

# Sports Facilities Strategy 2015 – 2028

## Executive Summary

### Introduction and Context

In August 2014 Chesterfield Borough Council appointed naa to support the development of a Sports Facilities Strategy for the borough. The Strategy is a part of a suite of strategic documents for sport and recreation planning and follows the production of the Playing Pitch Strategy (PPS), which was recommended for adoption by the council at a Cabinet meeting in October 2014.

These documents together, developed using the up-to-date Sport England methodologies, provide the Council and its partners with a robust evidence base and set of strategic priorities to direct future sports planning policy and funding. Specifically the Sports Facility Strategy underpins the new Queen's Park Leisure Centre development and sets out the strategic case for the planned new facility.

The scope of the facility strategy was established by the Council as:

- Swimming Pools
- Sports Halls
- Artificial Grass Pitches (AGPs)
- Informal Sport and Recreation

The Council plan to complete its strategic policy work with the development of a Sport and Physical Activity Strategy which will be delivered through the sport and leisure team and engaging key stakeholders including the Active Chesterfield Partnership.

The strategy has been undertaken and the report structured to address the key drivers of the Council and ensure compliance with new national planning policy.

The needs assessment work has been produced in line with the National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPF), which requires that (Paragraph 73, page 18):

*'.....planning policies are based upon robust and up-to-date assessments of needs for open space, sport and recreation facilities and opportunities for new provision.....'*

Assessing Needs and Opportunities Guide (ANOG) has been developed by Sport England and sets out an approach to undertaking needs assessment for sport and recreation facilities, in order to be compliant with the NPPF. The approach adopted to develop the facility strategy for Chesterfield has utilized the process set out in the ANOG guide.

The work has therefore considered the strategic context and sports participation profile across the borough, looked at supply and demand of facilities across Chesterfield in terms of *quantity, quality, access and availability*, built in consultation and utilised Sport England planning tools to develop the needs and evidence base and subsequent strategy recommendations.

The strategy sits within the context of Chesterfield Borough Councils Corporate Plan (2012-2015) and will support the stated vision of "putting our communities first" and the delivery of three specific priorities:

- To make Chesterfield a thriving borough.
- To improve the quality of life for local people.
- To provide value for money services

Against this backdrop, the strategy will help to deliver on the broader agenda of increasing participation in sport and physical activity, which is key to improving health and wellbeing outcomes and which can also play an important role in the development of community cohesion and integration.

### **Participation Profile**

Participation in sport and physical activity in Chesterfield is increasing and is now generally in line with regional and national averages. The proposed growth in population and housing numbers will mean the demand for facilities will increase and the need to build in headroom in terms of future facility provision is evident, particularly in terms of swimming provision. Future proofing any developments will therefore be important, particularly in terms of Queens Park.

Swimming is the most popular activity in Chesterfield as it is in the Region and England wide. Gym is third and fitness and conditioning which can take place in the sports hall or an ancillary hall are also the most popular activities in Chesterfield. So broadly the Sports Facilities Strategy is focusing on providing facilities for the most popular activities.

There is a close relationship with the areas of highest sports participation having the lower levels of obesity. This is in the SW of the borough. This is also where the cluster of sports provision is located, including QP. Sport and physical activity and facility provision would therefore appear to impact positively on the health agenda.

Five of the top seven segments in population numbers are above 46 years of age. Segments in these age groups have lower than national average rates of sports and physical activity participation and their reasons for participating are for recreational, social activity and with a strong personal health motivation. The population is rising and it is also ageing, which will impact on the scale and nature of participation.

There will be a need to match future facility provision and strategy to future demographic and participation profile. Alongside formal sports provision, the need for flexible activity spaces to meet more informal activity and health related programmes will need to be an important element of future provision.

### **Swimming Pools**

The evidence base is developed and applies the Sport England Assessing Needs and Opportunities Guidance (ANOG) which is the accepted industry methodology for developing an evidence base for indoor sports facilities. The sequence of the report is to set out the evidence base findings under the four ANOG headings of: *quantity, quality, access and availability*.

The evidence base draws on:

- the findings from the Sport England facility planning model (fpm) