodrush Community Sports Centre and The Holloway aspire to improve their pitch quality and have FA/FF approved maintenance schedules in place through the PitchPower process.
- Across the study area, 7 sites (8%) are not serviced by any sort of clubhouse or changing rooms. In addition, a further 4 (5%) sites are serviced by poor quality ancillary provision.
- 211 teams from within 33 clubs are identified as playing within Bromsgrove. This consists of 32 adult men's, 4 adult women's, 47 youth 11v11 boys', 6 youth 11v11 girls', 32 junior boys' 9v9 teams, 2 junior girls' 9v9 teams, 47 7v7 and mini soccer teams and 32 5v5 mini soccer teams. There is demand across all age groups of football across Bromsgrove.

- Spare peak time capacity across Bromsgrove totals 27.5 match equivalent sessions per week, across all pitch types. However, there is currently a small shortfall of 0.5 MES for youth 9v9 pitches.
- By 2040, there will be an increased demand for an extra 42 MES due to latent demand and population growth. This will result in a future total deficit of -14.5 MES per week across all pitch types in Bromsgrove. However, this deficit is mostly created by a -8.5 MES shortfall on youth 11v11 pitches and a -11.5 MES shortfall on youth 9v9 pitches. There is also a very minor deficit predicted on 7v7 pitches of -0.5 MES per week.
- Currently there is spare capacity on all pitch types in Bromsgrove other than youth 9v9. However Adult 11v11, 7v7 and 5v5 are responsible for 93% of the spare capacity of MES across the study area.

## Scenario 5 – All grass pitches to be improved by one quality increment to address future shortfalls of capacity for Youth 11v11, 9v9 and 7v7 pitches.

1.49. This scenario explores the impact of improving all youth 11v11, 7v7 and 9v9 football pitches by one increment, and the impact this would have on the future deficit of playing capacity across the District.

1.50. Table 14 highlights the carrying capacity of each pitch type dependent on quality.

**Table 14: Carrying Capacity per Pitch Type. All Figures in MES**

| Quality score | Adult football | Youth football | Mini soccer |
|---|---|---|---|
| Good (80-100%) | 3 | 4 | 6 |
| Standard (50-79.9%) | 2 | 2 | 4 |
| Poor (0-49.9%) | 1 | 1 | 2 |

1.51. Table 15 - 19 below outline the changes in carrying capacity to youth 11v11, 9v9 and 7v7 pitches if all were improved by one quality increment. They also demonstrate the impact these changes would have on both weekly and peak period balances.

**Table 15: SA1 Sub Area – Pitch Quality Improvements**

| Site name | Sub-Area | Availability | Pitch supply | Current Pitch Quality Rating | Current Pitch capacity MES | Current Pitch demand MES | Improved Pitch Capacity | New Balance Weekly | New Peak period |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Waseley Hills High School | SA1 | Available | 1 Youth 11v11 | Standard | 2 | 1 | 4 | 3 | No spare capacity |
| Waseley Hills High School | SA1 | Available | 1 7v7 | Standard | 4 | 1 | 6 | 3 | No spare capacity |

**Table 16: SA2 Sub Area – Pitch Quality Improvements**

| Site name | Sub-Area | Availability | Pitch supply | Current Pitch Quality Rating | Current Pitch capacity MES | Current Pitch demand MES | Improved Pitch Capacity | New Balance Weekly | New Peak period |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Hagley Playing Fields | SA2 | Available | 1 Youth 11v11 | Good | 4 | 1 | 4 | 3 | No spare capacity |
| Hagley Playing Fields | SA2 | Available | 1 7v7 | Good | 6 | 3 | 6 | 3 | No spare capacity |
| Haybridge High School | SA2 | Available | 3 Youth 11v11 | Standard | 6 | 2.5 | 12 | 9.5 | No spare capacity |
| Ridge Arena | SA2 | Available | 1 Youth 9v9 | Standard | 2 | 3 | 4 | 1 | No spare capacity |
| Ridge Arena | SA2 | Available | 1 7v7 | Standard | 4 | 1.5 | 6 | 4.5 | No spare capacity |

**Table 17: SA3 Sub Area – Pitch Quality Improvements**

| Site name | Sub-Area | Availability | Pitch supply | Current Pitch Quality Rating | Current Pitch capacity MES | Current Pitch demand MES | Improved Pitch Capacity | New Balance Weekly | New Peak period |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Hewell Cricket Club | SA3 | Available | 1 Youth 11v11 | Standard | 2 | 0.5 | 4 | 3.5 | 1 |
| Hopwood Recreation Ground | SA3 | Available | 1 Youth 11v11 | Standard | 2 | 0.5 | 4 | 3.5 | 1 |
| Hopwood Recreation Ground | SA3 | Available | 1 7v7 | Standard | 4 | 0 | 6 | 6 | 1 |
| Wiggin Memorial Ground | SA3 | Available | 1 7v7 | Poor | 2 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 1 |

**Table 18: SA4 Sub Area – Pitch Quality Improvements**

| Site name | Sub-Area | Availability | Pitch supply | Current Pitch Quality Rating | Current Pitch capacity MES | Current Pitch demand MES | Improved Pitch Capacity | New Balance Weekly | New Peak period |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Bay Tree Farm | SA4 | Available | 1 Youth 9v9 | Standard | 2 | 1 | 4 | 3 | No spare capacity |
| Bay Tree Farm | SA4 | Available | 2 7v7 | Standard | 8 | 3 | 12 | 9 | No spare capacity |
| The Phoenix Group | SA4 | Available | 1 7v7 | Good | 6 | 0 | 6 | 6 | 1 |
| Woodrush Community Sports Centre | SA4 | Available | 1 Youth 11v11 | Standard | 2 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 1 |
| Woodrush Community Sports Centre | SA4 | Available | 1 7v7 | Standard | 4 | 1 | 6 | 5 | 1 |

| Site name | Sub-Area | Availability | Pitch supply | Current Pitch Quality Rating | Current Pitch capacity MES | Current Pitch demand MES | Improved Pitch Capacity | New Balance Weekly | New Peak period |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Wythall Park | SA4 | Available | 1 Youth 11v11 | Standard | 2 | 0.5 | 4 | 3.5 | 1 |
| Wythall Park | SA4 | Available | 2 7v7 | Standard | 8 | 1.5 | 12 | 10.5 | 2 |

**Table 19: SA5 Sub Area – Pitch Quality Improvements**

| Site name | Sub-Area | Availability | Pitch supply | Current Pitch Quality Rating | Current Pitch capacity MES | Current Pitch demand MES | Improved Pitch Capacity | New Balance Weekly | New Peak period |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Barnsley Hall | SA5 | Available | 1 Youth 11v11 | Good | 4 | 1.5 | 4 | 2.5 | No spare capacity |
| Barnsley Hall | SA5 | Available | 1 Youth 9v9 | Good | 4 | 2 | 4 | 2 | No spare capacity |
| Barnsley Hall | SA5 | Available | 1 7v7 | Good | 6 | 3 | 6 | 3 | No spare capacity |
| Catshill Middle School | SA5 | Available | 1 Youth 11v11 | Standard | 2 | 3 | 4 | 1 | No spare capacity |
| Catshill Middle School | SA5 | Available | 4 7v7 | Standard | 16 | 12 | 24 | 12 | No spare capacity |
| Catshill Village Meadow | SA5 | Available | 1 Youth 11v11 | Standard | 2 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 1 |
| Chadsgrove School | SA5 | Available | 1 7v7 | Standard | 4 | 1 | 6 | 5 | 1 |

| Site name | Sub-Area | Availability | Pitch supply | Current Pitch Quality Rating | Current Pitch capacity MES | Current Pitch demand MES | Improved Pitch Capacity | New Balance Weekly | New Peak period |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Charford Recreation Ground | SA5 | Available | 1 Youth 9v9 | Standard | 2 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 1 |
| LG Harris/Meadow Park | SA5 | Available | 2 Youth 11v11 | Good | 8 | 4.5 | 8 | 3.5 | No spare capacity |
| LG Harris/Meadow Park | SA5 | Available | 2 7v7 | Good | 12 | 2 | 12 | 10 | No spare capacity |
| Lickey End | SA5 | Available | 1 Youth 11v11 | Poor | 1 | 1.5 | 2 | 0.5 | No spare capacity |
| Lickey End | SA5 | Available | 1 Youth 9v9 | Poor | 1 | 2.5 | 2 | -0.5 | There can be no spare capacity as the pitch is over played |
| Ryland Centre | SA5 | Available | 1 7v7 | Good | 6 | 0 | 6 | 6 | 1 |
| Stoke Prior Sports Club | SA5 | Available | 1 Youth 9v9 | Poor | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 |

1.52. Tables 20 - 22 below show the impact of improving the quality of youth 11v11, 9v9 and 7v7 pitches on the overall balance, by pitch type and sub area.

**Table 20: Youth 11v11 Supply and Demand Analysis – Improved pitch quality ratings – All Figures in MES**

| Analysis Area | Current Actual Spare capacity MES | Current Total overplay | Current position | Improved Quality Ratings – Current Position | Future Demand – Population Growth | Future Demand Latent Demand | Current Future position | Improved Quality Ratings – Future Position |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SA1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SA2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | -3 | -3 |
| SA3 | 1.5 | 0 | 1.5 | 2 | 0.5 | 2 | -1 | -0.5 |
| SA4 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2.5 | -1.5 | -1.5 |
| SA5 | 1 | -2 | -1 | 1 | 1.5 | 0.5 | -3 | -1 |
| **Bromsgrove** | **4.5** | **-2** | **2.5** | **5** | **4** | **7** | **-8.5** | **-6** |

1.53. Table 20 shows that improving the standard of youth 11v11 pitches by one quality increment would have a minor impact on the capacity balance across Bromsgrove. The current Bromsgrove-wide spare capacity would increase from 2.5 MES to 5 MES, largely due to the increase in capacity in the SA5 area. Here, the current deficit -1 MES would change to 1 MES of spare capacity.

1.54. When considering future capacity, the current deficit of -8.5 MES would decrease to -6 MES, with the largest impact again being made in SA5.

**Table 21: Youth 9v9 Supply and Demand Analysis – Improved pitch quality ratings – All Figures in MES**

| Analysis Area | Current Actual Spare capacity MES | Current Total overplay | Current position | Improved Quality Ratings – Current Position | Future Demand – Population Growth | Future Demand Latent Demand | Current Future position | Improved Quality Ratings – Future Position |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SA1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SA2 | 0 | -1 | -1 | 0 | 0.5 | 1.5 | -3 | -2 |
| SA3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.5 | 2 | -2.5 | -2.5 |
| SA4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2.5 | -3.5 | -3.5 |
| SA5 | 2 | -1.5 | 0.5 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 1.5 | -2.5 | -1.5 |
| **Bromsgrove** | **2** | **-2.5** | **-0.5** | **1.5** | **3.5** | **7.5** | **-11.5** | **-9.5** |

1.55. Table 21 shows that improving the standard of youth 9v9 pitches by one quality increment would have a small impact on the capacity balance across Bromsgrove. The current Bromsgrove-wide deficit of -0.5 MES would turn into 1.5 MES of spare capacity, largely due to the increase in capacity in the SA2 and SA5 areas.

1.56. When considering future capacity, the current deficit of -11.5 MES would decrease to -9.5 MES, again due to increase in capacity in SA2 and SA5 sub-areas.

**Table 22: Mini 7v7 Supply and Demand Analysis – Improved pitch quality ratings – All Figures in MES**

| Analysis Area | Current Actual Spare capacity MES | Current Total overplay | Current position | Improved Quality Ratings – Current Position | Future Demand – Population Growth | Future Demand Latent Demand | Current Future position | Improved Quality Ratings – Future Position |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SA1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SA2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.5 | 1.5 | -2 | -2 |
| SA3 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| SA4 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 2.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 |
| SA5 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 1 | 1 |
| **Bromsgrove** | **8** | **0** | **8** | **8** | **2** | **6.5** | **-0.5** | **-0.5** |

1.57. Table 22 shows that improving the standard of mini 7v7 pitches by one quality increment would have no impact on the capacity balance across Bromsgrove. The current Bromsgrove-wide spare capacity would remain at 8 MES.

1.58. When considering future capacity, the current deficit of -0.5 MES would also remain the same.

1.59. Although improving the quality of pitches increases their carrying capacity and benefits their weekly balance, it does not necessarily create additional capacity at peak times. If a pitch is already at capacity during the peak period, creating additional carrying capacity will have little impact on the overall position of the playing pitch.

## Scenario 5.2 – Quality improvements on grass pitches identified in the LFFP and their impact on overall capacity.

1.60. This scenario explores the impact of improving all youth 11v11, 7v7 and 9v9 football pitches identified in the LFFP by one increment, and the impact this would have on the future deficit of playing capacity across the District.

1.61. Table 23 shows the pitches which have been identified in the LFFP for grass pitch improvements.

**Table 23: Pitch Quality Improvements to LFFP Identified Sites**

| Site name | Sub-Area | Availability | Pitch supply | Current Pitch Quality Rating | Current Pitch capacity MES | Current Pitch demand MES | Improved Pitch Capacity | New Balance Weekly | New Peak period |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Haybridge High School | SA2 | Available | 3 Youth 11v11 | Standard | 6 | 2.5 | 12 | 9.5 | No spare capacity |
| Barnsley Hall | SA5 | Available | 1 Youth 11v11 | Good | 4 | 1.5 | 4 | 2.5 | No spare capacity |
| Barnsley Hall | SA5 | Available | 1 Youth 9v9 | Good | 4 | 2 | 4 | 2 | No spare capacity |
| Barnsley Hall | SA5 | Available | 1 7v7 | Good | 6 | 3 | 6 | 3 | No spare capacity |
| Charford Recreation Ground | SA5 | Available | 1 Youth 9v9 | Standard | 2 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 1 |
| Catshill Middle School | SA5 | Available | 1 Youth 11v11 | Standard | 2 | 3 | 4 | 1 | No spare capacity |
| Catshill Middle School | SA5 | Available | 4 7v7 | Standard | 16 | 12 | 24 | 12 | No spare capacity |

1.62. The sites listed in table 23, are all highlighted in the LFFP for grass pitch improvements. All sites in the list are located in SA5, other than Haybridge High School, which is situated in SA2.

1.63. Although improved grass pitches have a positive impact on the weekly carrying capacity of provision, in the cases above there will be no change in the future deficit of youth 11v11, 9v9 and 7v7 pitches. This is because all pitches above currently support team use during the peak period, and an increase in pitch quality does not increase the peak period.

1.64. As there is no current overplay of any pitches in table 23, grass pitch improvements of LFFP identified sites would not be targeting sites where quality increases would make a significant impact. Any grass pitch improvement should focus on those sites where there is a large amount of current and future overplay.

## Scenario 6 – Loss of access to unsecured grass pitch sites used in 2021 season and the impact of the demand on overall capacity should it be displaced from the unsecure sites.

1.65. This scenario considers the impact of community clubs losing access to unsecured sites and the impact that this would have on demand on overall pitch capacity across Bromsgrove.

1.66. Of the pitches 87 pitches used during the 2021 season, 21 have unsecured community use. The tables below show the unsecure sites, pitch type and current capacity by sub area and how loss of unsecured sites will affect the overall capacity.

**Table 24: Unsecure Sites in Bromsgrove - SA1**

| Site Name | Pitch Supply | Pitch capacity MES | Pitch demand MES | Balance Weekly | Peak period |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Romsley Playing Field | 1x Adult 11v11 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 1 |
| Waseley Hills High School | 1x Adult 11v11 | 2 | 1 | 1 | No spare capacity |
| Waseley Hills High School | 1x Youth 11v11 | 2 | 1 | 1 | No spare capacity |
| Waseley Hills High School | 1x 7v7 | 2 | 1 | 1 | No spare capacity |

**Table 25: Current and future position if unsecured sites used during 2021/22 season were lost – SA1 sub area.**

| Pitch Type | Current position | Reduction in supply of MES if unsecured pitches lost | Position with unsecured sites removed | Future position | Reduction in supply of MES if unsecured pitches lost | Future position with unsecured sites removed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Adult 11v11 | 2 | 4 | -2 | 2 | 4 | -2 |
| Youth 11v11 | 0 | 2 | -2 | 0 | 2 | -2 |
| Mini 7v7 | 0 | 2 | -2 | 0 | 2 | -2 |

1.67. Table 25 suggests that by removing unsecured sites from community use, then adult 11v11, youth 11v11 and mini 7v7 pitches would all be in a current and future deficit of -2 MES per week. However, the impact would likely be significantly less, as neither Romsley Playing Field or Wasely Hills High currently cater for any community football demand. Removing the sites would reduce the overall capacity in the sub-area, but there would be no additional demand to be catered for elsewhere.

**Table 26: Unsecure Sites in Bromsgrove – SA2**

| Site Name | Pitch Supply | Pitch capacity MES | Pitch demand MES | Balance Weekly | Peak period |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Belbroughton Recreation Ground | 1x Adult 11v11 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 |

**Table 27: Current and future position if unsecured sites used during 2021/22 season were lost – SA2 sub area.**

| Pitch Type | Current position | Reduction in supply of MES if unsecured pitches lost | Position with unsecured sites removed | Future position | Reduction in supply of MES if unsecured pitches lost | Future position with unsecured sites removed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Adult 11v11 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0.5 | 1 | -0.5 |

1.68. Table 27 suggests that by removing unsecured sites from community use in the SA2 area, then current spare capacity of adult 11v11 pitches would be reduced to a neutral position. Due to future team growth, this position would worsen to become a deficit of -0.5 MES. However, the impact would likely be significantly less, as Belbroughton Recreation Ground does not currently cater for any community football demand. Removing the site would reduce the overall capacity in the sub-area, but there would be no additional demand to be catered for elsewhere.

**Table 28: Unsecure Sites in Bromsgrove – SA3**

| Site Name | Pitch Supply | Pitch capacity MES | Pitch demand MES | Balance Weekly | Peak period |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Wiggin Memorial Ground | 1x 7v7 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 1 |

**Table 29: Current and future position if unsecured sites used during 2021/22 season were lost – SA3 sub area.**

| Pitch Type | Current position | Reduction in supply of MES if unsecured pitches lost | Position with unsecured sites removed | Future position | Reduction in supply of MES if unsecured pitches lost | Future position with unsecured sites removed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Mini 7v7 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | -2 |

1.69. Table 29 suggests that by removing unsecured sites from community use in the SA3 area, then current spare capacity of 7v7 pitches would be reduced to a neutral position. Due to future team growth, this position would worsen to become a deficit of -2 MES. However, the impact would likely be significantly less, as Wiggin Memorial Ground does not currently cater for any community football demand. Removing the site would reduce the overall capacity in the sub-area, but there would be no additional demand to be catered for elsewhere.

**Table 30: Unsecure Sites in Bromsgrove – SA4**

| Site Name | Pitch Supply | Pitch capacity MES | Pitch demand MES | Balance Weekly | Peak period |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| The Phoenix Group | 1 Adult 11v11 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 1 |
| The Phoenix Group | 1 7v7 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 1 |
| The Phoenix Group | 3 5v5 | 18 | 0 | 18 | 3 |
| The Wendy House | 1 5v5 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Woodrush Community Sports Centre | 1 Adult 11v11 | 1 | 1 | 0 | No spare capacity |
| Woodrush Community Sports Centre | 1 Youth 11v11 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Woodrush Community Sports Centre | 1 7v7 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 1 |
| Woodrush Community Sports Centre | 1 5v5 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 1 |

**Table 31: Current and future position if unsecured sites used during 2021/22 season were lost – SA4 sub area.**

| Pitch Type | Current position | Reduction in supply of MES if unsecured pitches lost | Position with unsecured sites removed | Future position | Reduction in supply of MES if unsecured pitches lost | Future position with unsecured sites removed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Adult 11v11 | 0 | 4 | -4 | -1 | 4 | -5 |
| Youth 11v11 | 2 | 2 | 0 | -1.5 | 2 | -3.5 |
| Mini 7v7 | 4 | 8 | -4 | 0.5 | 8 | -7.5 |
| Mini 5v5 | 6 | 24 | -18 | 3 | 24 | -21 |

1.70. Table 31 suggests that by removing unsecured sites from community use in the SA4 area, then current spare capacity of all pitch types other than 9v9 pitches would be significantly worsened. Due to future team growth, this position would worsen again to create significant deficits. However as in other sub-areas, the impact would likely be significantly less, as none of the unsecured sites currently help to meet any demand for community football. Removing the site would reduce the overall capacity in the sub-area, but there would be no additional demand to be catered for elsewhere.

**Table 32: Unsecure Sites in Bromsgrove – SA5**

| Site Name | Pitch Supply | Pitch capacity MES | Pitch demand MES | Balance Weekly | Peak period |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Catshill Village Meadow | 1 Youth 11v11 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 1 |
| King George V Playing Field | 1 Adult 11v11 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Ryland Centre | 1 Adult 11v11 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 1 |
| Ryland Centre | 1 7v7 | 6 | 0 | 6 | 1 |
| Ryland Centre | 1 5v5 | 6 | 0 | 6 | 1 |

**Table 33: Current and future position if unsecured sites used during 2021/22 season were lost – SA5 sub area.**

| Pitch Type | Current position | Reduction in supply of MES if unsecured pitches lost | Position with unsecured sites removed | Future position | Reduction in supply of MES if unsecured pitches lost | Future position with unsecured sites removed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Adult 11v11 | 3.5 | 4 | -0.5 | 0.5 | 4 | -3.5 |
| Youth 11v11 | -1 | 2 | -3 | -3 | 2 | -5 |
| Mini 7v7 | 2 | 6 | -4 | 1 | 6 | -5 |
| Mini 5v5 | 3 | 6 | -3 | 3 | 6 | -3 |

1.71. Table 33 suggests that by removing unsecured sites from community use in the SA5 area, then current spare capacity of all pitch types other than 9v9 pitches would be significantly worsened. Due to future team growth, this position would worsen again to create significant deficits. However as in other sub-areas, the impact would likely be significantly less, as none of the unsecured sites currently help to meet any demand for community football. Removing the site would reduce the overall capacity in the sub-area, but there would be no additional demand to be catered for elsewhere.

1.72. When this is considered in the wider context of Bromsgrove as a whole, there would be a current deficit of:

- Adult 11v11: -6.5 MES
- Youth 11v11: -5 MES
- Mini 7v7: -10 MES
- Mini 5v5: -21 MES

1.73. If future growth was also considered, across Bromsgrove there would be deficits of:

- Adult 11v11: -11 MES
- Youth 11v11: -10.5 MES
- Mini 7v7: -16.5 MES
- Mini 5v5: -24 MES

1.74. However as stated above, although theoretical capacity for each pitch type in each sub-area, would be lost, there is currently no demand being met by unsecure sites in Bromsgrove. Therefore, there would be no additional demand due to the loss of unsecure grass pitches and the capacity at other, secure sites would not be affected.

1.75. Whilst not always possible, securing community use through formal use agreements between providers and users would ensure that supply continues to be provided for in the long-term. Where there is potential external investment on school sites, there are opportunities to secure community use as part of the funding or approval agreement. For such agreements, it is important to ensure that provision is both accessible at peak time and affordable.

## Scenario 7 – The impact of bringing Council owned disused sites back into use.

1.76. There are several currently disused sites that have previously supported football use located across Bromsgrove and this scenario tests the impact of reinstating them to support community use. Most sites are disused due to a previous lack of demand, and although some minor maintenance work may be required, are feasible to be brought back into the supply of grass football provision.

1.77. Hayes Playing Fields, although currently disused and of very poor quality, is located on the site of a new 3G development, with new ancillary facilities. There are plans for the grass pitches on site to reintroduced to cater for demand from Alvechurch FC.

1.78. Table 34 outlines the site names, pitch types and sub-areas of disused sites in Bromsgrove.

**Table 34: Disused Football Sites in Bromsgrove**

| Site name | Sub-Area | Pitch Type |
|---|---|---|
| Boleyn Road | SA1 | Adult 11v11 |
| Rowney Green | SA3 | Adult 11v11 |
| Hayes Playing Fields | SA3 | Adult 11v11 |
| Aston Fields Recreation Ground | SA5 | Youth 11v11 |
| Aston Fields Recreation Ground | SA5 | Mini 7v7 |
| Garrington's | SA5 | Adult 11v11 |

| Site name | Sub-Area | Pitch Type |
|---|---|---|
| The Meadows | SA5 | Adult 11v11 |
| Sanders Park | SA5 | Youth 11v11 |
| Sanders Park | SA5 | Mini 7v7 |

1.79. The tables below demonstrate the impact of reinstating the pitches above on the capacity balances of pitch types and sub-area. It is presumed that all pitches will be reinstated to a 'standard' quality pitch rating. Each adult and youth 11v11 pitch will receive 2 MES per week of capacity and 7v7 pitches will be assigned 4 MES per week.

**Table 35: Current and future position if disused sites were reinstated – SA1 sub area**

| Pitch Type | Current position | Increase in supply of MES if disused sites reinstated | Position with disused sites used | Future position | Increase in supply of MES if disused sites reinstated | Future position with disused sites used |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Adult 11v11 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 4 |

1.80. Table 35 suggests that by reinstating the adult 11v11 at Boleyn Road, the current and future spare capacity will increase to 4 MES per week in SA1.

**Table 36: Current and future position if disused sites were reinstated – SA3 sub area**

| Pitch Type | Current position | Increase in supply of MES if disused sites reinstated | Position with disused sites used | Future position | Increase in supply of MES if disused sites reinstated | Future position with disused sites used |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Adult 11v11 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 0.5 | 4 | 4.5 |

1.81. Table 36 suggests that by reinstating the adult 11v11 pitches at Rowney Green and Hayes Playing Field, the current spare capacity will increase from 2 MES to 6 MES for senior pitches in SA3. When taking into account future growth, spare capacity will increase from 0.5 MES to 4.5 MES per week in SA3.

**Table 37: Current and future position if disused sites were reinstated – SA5 sub area**

| Pitch Type | Current position | Increase in supply of MES if disused sites reinstated | Position with disused sites used | Future position | Increase in supply of MES if disused sites reinstated | Future position with disused sites used |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Adult 11v11 | 3.5 | 4 | 7.5 | 0.5 | 4 | 4.5 |
| Youth 11v11 | -1 | 4 | 3 | -3 | 4 | 1 |
| Mini 7v7 | 2 | 8 | 10 | 1 | 8 | 7 |

1.82. Table 37 states that by reinstating the adult 11v11 pitches at Aston Fields, Garringtons, The Meadows and Sanders Park, the current spare capacity on adult 11v11 pitches will increase from 3.5 MES to 7.5 MES in SA5. When taking into account future growth, spare capacity will increase from 0.5 MES to 4.5 MES per week in SA5.

1.83. If youth 11v11 pitches in SA5 were reinstated, the current deficit of -1 MES would turn into 3 MES of spare capacity. The future position of -3 MES would also improve, creating 1 MES of spare capacity by 2040.

1.84. The picture for mini 7v7 pitches would improve significantly, through the creation of 8 MES of additional capacity in the sub-area. There would be future positions of 10 MES and 7 MES of current and future spare capacity.

## Scenario 8 – The impact on future capacity if latent demand predictions are not realised or only 50% realised.

1.85. Through consultation with clubs, a significant amount of latent demand was identified which contributed towards the future growth predictions outlined in the Stage C future capacity analysis. However latent demand identified by clubs is aspirational and often not realised or only part realised. This scenario will consider the impact on future capacity of football pitches if latent demand is not realised or only 50% realised.

1.86. The tables below highlight the changes in the future position of each type of grass football pitch when considering: only population growth; 50% latent demand; 100% latent demand.

1.87. There cannot be 0.25 demand, therefore if the 100% latent demand column identifies .5 MES of growth, then this will be rounded down to the nearest whole number in the 50% latent demand column.

**Table 38: Adult 11v11 Supply and Demand Analysis - All Figures in MES**

| Analysis Area | Future position – Population Growth Only | 50% Latent Demand | Future position – 50% Latent Demand | 100% Latent demand | Future position – 100% Latent Demand |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SA1 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| SA2 | 0.5 | 0 | 0.5 | 0 | 0.5 |
| SA3 | 1.5 | 0.5 | 1 | 1 | 0.5 |
| SA4 | -0.5 | 0 | -0.5 | 0.5 | -1 |
| SA5 | 1.5 | 0.5 | 1 | 1 | 0.5 |
| **Bromsgrove** | **5** | **1** | **4** | **2.5** | **2.5** |

**Table 39: Youth 11v11 Supply and Demand Analysis - Peak. All Figures in MES**

| Analysis Area | Future position – Population Growth Only | 50% Latent Demand | Future position – 50% Latent Demand | 100% Latent demand | Future position – 100% Latent Demand |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SA1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SA2 | -1 | 1 | -2 | 2 | -3 |
| SA3 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | -1 |
| SA4 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2.5 | -1.5 |
| SA5 | -2.5 | 0 | -2.5 | 0.5 | -3 |
| **Bromsgrove** | **-1.5** | **3.5** | **-5** | **7** | **-8.5** |

**Table 40: 9v9 Supply and Demand Analysis - Peak. All Figures in MES**

| Analysis Area | Future position – Population Growth Only | 50% Latent Demand | Future position – 50% Latent Demand | 100% Latent demand | Future position – 100% Latent Demand |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SA1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

| Analysis Area | Future position – Population Growth Only | 50% Latent Demand | Future position – 50% Latent Demand | 100% Latent demand | Future position – 100% Latent Demand |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SA2 | -1.5 | 0.5 | -2 | 1.5 | -3 |
| SA3 | -0.5 | 1 | -1.5 | 2 | -2.5 |
| SA4 | -1 | 1 | -2 | 2.5 | -3.5 |
| SA5 | -1 | 0.5 | -1.5 | 1.5 | -2.5 |
| **Bromsgrove** | **-4** | **3.5** | **-7.5** | **7.5** | **-11.5** |

**Table 41: 7v7 Supply and Demand Analysis - Peak. All Figures in MES**

| Analysis Area | Future position – Population Growth Only | 50% Latent Demand | Future position – 50% Latent Demand | 100% Latent demand | Future position – 100% Latent Demand |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SA1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SA2 | -0.5 | 0.5 | 0 | 1.5 | -2 |

| Analysis Area | Future position – Population Growth Only | 50% Latent Demand | Future position – 50% Latent Demand | 100% Latent demand | Future position – 100% Latent Demand |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SA3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 |
| SA4 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2.5 | 0.5 |
| SA5 | 1.5 | 0 | 1.5 | 0.5 | 1 |
| **Bromsgrove** | **6** | **3** | **3** | **6.5** | **-0.5** |

**Table 42: 5v5 Supply and Demand Analysis - Peak. All Figures in MES**

| Analysis Area | Future position – Population Growth Only | 50% Latent Demand | Future position – 50% Latent Demand | 100% Latent demand | Future position – 100% Latent Demand |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SA1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SA2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.5 | -0.5 |
| SA3 | 0 | 1 | -1 | 2 | -2 |

| Analysis Area | Future position – Population Growth Only | 50% Latent Demand | Future position – 50% Latent Demand | 100% Latent demand | Future position – 100% Latent Demand |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SA4 | 5.5 | 1 | 4.5 | 2.5 | 3 |
| SA5 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 |
| **Bromsgrove** | **8.5** | **2.5** | **6** | **5** | **3.5** |

## Football Recommendations

1. Protect existing quantity of pitches (unless replacement provision is agreed upon and provided).
2. Work to reinstate currently disused Council owned football pitches into circulation to support current and future community usage. Particular focus should be on reinstating the youth 11v11 pitches at Aston Fields Recreation Ground and Sanders Park, which will have a significant impact on the reducing the predicted future shortfalls of this pitch type.
3. Where pitches are overplayed and/or assessed as 'Poor' or 'Standard' quality, prioritise investment and review maintenance regimes to ensure it is of an appropriate standard to sustain use and improve quality to a 'good' standard.
4. Work to accommodate future demand as well as unmet and latent demand at sites which are not operating at capacity, or at sites not currently available for community use that could become so, moving forward. There are a number of sites throughout Bromsgrove, that are available for community use, but not currently supporting any formal football activity. Utilising Romsley Paying Field (SA1), Belbroughton Rec Ground (SA2), The Pheonix Group (SA4), Catshill Village Meadow (SA5) and The Ryland Centre (SA5) should be a priority.
5. Improve ancillary facilities where there is a demand to do so and where it can benefit the wider footballing offer, particularly for women and girls. Potential focus should be on poor quality facilities at Charford Rec Ground (SA5) and Catshill Village Meadow (SA5).

## Bromsgrove District Council PPS – Hockey Stage D Findings

## Hockey Pitch Summary – key Issues

1. There are currently four full size, hockey suitable AGPs in Bromsgrove. Bromsgrove Cricket, Hockey and Tennis Club and Woodrush Community Sports Centre cater for community hockey demand. Bromsgrove School is a private education site, with two sand dressed 3G pitches that are unavailable for community use.

2. Bromsgrove Hockey Club are the only club based in the area. They are a large club with the thriving junior section based at Bromsgrove Cricket, Hockey and Tennis Club. Kings Heath Pickwick HC are based outside of the study area, but use Woodrush Community Sports Centre for all their training and match play demand.

3. The AGP at Bromsgrove Cricket Hockey and Tennis Club is currently at full capacity, forcing some teams from Bromsgrove HC to use Droitwich Leisure Centre, outside of the study area.

## Scenario 9 – The loss of Bromsgrove Cricket, Hockey and Tennis Club

1.88. There are proposals for the land at Bromsgrove Cricket, Hockey and Tennis Club in SA5,to be used to support the District's housing development plan. This scenario will explore the impact on hockey of the loss of this site and options for its replacement.

1.89. The site currently supports 28 hours per week of hockey usage as highlighted in table 43. The deficit of supply on a Saturday is met outside of the study area at Droitwich Leisure Centre.

**Table 43: Supply and Demand Balance for Hockey at Bromsgrove Cricket, Hockey and Tennis Club**

| Site name | Supply (hours) | | | Demand (Hours: training and matches) | | | Balance (hours) | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Week | Sat | Sun | Week | Sat | Sun | Week | Sat | Sun |
| Bromsgrove Cricket, Hocket and Tennis Club | 20 | 8 | 8 | 14 | 9 | 5 | 6 | -1 | 3 |

1.90. Although Droitwich Leisure Centre is able to cater for some of Bromsgrove's exported demand, the site is also home to Droitwich Hockey Club and therefore could not support an additional 28 hours per week.

1.91. As highlighted in table 44, Woodrush Community Sports Centre is the only other hockey suitable AGP in Bromsgrove. It currently meets 16.5 hours of demand from Kings Heath Pickwick HC and Hollywood United FC. This leaves 8 hours of spare capacity mid-week, 5.5 hours on Saturdays and 3 hours on Sundays.

**Table 44: Supply and Demand Balance for Hockey at Woodrush Community Sports Centre**

| Site name | Supply (hours) | | | Demand (Hours: training and matches) | | | Balance (hours) | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Week | Sat | Sun | Week | Sat | Sun | Week | Sat | Sun |
| Woodrush Community Sports Centre | 20 | 8 | 8 | 12 | 2.5 | 2 | 8 | 5.5 | 3 |

1.92. Based on this capacity analysis, this site could not support the additional demand from Bromsgrove HC as a result of the loss of their site. Woodrush Community Sports Centre is located in SA3, and is around a 30 minute drive from Bromsgrove Cricket Hockey and Tennis Club. This may have an impact on the level of participation if demand was relocated.

1.93. If Bromsgrove Cricket Hockey and Tennis Club is lost, then a new development would be required. Any new development would require a full size, floodlit hockey specific AGP. The site would ideally be located in the SA5 sub area, as this is where most of the demand is currently being met, however provision could be located anywhere within a 20 minute drive time of the current facility. A site currently under local authority ownership, which would not result in the loss of other grass or artificial pitches would also be beneficial.

1.94. The development of a new, full-size hockey AGP would be able to meet most of Bromsgrove Hockey Club's demand needs. There is currently a small amount of unmet demand from the club at the current site, however this is a result of the demand from adult hockey during peak time on Saturday. Unless there was a reduction in the number of adult teams, this demand cannot be met by any AGP at peak time, meaning that a new development may still not be able to cater for the current displaced demand, unless it consisted of two full size hockey AGPs.

1.95. It must also be considered that there are two full-size, sand-dressed AGPs at Bromsgrove School which are currently not available for community hockey use. The development of a community use agreement with the school would result in all current and future hockey demand being met, with ample flexibility for future growth.

## Scenario 10 – The impact of the loss of Woodrush Community Sports Centre AGP on Kings Heath Pickwick HC

1.96. Woodrush Community Sports Centre is an education owned facility in SA3, which includes 1 full size sand-dressed AGP.

1.97. The site currently supports use from Kings Heath Pickwick HC and Hollywood United FC, but does have a considerable amount of spare capacity. Table 45 below outlines the supply and demand analysis for the pitch.

**Table 45: Supply and Demand Balance for Hockey at Woodrush Community Sports Centre**

| Site name | Supply (hours) | | | Demand (Hours: training and matches) | | | Balance (hours) | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Week | Sat | Sun | Week | Sat | Sun | Week | Sat | Sun |
| Woodrush Community Sports Centre | 20 | 8 | 8 | 12 | 2.5 | 2 | 8 | 5.5 | 3 |

1.98. Although Kings Heath Pickwick HC are based outside of Bromsgrove, Woodrush Community Sports Centre is the only AGP which they use. Of the demand highlighted in table 45, they use the AGP for 1 hour mid-week, 2.5 hours on Saturday and 2 hours Sunday.

1.99. Although the hockey club's mid-week and Sunday demand, could theoretically be met at Bromsgrove Cricket Hockey and Tennis Club, their match play requirements on Saturdays could not. The site is also a significant distance from the hockey club's location which may affect participation negatively.

## Scenario 11 – The impact of further imported demand at Woodrush Community Sports Centre

1.100. As outlined in table 45 above, there is currently 8 hours of spare capacity mid-week, 5.5 hours on Saturday and 3 hours Sunday at Woodrush Community Sports Centre AGP.

1.101. The following assumptions on peak times have been developed, based on standard practice for competitive grass roots hockey:

- There are 4 x 2 hours match slots on Saturday per pitch
- There are 4 x 1.5 hours match slots on Sunday per pitch
- Adult games are played on Saturdays
- Junior games are played on Sundays
- All teams require 0.5 games per weekend, due to home and away fixtures

- All teams require 1 hour of mid-week training per week

1.102. Based on the assumptions above and the spare capacity indicated in table 45, there are 2 match play sessions available on Saturdays and 1 available on Sundays.

1.103. Therefore, it could be concluded that Woodrush Community Sports Centre AGP could meet the match play demand for an additional 4 adult teams and 2 junior teams. The mid-week training demand for these 6 new teams could also be met.

## Hockey Recommendations

1. Protect all current hockey sites, including Bromsgrove Cricket, Hockey and Tennis Club, in accordance with Sport England's Playing Fields Policy, which opposes any development which would lead to the loss of a current playing pitch, land allocated for playing pitch provision or land which has previously been used as a playing field.

2. If the AGP at Bromsgrove Cricket Hockey and Tennis Club is lost, development of a replacement full size, floodlit hockey specific AGP is required in the SA5 sub area.

3. Protect Woodrush Community Sports Centre to prevent further deficit of hockey AGPs in the District and to allow for further growth or increased imported demand

4. Develop community use agreements with Bromsgrove School to secure the future of hockey in Bromsgrove.

## Bromsgrove District Council PPS – Cricket Stage D Findings

1.104. To help develop the recommendations/actions and to understand their potential impact, several relevant scenario questions are tested against the key issues in this section for each playing pitch sport, resulting in sport specific recommendations.

## Cricket – Grass Pitch Summary key issues

1. There is spare capacity across Bromsgrove as a whole, however this is a result of significant levels of spare capacity in SA3 (126 MPS). There is current overplaying of cricket wickets in SA2 (-15 MPS) and SA5 (-33 MPS).

2. New population growth, latent demand expectations and the growth of women's and girls' cricket will lead to an expected shortfall in provision by 2040 across Bromsgrove of -264 MPS. However, this is mainly a result of latent demand predictions in the SA2 area.

3. All grass wickets are of good or standard quality in Bromsgrove. NTP's on community sports clubs' sites are also of a standard quality. However artificial wickets on education sites are poor and only cater for curricular use.

4. Where possible, facilities should have improved pavilions and clubhouses, nets, and car parking at existing facilities.

## Scenario 12 – Addressing shortfalls in provision – wicket quality improvements

1.105. This scenario considers options for addressing the current and future capacity deficits of grass wickets in Bromsgrove, in particular in SA2 and SA5.

1.106. Table 46 provides an overview of the current position for grass wickets by sub-area.

**Table 46: Current and Future Position for Adult Grass Wickets in Bromsgrove**

| Analysis Area | Site capacity | Current demand | Current position | Total Future demand | Future position |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SA1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SA2 | 274 | 289 | -15 | 471 | -197 |
| SA3 | 268 | 142 | 126 | 230 | 38 |
| SA4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SA5 | 290 | 323 | -33 | 395 | -105 |
| **Total - Bromsgrove** | **832** | **754** | **78** | **1096** | **-264** |

1.107. As table 46 shows, although there is a current spare capacity of 78 MPS District-wide, there is a deficit of -15 MPS in SA2 and -33 MPS in SA5. These deficits are expected to increase significantly by 2040 to -197 MPS in SA2 and -105 MPS in SA5, largely as a result of latent demand.

1.108. One option to reduce these deficits is to improve the quality of grass wickets. Table 47 explores the impact bringing all grass wickets to a 'good' quality standard would have on capacity. This analysis will only be carried out for grass wickets as part of this scenario. A standard quality grass wicket can support 4 MPS, whilst a good quality grass wicket can cater for 5 MPS. There are no poor-quality grass wickets in the study area.

**Table 47: Improving All Grass Wickets to 'Good'**

| Playing Pitch Sites | Sub Area | Squares | Quality of Provision | Grass Wickets | Grass Supply (MPS) | Grass Demand | Grass Balance (MPS) | Grass Supply After Improvements (MPS) | Grass Balance After Improvements (MPS) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Belbroughton CC | SA2 | 1 | Good | 12 | 60 | 85 | -25 | 60 | -25 |
| Centenary Fields East | SA2 | 1 | Standard | 6 | 24 | 14 | 10 | 30 | 16 |
| Hagley CC | SA2 | 1 | Good | 15 | 75 | 100 | -25 | 75 | -25 |
| Old Halesonians Association | SA2 | 1 | Good | 10 | 50 | 40 | 10 | 50 | 10 |
| Romsley and Hunnington Sports Club | SA2 | 1 | Good | 13 | 65 | 50 | 15 | 65 | 15 |
| Alvechurch and Hopwood CC | SA3 | 1 | Good | 8 | 40 | 40 | 0 | 40 | 0 |
| Barnt Green CC | SA3 | 2 | Good | 25 | 125 | 52 | 73 | 125 | 73 |
| Five Ways Old Edwardians Sports Club | SA3 | 1 | Good | 15 | 75 | 30 | 45 | 75 | 45 |
| Hopwood Cricket Ground | SA3 | 1 | Standard | 7 | 28 | 20 | 8 | 35 | 15 |
| Avoncroft CC | SA5 | 1 | Good | 8 | 40 | 80 | -40 | 40 | -40 |
| Bromsgrove Cricket Hockey and Tennis Club | SA5 | 3 | Good | 32 | 160 | 153 | 7 | 160 | 7 |
| Bromsgrove School | SA5 | 3 | Good | 18 | 90 | 90 | 0 | 90 | 0 |
| | | | **BROMSGROVE** | **169** | **832** | **754** | **78** | **845** | **91** |

1.109. The result of improving all grass wickets to good quality, is an increase in the overall capacity of 13 MPS. Table 48 below analyses the impact of this on each sub area and how it affects future capacity.

**Table 48: Current and Future Position for Adult Grass Wickets**

| Analysis Area | Site capacity After Improvements (MPS) | Current demand | Current position After Improvements (MPS) | Total Future demand | Future position After Improvements (MPS) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SA1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SA2 | 280 | 289 | -9 | 471 | -191 |
| SA3 | 275 | 142 | 133 | 230 | 45 |
| SA4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SA5 | 290 | 323 | -33 | 395 | -105 |
| **Total - Bromsgrove** | **845** | **754** | **91** | **1096** | **-251** |

1.110. As the two current 'standard' wickets are located in SA2 and SA3, these are the only sub areas that are effected by grass wicket improvements. As table 48 highlights the current deficit of -15 MPS would be reduced to -9 MPS in SA2. When factoring in population growth and latent demand, the future deficit would decrease from -197 MPS to -191 MPS.

1.111. In SA3, there would be an increase of 7 MPS to create 133 MPS of spare capacity. The future spare capacity would also increase by 7, from 38 MPS to 45 MPS by 2040.

1.112. If all wickets were improved to a good standard, then there would currently be 91 MPS of spare capacity. However, after population growth and latent demand are considered, there would still remain a significant future deficit of -251.

1.113. Another option to reduce the capacity deficits across Bromsgrove is to further utilise the non-turf pitches (NTPs).

## Scenario 13 – Addressing shortfalls in provision - The impact of all junior cricket moving to non-turf wickets

1.114. This scenario considers the impact on the supply and demand balance of grass wickets in Bromsgrove, if all junior cricket was moved to non-turf wickets.

1.115. In the 2021 season, there were 73 junior teams, equating to a demand for 584 MPS (8 MPS per junior team). Table 49 below provides an overview of the junior cricket provision in Bromsgrove.

**Table 49: Junior cricket demand by club**

| Club | Sub-Area (Home Ground Location) | No. of junior teams | Demand MPS |
|---|---|---|---|
| Belbroughton CC | SA2 | 13 | 104 |
| Hagley CC | SA2 | 7 | 56 |
| Romsley and Hunnington Sports Club | SA2 | 4 | 32 |
| Alvechurch and Hopwood CC | SA3 | 9 | 72 |
| Barnt Green CC | SA3 | 11 | 88 |
| Avoncroft CC | SA5 | 8 | 64 |
| Bromsgrove CC | SA5 | 21 | 168 |
| | | **73** | **584** |

1.116. If this is broken down into sub areas, there would be a demand of 192 MPS from SA2, 160 MPS from SA3 and 232 from SA5. Table 50 shows the impact to the current supply and demand balance at individual sites if all junior cricket was placed onto non-turf wickets.

1.117. Belbroughton CC already have some demand being met by NTPs, therefore the demand removed from the site below will be slightly reduced from the figures in table 49.

1.118. Alvechurch and Hopwood CC also meet some of their demand on NTPs so the reduction in demand will reflect this. However, their junior teams utilise both Alvechurch and Hopwood CC site and Hopwood Cricket Ground, therefore this reduction in demand will be split between the sites.

**Table 50: Supply and demand balance for cricket sites in Bromsgrove if junior cricket was removed from grass wickets**

| Playing Pitch Sites | Sub Area | Squares | Quality of Provision* | Grass Wickets (Grass) | Grass Supply (MPS) | Current Demand (Grass) | Current Balance (MPS) | Demand without junior cricket | Balance without junior cricket (MPS) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Belbroughton CC | SA2 | 1 | Good | 12 | 60 | 85 | -25 | 16 | 44 |
| Hagley CC | SA2 | 1 | Good | 15 | 75 | 100 | -25 | 44 | 31 |
| Romsley and Hunnington Sports Club | SA2 | 1 | Good | 13 | 65 | 50 | 15 | 18 | 47 |
| Alvechurch and Hopwood CC | SA3 | 1 | Good | 8 | 40 | 40 | 0 | 4 | 36 |
| Hopwood Cricket Ground | SA3 | 1 | Standard | 7 | 28 | 20 | 8 | 0 | 28 |
| Barnt Green CC | SA3 | 2 | Good | 25 | 125 | 52 | 73 | 0 | 125 |
| Avoncroft CC | SA5 | 1 | Good | 8 | 40 | 80 | -40 | 16 | 24 |
| Bromsgrove Cricket Hockey and Tennis Club | SA5 | 3 | Good | 32 | 160 | 153 | 7 | 0 | 160 |

1.119. Table 50 shows that relocating all junior cricket to non-turf wickets, would significantly increase the spare capacity at individual sites.

1.120. However, it is also important to understand how the scenario will impact each sub area and Bromsgrove as a whole, currently and by 2040. Table 51 again highlights the current and future position for grass wickets in Bromsgrove, with junior cricket being met on grass wickets. Table 52 sets out the predicted growth of junior cricket through population growth and latent demand by 2040. Table 52 suggests that there will be 26 new junior teams by 2040, equating to additional demand of 208 MPS. This can be broken down into sub areas, with the junior cricket in SA2 demanding an additional 120 MPS by 2040, SA3 will have an extra 48 MPS, and SA5 will see demand for an additional 40 MPS from junior cricket.

**Table 51: Current and Future Position for Adult Grass Wickets**

| Analysis Area | Site capacity | Current demand | Current position | Total Future demand | Future position |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SA1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SA2 | 274 | 289 | -15 | 471 | -197 |
| SA3 | 268 | 142 | 126 | 230 | 38 |
| SA4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SA5 | 290 | 323 | -33 | 395 | -105 |
| **Total - Bromsgrove** | **832** | **754** | **78** | **1096** | **-264** |

**Table 52: Total projected future cricket team growth by Sub Area**

| Analysis Area | Adult Teams | | Junior Teams | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Population Growth | Latent Demand | Population Growth | Latent Demand | |
| **SA2** | 4 | 1 | 6 | 9 | **20** |
| **SA3** | 3 | 1 | 4 | 2 | **10** |
| **SA5** | 3 | 1 | 5 | 0 | **8** |
| **Total - Bromsgrove** | **10** | **3** | **15** | **11** | **39** |

1.121. All information above can then be filtered into table 53 which highlights the current and future position for grass wickets in Bromsgrove, if all junior cricket demand was met by non-turf wickets.

**Table 53: Current and Future Position for Grass Wickets – Junior demand met on non-turf wickets**

| Analysis Area | Site capacity | Current demand | Current position | Total Future demand | Future position |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SA1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SA2 | 274 | 132 | 142 | 172 | 102 |

| Analysis Area | Site capacity | Current demand | Current position | Total Future demand | Future position |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SA3 | 268 | 34 | 234 | 66 | 202 |
| SA4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SA5 | 290 | 106 | 184 | 138 | 152 |
| **Total - Bromsgrove** | **832** | **272** | **560** | **376** | **456** |

1.122. The impact of the scenario is significant. The would be an increase in the current spare capacity across Bromsgrove from 78 MPS to 560 MPS.

1.123. The biggest impact would be made when considering the future position. The current predicted deficit of -264 across the study area would turn into 456 MPS of spare capacity by 2040

1.124. However, Bromsgrove does not have the non-turf wicket infrastructure to support all junior cricket. Currently there are just four good or standard quality NTPs in the study area, creating a possible capacity of 240 MPS. ECB guidelines state a good quality artificial wicket can support 60 MPS for junior cricket. A poor quality NTP is not assigned any carrying capacity.

1.125. In the 2021 season there was a demand for 584 MPS of junior cricket, and there will be a demand for 792 MPS of junior cricket by 2040. This suggests that there is a need for a total of 13 good or standard quality non-turf wickets in Bromsgrove by 2040.

1.126. There are currently 13 NTPs in Bromsgrove, however 8 of them of poor quality and located on education sites. The improvement of these NTPs and securing community use of them, would have a significant impact on cricket provision in Bromsgrove.

1.127. However, whilst use of education sites would provide additional capacity for junior cricket in Bromsgrove, it is likely that the preferred option for clubs would be to retain junior demand on their own sites. Belbroughton CC, Hagley CC, Alvechurch and Hopwood CC and Avoncroft CC sites are all currently overplayed or have no spare capacity. The development of one additional NTP on each of these sites would result in spare capacity.

1.128. PriorIty for NTP development at club sites should be focused on Hagley CC and Avoncroft CC as this is where the largest overall deficits of provision are. Belbroughton CC has a NTP that has the capacity to support a small amount of additional junior demand and Alvechurch and Hopwood CC is not currently in a deficit, although will be by 2040.

1.129. However, moving junior cricket activity onto NTPs would significantly reduce the quality of junior cricket across Bromsgrove, and dependent on pitch quality, may cause some safety concerns. The cost of implementing and maintaining NTPs can be detrimental for clubs, and additional NTPs may involve the loss of grass wickets if there is a shortage of space on sites.

## Scenario 14 – The impact of Dynamos and Allstars use of the outfield and its impact on training for other teams

1.130. Through consultation, 108 Dynamos and Allstar cricket sessions took place across Bromsgrove in 2021. These sessions are aimed at 5 – 11-year-olds and are focussed on fun, skill development and fundamental movement in the context of cricket, where parental involvement and engagement is encouraged.

1.131. These sessions do not take place on grass or artificial wickets, rather make use of indoor space, the outfield or other informal outdoor space. Formal cricket training for adult and older junior teams takes place in nets or occasionally on the outfield. No conflict of use was highlighted through any of the cricket club consultation.

1.132. However, the growth of Dynamos and All Stars cricket, is resulting in outfields being used more regularly, therefore worsening the condition. In some cases, this may affect whether the ground can facilitate fixtures on the grass or artificial wickets. Some match play demand from junior cricket is also being met on the outfield to reduce demand on grass wickets. However, if outfields continue to deteriorate, then this junior demand may be forced to return to grass wickets, increasing the deficit of provision in some areas.

1.133. Worcestershire Cricket and the ECB are hopeful that the growth of Dynamo and All Star cricket will lead to further growth of the junior game. Although this is a positive, demand for cricket provision will be enhanced, placing further stress on the current supply of cricket facilities. Securing use of indoor facilities, informal spaces at cricket sites, as well as the development of additional NTPs for junior cricket will all contribute to making the growth of Dynamo and All Starts cricket more sustainable in the future.

## Scenario 15 – The impact of club use of outgrounds and their suitability and security

1.134. Only Alvechurch and Hopwood CC have use of a formal out-ground. Hopwood Cricket Ground helps to meet 20 MPS of demand from the club, which is possible in part due to the club's ownership of the site. This ownership provides a security and flexibility for the club to continue to grow.

1.135. Avoncroft CC stated through consultation, that because of their rapidly expanding junior section, and growth of the senior game as a result, their current site cannot facilitate the level of demand needed. Therefore, the club are forced to rent facilities outside of Bromsgrove, in Kidderminster to ensure all junior teams are provided for. This is not a formal out-ground and there is no security of use.

## Cricket Recommendations

- Develop secure community use agreements at education sites in Bromsgrove. This would minimise the impact of team growth and the shortfall in grass wickets that is predicted by 2040.
- Consider the development of additional non-turf wickets at existing club sites, prioritising Avoncroft CC and Hagley CC. However, this must not result in the loss of grass provision.
- Improve existing non-turf wickets on educational sites, enabling them to safely meet junior cricket demand, therefore creating extra capacity on grass wickets for adult provision. The development of community use agreements would again be imperative for this,
- Consider the development of additional grass wickets at Avoncroft CC and Bromsgrove Cricket Hockey and Tennis Club.

## Bromsgrove District Council PPS – Rugby Union Stage D Findings

## Rugby Union Pitch Summary – Key Issues

- There are currently 10 rugby union sites in Bromsgrove, with a total of 34 pitches. 38% of these pitches are in the SA3 sub area, with 29% being situated in SA5 and 26% in SA2 and 9% in SA4. There is no rugby union provision in SA1. Of these pitches, 85% are rated good and the remaining 15% are of standard quality.
- In terms of demand, 76 teams were identified during the consultation process, again with the highest concentration being in SA3, followed by SA2 and then SA4. 21% of the teams are adult male, 44% youth and 35% minis.

- There are no mini or junior rugby union pitches in Bromsgrove, which means that junior and mini demand is having to be met by senior pitches. However, having more full size pitches allows for a wider range of rugby union to be catered for. Mini and junior pitches are designed to fit within the dimensions of a full size pitch, which has a positive effect on maintenance by allowing all pitch types to be maintained to the same high standard.
- Based on the supply and demand analysis, there is currently an under supply of 9.5 MES for training and a surplus of 18 MES for match play across the study area. A large proportion of the oversupply of match sessions is generated by the SA2 area. The SA2 area is also responsible for the deficit of training sessions.
- Across Bromsgrove 85% of pitches are rated as good
- Based on population growth, latent demand and expected increase in female participation, it is estimated that will be a total of 34 new teams in Bromsgrove by 2040. The majority of this growth is predicted to come from latent demand. It should be noted that latent demand is gauged through consultations with clubs, and this perceived growth often does not meet expectations. 20 of these new teams are predicted to be generated by the SA3 sub area.
- Due to the expected increased future demand for rugby union provision, the under supply of training availability is expected to increase to -45.5 MES. This increase is nearly all a result of latent demand predictions for team growth in the SA3 sub area, and a lack of floodlit provision.
- The current spare capacity of 18 MES for match play is expected to reduce to 1 MES by 2040 when latent demand and population growth are considered. The only expected change in the supply of rugby union pitches in Bromsgrove is the development of one further senior pitch at Kings Norton RFC, however this is unlikely to affect the supply and demand balance significantly.

## Scenario 16 – The additional of extra floodlit provision to address the mid-week training shortfall

1.136. This scenario considers the impact of developing additional pitch floodlighting to address the current deficit of mid-week training provision. Table 54 below shows the current and future balance for grass rugby pitches in Bromsgrove.

**Table 54: Current and Future Position for All Community Available Rugby Grass Provision**

| Sub Area | Current Balance | | Projected Balance | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Training | Match | Training | Match |
| SA2 | -5 | 12 | -8 | 10.5 |
| SA3 | -3 | 5 | -29 | -8 |
| SA4 | -1.5 | 1 | -8.5 | -1.5 |
| SA5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Bromsgrove Study Area | **-9.5** | **18** | **-45.5** | **1** |

1.137. As highlighted in table 54, there is a current shortfall of -9.5 MES for training demand across Bromsgrove. -5 MES of this is generated in SA2, -3 MES in SA3 and -1.5 MES in SA4. There is no rugby provision in SA1, and all rugby pitches in SA5 are located on education sites and support no community demand.

1.138. Table 55 provides an overview of rugby pitches in Bromsgrove, currently used to meet community demand.

**Table 55: Rugby Site Breakdown**

| Site Name | Sub area | No. Adult Pitches | Pitch Quality | Capacity Per Pitch | No. Floodlit Pitches | No. Mini/Midi Pitches |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Old Halesonians Association | SA2 | 6 | All Pitches M2/D1 | 3 | 1 | 3 |
| Bromsgrove Rugby Club | SA3 | 4 | All Pitches M1/D1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |

| Site Name | Sub area | No. Adult Pitches | Pitch Quality | Capacity Per Pitch | No. Floodlit Pitches | No. Mini/Midi Pitches |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Five Ways Old Edwardians | SA3 | 2 | All Pitches M2/D1 | 3 | 1 | 0 |
| Kings Norton RFC | SA3 | 3 | All Pitches M2/D1 | 3 | 1 | 0 |
| Woodrush Rugby Club | SA4 | 3 | All Pitches M2/D1 | 3 | 1 | 0 |

1.139. Table 56 outlines the current supply of grass pitches currently used for community rugby, and how they support training demand from clubs. Only floodlit pitches can be used to meet training demand due to the winter rugby season.

**Table 56: Current Supply and Demand Capacity Balance by Site (All Figures in MES)**

| Site | Sub Area | Availability | Security | Number of Floodlit Pitches | Mid-Week Day/Training | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | Supply | Demand | Balance |
| Old Halesonians Association | SA2 | Available | Secured | **1** | 3 | 8 | -5 |
| Bromsgrove Rugby Club | SA3 | Available | Secured | **3** | 6 | 6.5 | -0.5 |

| Site | Sub Area | Availability | Security | Number of Floodlit Pitches | Mid-Week Day/Training | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | Supply | Demand | Balance |
| Five Ways Old Edwardians | SA3 | Available | Secured | 1 | 3 | 4 | -1 |
| Kings Norton RFC | SA3 | Available | Secured | 2 | 6 | 4.5 | 1.5 |
| Woodrush Rugby Club | SA4 | Available | Secured | 1 | 3 | 4.5 | -1.5 |
| **Overview of Secure Available Sites** | | | | **8** | **21** | **27.5** | **-6.5** |

1.140. With the current stock of floodlit pitches, there is a deficit of training provision of -6.5 MES. The analysis in table 57 below will explore how many additional pitches will need floodlit provision to meet the current demand for training.

**Table 57: Current Supply and Demand Capacity Balance by Site (All Figures in MES) - Increased number of floodlit pitches**

| Site | Sub Area | Availability | Security | Number of Floodlit Pitches | Mid-Week Day/Training | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | Supply | Demand | Balance |
| Old Halesonians Association | SA2 | Available | Secured | 3 | 9 | 8 | 1 |
| Bromsgrove Rugby Club | SA3 | Available | Secured | 4 | 8 | 6.5 | 1.5 |
| Five Ways Old Edwardians | SA3 | Available | Secured | 2 | 6 | 4 | 2 |
| Kings Norton RFC | SA3 | Available | Secured | 3 | 9 | 4.5 | 4.5 |
| Woodrush Rugby Club | SA4 | Available | Secured | 2 | 6 | 4.5 | 1.5 |
| **Overview of Secure Available Sites** | | | | **14** | **38** | **27.5** | **10.5** |

1.141. Table 57 suggests that to meet training demand, an additional 6 pitches would need floodlights in Bromsgrove. If this development was to happen, it would result in 10.5 MES of spare training capacity. SA2 would require 2 additional floodlit pitches, resulting in 1 MES of spare capacity. SA4 would require 1 additional floodlit pitch which would provide 1.5 MES of spare training capacity. There are 3 sites in SA3, which would require a total of 3 additional floodlit pitches to meet demand. The addition of these floodlights would result in a 8 MES of spare mid-week capacity in SA3.

1.142. However, use of grass pitches to support training demand, would reduce their capacity to meet weekend match play demand. In the scenario above, grass pitches in Bromsgrove would support an additional 9.5 MES mid-week. This would reduce the current spare capacity for match play from 18 MES per week to 8.5 MES.

1.143. When considering future demand for training, there is a deficit of -42.5 MES. To meet this demand on floodlit grass pitches would require an additional 14 pitches to be floodlit. As there are only 18 pitches available for community use in Bromsgrove, this is not realistic.

1.144. Dependent on available space and where possible, it may be financially beneficial for clubs to develop designated floodlit training space, which does not aim to support any match play demand. This would mean that no capacity would be taken away from pitches used to support match play. However, even if these 'training areas' were good quality, they would likely still be unable to support the level of future training demand.

1.145. The most sustainable option to secure training demand for all clubs in the area, would be the development of a WR22 compliant 3G AGP. As explored in Scenario 3 above, 3G provision could help to meet some training demand from rugby clubs. A WR22 3G development in SA3, coupled with increased floodlighting of grass pitches in SA2, SA3 and SA4 would enable access to 3G provision for clubs who need it, as well as increasing training capacity for those who prefer to utilise their own grass pitches.

## Scenario 17 – The impact on improved pitch maintenance regimes at Bromsgrove Rugby Club

1.146. This scenario will explore the impact on capacity if pitches at Bromsgrove Rugby Club were maintained to a higher standard. All other pitches, currently used to support community use are already rated M2, the highest score. An overview of how maintenance affects pitch capacity is provided in table 58.

**Table 58: Match Equivalent Calculation for Rugby Pitches. Source: Appendices 4a to 4c – Rugby Football Union**

| Drainage | Maintenance | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Poor (M0) | Standard (M1) | Good (M2) |
| Natural Inadequate (DO) | 0.5 | 1.5 | 2 |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Natural Adequate (D1) | 1.5 | 2 | 3 |
| Pipe Drained (D2) | 1.75 | 2.5 | 3.25 |
| Pipe and Slit Drained (D3) | 2 | 3 | 3.5 |

1.147. All four pitches at Bromsgrove Rugby Club are rated as M1/D1, meaning they each have a capacity of 2 MES per week. Table 59 below shows how this current maintenance score effects training and match play capacity.

**Table 59: Supply and Demand Capacity Balance by Site (All Figures in MES)**

| Site | Sub Area | Availability | Security | Number of Floodlit Pitches | Mid-Week Day/Training | | | Weekend Match Day Senior/ Junior | | | Weekend Match Day Mini | | | Total Senior/Junior Match Pitch Balance | Unmet Mini Demand Placed on Senior Match Pitches (50% of Senior ME) | Total Pitch Balance |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | Supply | Demand | Balance | Supply | Demand | Balance | Supply | Demand | Balance | | | |
| Bromsgrove Rugby Club | SA3 | Available | Secured | 3 | 6 | 6.5 | -0.5 | 6 | 7 | -1 | 8 | 3 | 5 | -1.5 | 0 | 3.5 |

1.148. Table 60, shows the impact of all pitches at Bromsgrove Rugby Club being moved to a rating M2/D1.

**Table 60: Supply and Demand Capacity Balance by Site (All Figures in MES)**

| Site | Sub Area | Availability | Security | Number of Floodlit Pitches | Mid-Week Day/Training | | | Weekend Match Day Senior/ Junior | | | Weekend Match Day Mini | | | Total Senior/Junior Match Pitch Balance | Unmet Mini Demand Placed on Senior Match Pitches (50% of Senior ME) | Total Pitch Balance |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | Supply | Demand | Balance | Supply | Demand | Balance | Supply | Demand | Balance | | | |
| Bromsgrove Rugby Club | SA3 | Available | Secured | 3 | 8 | 6.5 | 1.5 | 8 | 7 | 1 | 10 | 3 | 7 | 2.5 | 0 | 9.5 |

1.149. Table 60, suggests that by improving maintenance of all pitches at Bromsgrove Rugby Club, the deficits for training is eradicated and spare capacity of 1.5 MES is created. The position for match play will remain at -1 MES, whilst there will be 7 MES available for mini rugby.

1.150. This increase in capacity will affect the overall position for grass rugby pitches in the District, as highlighted in table 61. The existing deficit for mid-week training will decrease to --4.5 MES.

1.151. When considering the future position, the deficit of training would decrease to -40.5 MES.

**Table 61: Current and Future Position for All Community Available Rugby Grass Provision – Bromsgrove Rugby Club Maintenance Improvements**

| Sub Area | Current Balance – Improved Maintenance | | Projected Balance – Improved Maintenance | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Training | Match | Training | Match |
| SA2 | -5 | 12 | -8 | 10.5 |
| SA3 | 2 | 10 | -22 | -3 |
| SA4 | -1.5 | 1 | -8.5 | -1.5 |
| SA5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Bromsgrove Study Area | **-4.5** | **23** | **-40.5** | **6** |

1.152. The Grounds Management Association (GMA), in partnership with the RFU offer clubs the opportunity to utilise the PitchPower application and receive maintenance recommendations through the pitch advisory service. Currently, only Kings Norton RFC have a report in place. If PitchPower reports were carried out on each site, key recommendations could be provided to clubs on how to improve their pitch quality. It should be a priority for all sites with community use to engage with this service.

## Scenario 18 – The installation of drainage systems at all rugby club sites

1.153. This scenario will explore the impact of installing drainage systems at all rugby sites currently used for community use. All relevant pitches have a current drainage score of D1. The installation of pipe drainage will improve these ratings by one increment to D2. For the purpose of this scenario maintenance scores will not change. Table 58 provides further detail on the capacity of pitches with differing drainage scores.

1.154. Table 62 summarises the current maintenance and drainage scores for pitches with community use in Bromsgrove and potential changes due to improvements in pitch drainage.

**Table 62: Rugby Site Breakdown**

| Site Name | Sub area | No. Adult Pitches | No. Mini/Midi Pitches | Current Pitch Quality | Current Capacity Per Pitch | Pitch Quality with Improved Drainage | Capacity Per Pitch with Improved Drainage |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Old Halesonians Association | SA2 | 6 | 3 | All Pitches M2/D1 | 3 | M2/D2 | 3.25 |
| Bromsgrove Rugby Club | SA3 | 4 | 4 | All Pitches M1/D1 | 2 | M1/D2 | 2.5 |
| Five Ways Old Edwardians | SA3 | 2 | 0 | All Pitches M2/D1 | 3 | M2/D2 | 3.25 |
| Kings Norton RFC | SA3 | 3 | 0 | All Pitches M2/D1 | 3 | M2/D2 | 3.25 |

| Site Name | Sub area | No. Adult Pitches | No. Mini/Midi Pitches | Current Pitch Quality | Current Capacity Per Pitch | Pitch Quality with Improved Drainage | Capacity Per Pitch with Improved Drainage |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Woodrush Rugby Club | SA4 | 3 | 0 | All Pitches M2/D1 | 3 | M2/D2 | 3.25 |

1.155. Table 63 below demonstrates the potential changes in supply and demand balances if drainage systems were installed at club sites across Bromsgrove.

**Table 63: Supply and Demand Capacity Balance by Site (All Figures in MES)**

| Site | Sub Area | Availability | Security | Number of Floodlit Pitches | Mid-Week Day/Training | | | Weekend Match Day Senior/ Junior | | | Weekend Match Day Mini | | | Total Senior/Junior Match Pitch Balance | Unmet Mini Demand Placed on Senior Match Pitches (50% of Senior ME) | Total Pitch Balance |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | Supply | Demand | Balance | Supply | Demand | Balance | Supply | Demand | Balance | | | |
| Old Halesonians Association | SA2 | Available | Secured | 1 | 3.25 | 8 | -4.75 | 16.25 | 9 | 7.25 | 9.75 | 3 | 6.75 | 3 | 0 | 9.75 |
| Bromsgrove Rugby Club | SA3 | Available | Secured | 3 | 7.5 | 6.5 | 1 | 7.5 | 7 | 0.5 | 10 | 3 | 7 | 1.5 | 0 | 8.5 |
| Five Ways Old Edwardians | SA3 | Available | Secured | 1 | 3.25 | 4 | -0.75 | 3.25 | 3 | 0.25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | -0.5 | 0 | -0.5 |
| Kings Norton RFC | SA3 | Available | Secured | 1 | 3.25 | 4.5 | 1.75 | 6.5 | 3.5 | 3 | 0 | 1.5 | -1.5 | 4.75 | -1.5 | 3.25 |
| Woodrush Rugby Club | SA4 | Available | Secured | 1 | 3.25 | 4.5 | -1.25 | 6.5 | 3.5 | 3 | 0 | 1.5 | -1.5 | 1.75 | -1.5 | -0.25 |
| **Overview of Secure Available Sites** | | | | **7** | **20.5** | **27.5** | **-4** | **49** | **26** | **14** | **19.75** | **9** | **10.75** | **10.5** | **-3** | **20.75** |

1.156. Table 64 shows the impact on capacity in individual sub-area and Bromsgrove-wide if drainage was installed at each site.

**Table 64: Current and Future Position for All Community Available Rugby Grass Provision – Drainage Improvements**

| Sub Area | Current Balance – Improved Drainage | | Projected Balance – Improved Drainage | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Training | Match | Training | Match |
| SA2 | -4.75 | 14 | -7.75 | 12.5 |
| SA3 | 2 | 9.25 | -24 | -3.75 |
| SA4 | -1.25 | 1.5 | -8.25 | -0.5 |
| SA5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Bromsgrove Study Area | **-4** | **24.75** | **-40** | **8.25** |

1.157. The impact on the overall position for capacity as a result of drainage installation, would be minimal. As highlighted in Table 64, although there would be small reductions in deficit for training demand, and increase in match play capacity, the overall position for rugby provision in Bromsgrove would remain the same.

## Rugby Union Recommendations

- Improve the maintenance regime at Bromsgrove Rugby Club and prioritise GMA inspections and reports at all community club sites in the study area.
- The development of a WR22 3G pitch, and its prioritisation of rugby activity should be considered to contribute toward meeting training demand from all clubs. This should be in either the SA2 or SA3 sub-area, where there is the largest deficit for current and future training facilities. Any 3G development should not be located on an existing Rugby Union site, but rather focus on multi-sport outcomes through providing for both football and rugby union demand.

- Encourage all club sites to undertake Pitch Power reports to inform pitch improvement plans and provide maintenance guidance to ensure pitch quality on all sites is of the highest standard possible.

## Bromsgrove District Council PPS – The loss of specific outdoor sports facilities

## Scenario 19 - Bromsgrove Cricket, Hockey and Tennis Club (BCHT)

1.158. The BCHT site in SA5 has been identified as a potential key site, which the redevelopment of would allow for significant new housing development in Bromsgrove. However, the loss of facilities would have a significant impact on the supply of cricket, hockey and tennis provision in the area.

1.159. Currently there is a shortfall of -33 MPS in SA5 when considering grass wicket cricket provision. Although theoretically the BCHT site has 7 MPS of spare capacity per season, there is no capacity for additional cricket during peak times. BCGT caters for demand from Bromsgrove CC, who have 32 teams, including 4 female only teams, across all age groups.

1.160. At the current BCHT site, there are 3 cricket squares, consisting of 32 grass wickets. As highlighted above, there is no spare capacity at peak times on site. Latent demand and population growth identifies an additional 4 adult teams and 5 junior teams in SA5 by 2040. Adult teams are presumed to play 10 matches per season and juniors to play 8, therefore there would be an additional demand for 80 matches per season. This would potentially leave BCHT in a deficit of -73 MPS per season for cricket.

1.161. A good quality grass wicket can cater for 5 matches per season, so to reduce this future deficit there is an need for an additional 15 good quality wickets. To meet all current and potential future cricket demand, any new site would require 47 good quality grass wickets, spread over 3 squares.

1.162. A cricket site of this size is extremely rare, and as such is highly important in catering for the large amount of demand from Bromsgrove CC. There is no immediately appropriate site where this demand could be relocated to if BCHT was lost, and therefore it should be protected from future housing development.

1.163. When considering tennis provision, club sites in Bromsgrove are currently being over-utilised by 2%, which is expected to increase to 16% by 2040. Approximately 256 members use the BCHT club site, with further demand being met from casual and public use. There are no other tennis club sites in SA5 and other club sites in Bromsgrove are currently over utilised, a position which is expected to worsen by 2040.

1.164. The significant size of the site, high quality of the courts and its location in catering for tennis demand in SA5, mean that BCHT is a key site for tennis in Bromsgrove and should be protected as part of the supply of tennis facilities.

1.165. The AGP at BCHT helps to meet demand from 29 teams and 410 members of Bromsgrove Hockey Club. However, due to lack of capacity at peak times, the club are forced to travel outside of Bromsgrove to satisfy their need for match play. The AGP also supports some other demand from grass roots sports clubs e.g. football and walking sports.

1.166. As highlighted in Scenario 9, the loss of the hockey pitch at BCHT would have a major impact on the ability of Bromsgrove Hockey Club to operate. There are no other hockey facilities in SA5 and Woodrush Community Sports Centre (SA4) does not have the capacity to meet the clubs demand. If BCHT was to be lost, a replacement site would need to provide an additional 2 sand-dressed AGPs to meet current and future demand, as well as allow exported demand to return to Bromsgrove.

1.167. The points above, which are explained in further detail in the Stage C report, highlight that the loss of cricket, hockey and tennis facilities at BCHT, would have a negative impact on sporting provision locally and district wide. The location of the site is vital in catering for the demand of the largest population of all sub-areas in Bromsgrove and there are no identifiable sites where an adequate replacement of facilities could be made. The multi-sport nature of the large site should also be recognised in providing increase opportunities for all, in particular children and young people.

1.168. BCHT should be protected as a key part of the supply of hockey, cricket and tennis facilities in SA5 and the wider Bromsgrove area.

## Scenario 20 – Barnsley Hall Playing Fields

1.169. Barnsley Hall Playing Fields in SA5 currently consists of 1 youth 11v11, 1x youth 9v9, 1x 7v7 and 1x 5v5 pitches, all of which are good quality. The youth 11v11 and youth 9v9 pitches both have a carrying capacity of 4 MES, while the 7v7 and 5v5 have a capacity of 6 MES each. Below, the impact of the loss of these pitches on capacity in SA5 and Bromsgrove-wide will be explored.

1.170. **Youth 11v11 –** There is a current deficit of -1 MES in SA5, and 2.5 MES of spare capacity across the study area. The loss of Barnsley Hall would increase the SA5 deficit to -5 MES and create a deficit of -1.5 MES across Bromsgrove. When taking into account population growth and latent demand, the future deficit of -3 MES in SA5 would increase to -7 MES and there would be a deficit of -12.5 MES in the study area.

1.171. **Youth 9v9 -** There is a current spare capacity of 0.5 MES in SA5, and a deficit of -0.5 MES across the study area. The loss of a 9v9 pitch at Barnsley Hall would create a deficit of -3.5 MES in SA5 increase the study area deficit of to -4.5 MES. When taking into account population growth and latent demand, the future deficit of -2.5 MES in SA5 would increase to -6.5 MES and there would be a deficit of -15.5 MES in the study area.

1.172. **Mini 7v7 –** In SA5 there is a current spare capacity of 2 MES which is predicted to reduce to 1 MES by 2040. If the 7v7 pitch at Barnsley Hall was lost, these positions would worsen to deficits of -4 MES and -5 MES respectively. When considering the whole study area, the loss of the pitch would result in the current spare capacity being reduced from 8 MES to 2 MES, and the future deficit of -0.5 MES being increased to -6.5 MES.

1.173. **Mini 5v5 –** In SA5 there is a current spare capacity of 3 MES which is predicted to remain the same by 2040. The loss of the 5v5 pitch at Barnsley Hall would result in these positions worsening to deficits of -3 MES. When considering the whole study area, the loss of the pitch would result in the current spare capacity being reduced from 9 MES to 2 MES, and the future deficit of -3.5 MES being increased to -9.5 MES.

1.174. Barnsley Hall is a key site for football in Bromsgrove and caters for demand from a large junior club at Bromsgrove Sporting Colts. The loss of these pitches would have an extremely negative impact on both the club and the wider football landscape in the area. The site has also been highlighted at a potential site for the development of 3G AGP provision as part of the LFFP.

## Bromsgrove District Council PPS – The impact of housing development on sporting provision

1.175. This scenario will explore the impact of increased housing development on the supply and demand analysis for 3G AGPs, grass football, rugby union and cricket pitches in Bromsgrove.

1.176. When analysing the future population growth in Bromsgrove and how it affects each sport, Stage C considered ONS data which suggested an increase of 13,656 people from 101,477 to 115,103 by 2040; an increase of 13.46%.

1.177. Table 65 below shows the location and scale of proposed house building to 2040 in Bromsgrove. Each house built, is presumed to bring an additional 2.4 people. All figures have been rounded to the nearest number.

**Table 65: Future Housing Development - Bromsgrove**

| Analysis Area | Total Number of Homes | Number of People (2.4 people per house) |
|---|---|---|
| SA2 | 26 | 62 |
| SA5 | 1,952 | 4,685 |
| **Bromsgrove** | **1,978** | **4,747** |

1.178. These figures include sites that are currently allocated in the Adopted Bromsgrove Local Plan (2017) and are expected to be delivered by 2040. There are no other large housing developments that have been identified by Bromsgrove District Council at this time. This does not include any windfall sites or future sites that may be allocated in the ongoing Bromsgrove District Plan Review. The impact of any additional housing allocations can be explored at Stage E of the PPOSS, through use of Sport England's Playing Pitch Calculator.

1.179. Although it is suggested that there will be an additional 62 people in SA2 due to housing development (land at Algoa House, Western Road), Sport England's Playing Pitch Calculator will not consider this increase large enough to warrant the need for additional outdoor sports facilities, therefore it will not be considered as part of this scenario.

1.180. Development in SA5 is predicted to bring 1,952 new homes to the area. This is broken down into 6 separate developments, outlined below:

- **Brine Pump Cottage, Weston Hall Road –** 14 houses
- **The Council House, Burcot Lane –** 61 houses
- **Whitford Road –** 505 houses
- **Burcot Garden Centre –** 12 houses
- **Perryfields Road –** 1,300 houses
- **Perryfields –** 60 houses

1.181. This new housing development information, and the level of population it will cater for, has been used by Sport England's Playing Pitch Calculator to inform the increased level of need for each sport, that will be needed in SA5. The impact of this housing development is explored for individual sports in table 66.

**Table 66: Future Housing Development – Impact on demand for individual sports in SA5**

| Sport | Age Group | Demand for Match Equivalent Sessions (MES) in the Peak Period (per season for cricket) | Demand for Training Sessions or Hours Per Week |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Football** | Adult | 1.21 MES | 9.66 hours on a 3G AGP |
| | Youth | 2.43 MES | |
| | Mini | 1.19 MES | |
| **Rugby Union** | Adult (incl Youth and Mini) | 1.33 MES | 1.46 MES on floodlit grass pitches |
| **Hockey** | Adult | 4.85 MES | 14.55 hours on sand-dressed AGP |
| | Junior and Mixed U10s | 4.60 MES | 0.21 hours on sand-dressed AGP |
| **Cricket** | Open Ages and Junior | 47.76 MPS | n/a |

## Football

1.182. Table 66 indicates that housing development in SA5 will result in an increased demand for 1.2 MES for adult football, 2.4 MES for youth football and 1.2 MES for mini football.

1.183. Table 67 shows the current position for football pitch types in the SA5 sub area, and how future population growth and latent demand affects the capacity of pitches.

**Table 67: Future Housing Development – Impact on demand for individual sports in SA5**

| Pitch Type | Actual Spare capacity MES | Total Overplay | Current position | Future demand – Population Growth | Unmet/Latent demand | Future position – Incl Latent Demand |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Adult** | 3.5 | 0 | 3.5 | 2 | 1 | 0.5 |
| **Youth 11v11** | 1 | -2 | -1 | 1.5 | 0.5 | -3 |
| **Youth 9v9** | 2 | -1.5 | 0.5 | 1.5 | 1.5 | -2.5 |
| **Mini 7v7** | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 1 |
| **Mini 5v5** | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 |

1.184. **Adult football –** When considering the additional need created by housing development in SA5, the future spare capacity by 2040 will be lost and there will be a deficit of -0.7 MES on adult grass football pitches.

1.185. **Youth football –** Across youth 11v11 and youth 9v9 pitches, there is predicted to be a total future deficit of -5.5 MES by 2040. Housing development in SA5 will increase demand for grass pitches by 2,4 MES per week, resulting in a deficit of -7.9 MES.

1.186. **Mini football –** Mini 7v7 and 5v5 have a total future spare capacity of 4 MES per week in SA5. However, increased demand for 1.2 MES due to housing development in the area will reduce this to 2.8 MES of spare capacity by 2040.

1.187. To meet the predicted deficit of youth grass football pitches by 2040, a number of options can be explored. Grass pitch improvement, could help to reduce the overall position, but does not necessarily create capacity at peak times. However, as explored in Scenario 5, it could create additional peak time capacity at Catshill Village Meadow, Charford Recreation Ground and Stoke Prior Sports and Social Club. If each of these sites created an additional 1 MES of spare peak time capacity the future deficit would be reduced to -4.9 MES per week. Focus should be on Stoke Prior, due to its current poor quality rating,

1.188. Table 10 in the Stage C Assessment, suggested there were 5 currently disused grass pitches in SA5, located at Garrington's, The Meadows, Sanders Park, Bromsgrove Cricket Hockey and Tennis Club. If these were reintroduced as youth grass provision, alongside grass pitch improvement, then the future deficit would be eliminated.

1.189. The Ryland Centre, although not currently marked out for youth football provision, does not meet any football demand during peak times for match play. The site could only contain 1 youth pitch, but is another option for reducing the future deficit in SA5.

1.190. If additional grass pitches were to be provided as part of any new development, then the focus should be on the developing additional youth 11v11 and youth 9v9 provision.

## 3G Artificial Grass Pitches

1.191. Table 66 suggests that due to an increase in population due to housing development, there will be a demand for an additional 9.7 hours of training time from football teams on 3G pitches in SA5.

1.192. Table 68 highlights that by 2040, there will be a need for an additional 1.5 full size equivalent 3G AGPs in SA5. However, Sport England's Playing Pitch Calculator indicated that there would be an additional demand for 9.7 hours due to housing development. There are 34 available hours per week on a full size 3G pitch, meaning that this demand equates to 0.3 of a pitch. This suggests that the total deficit of 3G provision in SA5 by 2040 will be -1.8 full size equivalent 3G AGPs.

**Table 68: Future Capacity Analysis for AGPs in SA5**

| Sub Area | Current Teams | Current No. of 3G AGPs | Current balance | Projected No. new teams created by Population Growth (TGR) | Number of new AGPs required to meet future demand | Total Future Position (after population growth) | Additional Demand created by Housing Development |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SA5 | 82 | 1 | -1.2 | 11 | 0.3 | -1.5 | 0.3 |

1.193. There is currently 1 3G AGP located in SA5, which has no spare capacity, meaning that this additional demand created by housing development will need to be met by new development.

1.194. Barnsley Hall is highlighted in the Bromsgrove LFFP has a potential site for 3G development. Although a additional of a full size 3G pitch here would meet the additional demand created by housing, further development would be needed to meet the total demand for artificial provision in the sub area.

1.195. Bromsgrove Sporting FC utilise the Barnsley Hall site for their youth and community teams, while their first team is located at the Victoria Ground. As mentioned earlier, the club are continuing to develop the Victoria Ground, as the club feel their current facilities are halting their growth and as such aspire to develop a 3G pitch at the Victoria Ground.

1.196. Although the development of 2 additional 3G AGPs in SA5 would cater for all future demand, the feasibility and sustainability of this level of investment and development needs to be considered through ongoing work at stage E.

## Rugby Union

1.191. Although table 66 indicated that there will be an increased demand for 1.3 MES for match play and 1.5 MES for training due to housing development in SA5, there is currently no rugby provision in SA5. Any additional demand for rugby union provision is likely to be met by sites in SA2, SA3 or SA4.

**Table 69: Current and Future Position for All Community Available Rugby Grass Provision**

| | Current Balance | | Projected Balance – Population Growth | | Projected Balance After Housing Development | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Training | Match | Training | Match | Training | Match |
| Bromsgrove Study Area | -9.5 | 18 | -45.5 | 1 | -47 | -0.3 |

1.192. To meet the demand created by housing development in SA5, additional floodlighting of grass pitches could be installed or improved maintenance regimes implemented. Scenario 16 suggests that installing additional floodlighting on one pitch could add 3 MES of additional training capacity, easily meeting the 1.5 MES of demand created through housing. Installation of floodlighting should be focussed on Old Halesonians Association, Five Ways Old Edwardians, Kings Norton RFC or Woodrush Rugby Club, as these would have the biggest impact.

1.193. As highlighted in Scenario 17, improving the maintenance regime at Bromsgrove Rugby Club by one increment to M2, would add 3 MES of capacity to the site. This would allow the additional match play demand from housing development to be met on site.

1.194. However, adding this additional demand to demand created by population growth and latent demand, the deficit of training worsens to -47 MES and the spare capacity for match play is turned in a small deficit of -0.3 MES.

1.195. To be able to meet this significant deficit of training provision, a variety of options will need to be implemented, including implementing floodlighting, improved pitch maintenance and the development of WR22 compliant 3G pitches. Although clubs may prefer to utilise their own grass pitches for training, a WR22 3G development in SA3, coupled with increased floodlighting of grass pitches in SA2, SA3 and SA4 would enable access to 3G provision for clubs who need it, as well as increasing training capacity on existing grass pitches.

1.196. Priority sites for 3G development should be TO BE DISCUSSED WITH RFU

## Cricket

1.197. The Sport England's Playing Pitch Calculation suggests that additional housing development in SA5 will add 48 MPS of demand for grass wickets in the sub area. Table 70 shows the current and future capacity positions for the sub area.

**Table 70: Current and Future Position for Adult Grass Wickets**

| Analysis Area | Site capacity | Current demand | Current position | Total Future demand | Future position |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SA5 | 290 | 323 | -33 | 395 | -105 |

1.198. To cater for this additional 48 MPS of demand, three options can be considered: grass wicket improvement, non-turf wicket (NTP) development and creation of additional grass wickets.

1.199. As explored in Scenario 12, grass wicket improvements to club sites in SA5 would have no impact on the capacity balance, as they are already rated as good quality.

1.200. One good quality NTP can cater for up to 60 matches per season. Although not applicable for adult cricket, junior cricket can be supported by NTPs. As explored in Scenario 13, if junior demand was moved to NTPs, then additional capacity would be created on existing grass wickets. Only one NTP would be required to create enough additional capacity to meet the 48 MPS of demand from housing development.

1.201. Although there are 3 existing NTPs in SA5, all are poor quality and 2 are located on education sites. Improving the quality of these would increase capacity, however it would be the preference of all clubs to retain junior demand at their existing site. Therefore, a priority site for the development of an

NTP should be Avoncroft CC. There is currently 64 MPS of junior demand on the grass wickets, which if most was moved to NTP provision, would create enough capacity for the additional 48 MPS of demand.

1.202. One good quality grass wicket can accommodate up to 5 matches per season. If additional grass wickets were to be developed to meet the housing development demand, 10 extra wickets would be required. As there is a current deficit of -40 MPS at Avoncroft CC, any new grass provision should be focused there, which any that cannot be housed at Avoncroft, located at Bromsgrove Cricket, Hockey and Tennis Club.

## Hockey

1.203. Due to housing development in SA5, the Playing Pitch Calculator suggests there will be an additional need for 9.5 MES for hockey, and an extra 15 hours of training time on sand-dressed AGPs. If we can presume that a match requires 1.5 hours of usage on an AGP, there is a total requirement of an additional 29 hours.

1.204. As the sand-dressed AGP at Bromsgrove Cricket, Hockey and Tennis Club is already at capacity on Saturdays for match play , and the main users, Bromsgrove Hockey Club, have some exported demand, the site cannot cater for any of the additional 14 hours of match play demand. However, the site does have 6 hours available mid-week for training, therefore would be able to cater for 40% of the additional training demand created by housing development.

1.205. The remaining demand can therefore only be met by new development or accessing currently unavailable provision. It is unlikely that a new sand-dressed AGP will be developed, therefore the focus should be on agreeing community use agreements for hockey at Bromsgrove School, where there are currently 2 full size sand dressed AGPs.

## Priority Sites for Development to Meet Housing Development Demand

1.206. Where additional pitch provision will not be located within the hosuing development, developer contributions should be secured to invest in existing provision or to provide new playing pitches off-site. Table 71 outlines the priority sites in SA5 where developer contributions could be used to address the current and future shortfalls in provision.

**Table 71: Priority Sites for Developer Contributions – SA5**

| Site | Sport | Recommendation |
|---|---|---|
| Garringtons | Football | Reinstate site – include youth football provision |
| The Meadows | Football | Reinstate site – include youth football provision |
| Sanders Park | Football | Reinstate site – include youth football provision |
| Catshill Village Meadow | Football | Grass pitch improvements |
| Charford Recreation Ground | Football | Grass pitch improvements |
| Stoke Prior Sport and Social Club | Football | Grass pitch improvements |
| Barnsley Hall | Football / AGP | Development of 3G pitch provision in line with LFFP |
| Avoncroft | Cricket | Development of non-turf pitch or additional grass wicket provision |
| Bromsgrove Cricket Hockey and Tennis Club | Cricket | Additional grass wicket provision |
| Old Halesonians Association | Rugby Union | Installation of additional floodlighting |
| Five Ways Old Edwardians | Rugby Union | Installation of additional floodlighting |
| Kings Norton RFC | Rugby Union | Installation of additional floodlighting |
| Woodrush Rugby Club | Rugby Union | Installation of additional floodlighting |
| Bromsgrove Rugby Cub | Rugby Union | Grass pitch improvements |

| Site | Sport | Recommendation |
|---|---|---|
| Bromsgrove School | Hockey | Implementation of community use agreement of 1 or more of the sand-dressed AGPs. |

# Tennis Overview

**Table 72: Key PPOSS Findings for Tennis in Bromsgrove**

| Key Question | Analysis |
|---|---|
| **What are the main characteristics of the current supply and demand for provision?** | Of the 48 courts in the study area, 31 are available for community use. 69% of the total courts are floodlit. There is a total of 1,268 members of clubs in Bromsgrove, whilst 1,074 people play tennis at least twice every 28 days and 2,975 play at least once per year. |
| **Is there enough accessible and secured community use provision to meet current demand?** | Club sites in Bromsgrove are operating at 2% over their maximum capacity, whilst publicly available courts are operating at around 40% under capacity. This is an average utilisation level according to LTA data. |
| **Is the provision that is accessible of sufficient quality and appropriately maintained?** | 58% of the current supply of courts are rated as good quality, whilst 42% are rated as standard. There are no poor-quality courts in the study area. |
| **What are the main characteristics of the future supply and demand for provision?** | If participation continues to grow in line with population the playing population will increase by 13.46%. This means that club sites are estimated to be operating at 16% over their maximum capacity. Demand for public courts will also increase by 97 sessions per month, bringing the utilisation of public courts to 67.8% by 2040. |
| **Is there enough accessible and secured community use provision to meet future demand?** | When considering club sites, there is expected to be an 16% undersupply of courts by 2040. However, there is predicted to be approximately 32% spare capacity on public courts even when future population growth is taken into account. |

## Recommendations for Tennis

1. Protect existing quantity of tennis courts and community access to them. This is particularly important at Bromsgrove Cricket Hockey and Tennis Club. Responsibility of BDC, Sports Club, Facility Owners.

2. Support grounds staff to review quality issues on courts to ensure appropriate quality is achieved at sites assessed as standard and sustained at sites assessed as good. Priority sites for quality reviews are Rowney Green and Sanders Park. Responsibility of LTA, BDC and Sports Clubs where appropriate.

3. Ensure club future demand can be accommodated on existing supply of courts. Responsibility of LTA, BDC and Sports Clubs where appropriate.

4. Ensure that any large housing developments provide for tennis and need is assessed by use of Sport England's ANOG Guidance.

5. Where developments would benefit from floodlights on site to provide additional evening capacity, work with facility owners to determine the viability of these investments.

# Netball Overview

**Table 23: Key PPOSS Findings for Netball in Bromsgrove**

| Key Question | Analysis |
|---|---|
| **What are the main characteristics of the current supply and demand for provision?** | Education owned sites provide all of provision of outdoor courts in the Study Area, and all are available to the community. Most netball provision in the area takes place indoors, however there is some outdoor netball activity in the summer. This is due to the lack of accessible floodlit provision in the winter. |
| **Is there enough accessible and secured community use provision to meet current demand?** | Although theoretically there is spare capacity on outdoor courts in the study area, only Bromsgrove School is floodlit. According to users, this site is difficult to access during winter months due to other sporting provision. Therefore we can consider there is an deficit of outdoor netball provision in<br><br>Due to the lack of floodlit courts in the study area, the vast majority of netball activity is on indoor courts. |

| Key Question | Analysis |
|---|---|
| **Is the provision that is accessible of sufficient quality and appropriately maintained?** | 31% of courts in the study area are rated as good, although these are all located at Bromsgrove School. The remaining courts are all rated as standard quality. There are no courts rated as poor in Bromsgrove. |
| **What are the main characteristics of the future supply and demand for provision?** | There is currently no increase in future demand for outdoor netball courts in Bromsgrove. |
| **Is there enough accessible and secured community use provision to meet future demand?** | There is a lack of securely available sites in Bromsgrove. Although all sites are available to the community, it should be noted that this is often agreed on a monthly basis with no security of tenure.<br><br>Due to the lack of outdoor floodlit, accessible provision, it is expected that there will still be deficit of outdoor provision by the end of the study period. |

## Recommendations for Netball

1. Protect existing quantity of netball courts. Responsibility of BDC, Sports Club, Facility Owners.

2. Ensure club future demand can be accommodated on through existing indoor provision and supplemented through existing supply of outdoor courts, working with facility owners/managers to provide both indoor and outdoor netball. Responsibility of England Netball, BDC and Sports Clubs where appropriate.

3. Ensure that any large housing developments provide for netball, need should be assessed by use of Sport England's ANOG Guidance.

4. Where developments would benefit from floodlights on site to provide additional evening capacity, work with facility owners to determine the viability of these investments.

# Outdoor Bowls Overview

**Table 74: Key PPOSS Findings for Bowls in Bromsgrove**

| Key Question | Analysis |
|---|---|
| **What are the main characteristics of the current supply and demand for provision?** | There are currently 6 sites across Bromsgrove with 6 greens. There are 5 clubs in the Study Area with a total estimated membership of 320 players. |
| **Is there enough accessible and secured community use provision to meet current demand?** | All 6 sites in the study are secured for community use, and clubs operating at the greens, highlight through consultation and online presence that new members/participants would be welcome. This suggests that all greens have some spare capacity. |
| **Is the provision that is accessible of sufficient quality and appropriately maintained?** | Of the 6 available sites, 5 were rated as good quality and the other rated as standard. Maintenance of the greens owned by sports clubs is good. The green at Sanders Park is maintained by the local authority and is only used on a pay and play basis. |
| **What are the main characteristics of the future supply and demand for provision?** | Future population projections indicate a potential of 67 additional players by 2040. Although any future growth in demand can be satisfied with the current green stock, Bromsgrove District Council are considering the future of the green at Sanders Park. However as this is just pay and play use, it will likely have little effect on the supply and demand balance in the area. |
| **Is there enough accessible and secured community use provision to meet future demand?** | The potential increase in demand of 67 participants by 2038 is able to be met by the current green and club supply. |

## Recommendations for Outdoor Bowls

1. Protect existing quantity of all facilities. Responsibility of BDC, Sports Club, Facility Owners.
2. Support grounds staff to review quality issues on greens to ensure appropriate quality is achieved at sites assessed as standard and sustained at sites assessed as good. Responsibility of Bowls bodies, BDC and Sports Clubs where appropriate.
3. Ensure club future demand can be accommodated on existing supply of greens. Responsibility of Bowls bodies, BDC and Sports Clubs where appropriate.
4. Work with clubs, BDC and bowls bodies to further assess the need for improved ancillary facilities at Sanders Park and Stoke Prior Crown Green.
5. Work with clubs to support development and growth of the sport.

# Summary of Recommendations

**Table: Summary of Recommendations**

| Objective | Recommendation |
|---|---|
| **OBJECTIVE 1:** To **protect** the existing supply of outdoor sports facilities to meet current and future needs | • Recommendation 1: Ensure, that all existing outdoor sports facilities are protected through the implementation of local planning policy;<br>• Recommendation 2: Secure tenure and access to sites for participation-focused development clubs, through a range of solutions and partnership agreements; and<br>• Recommendation 3: Ensure continued use of education facilities where there is a need, these should have long-term security agreements where possible. |
| **OBJECTIVE 2:** To **enhance** outdoor sports provision and ancillary facilities through improving quality and management of sites | • Recommendation 4: Improve quality of playing pitches and ancillary facilities;<br>• Recommendation 5: Work with facility owners, operators and sports clubs to ensure there is an appropriate maintenance regime on all pitches being improved |

| | |
|---|---|
| **OBJECTIVE 3:** To **provide** new outdoor sports facilities where there is current or future demand to do so | • Recommendation 6: Secure external funding in partnership with other stakeholders; and<br>• Recommendation 7: Secure developer contributions.<br>• Recommendation 8: Identify opportunities to add to the overall stock to accommodate both current and future demand; and<br>• Recommendation 9: Rectify quantitative shortfalls through the current stock.<br>• Recommendation 10: develop facilities in the area of greatest demand to minimise travel time for residents |

# Action Plan

16.1. The Sport Specific Action Plan Appendix C provide individual sport recommendations and individual site recommendations by geographic area and reflect the outcomes of the scenarios and identified quantitative and quality improvements identified in Section 3 and in Section 4 of this report.

16.2. The Sport Specific and Individual Site Action Plans are given timescales to deliver:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Short Term** Delivered against or worked towards within three years (ahead of the first full review of the PPS); | **Medium Term.** Delivered within 6 years; and | **Long Term.** No specific date – In many instances the action is an aspiration and is general support for clubs or other bodies to progress with and is not an action the Council or the Playing Pitch Steering Group have control over. |

16.3. The strategic actions within Appendix F and G have also been ranked as low, medium, or high based on cost. These are based on Sport England's estimated facility costs. The range in which these sit are:

| (L) - Low - less than £50k | (M) - Medium - £50k-£250k | (H) - High £250k and above |
|---|---|---|

16.4. In addition to using the planning system to lever in developer contributions, it is recognised that external partner funding will need to be sought to deliver much of the action plan. Although seeking developer contributions in applicable situations and other local funding/community schemes could go some way towards meeting deficiencies and/or improving provision, other potential/match sources of funding should be investigated e.g. look to apply for grants and work with NGBs and Sport England to seek partnership funding for several projects.

16.5. It is important that the PPS Steering Group keep this strategy alive. This will be achieved by:

- Monitoring the delivery of the recommendations and actions;
- Providing up to date annual supply and demand for pitch stock; and
- Addressing changing trends and formats for the different pitch sports as they develop and monitoring participation of these changes and trends.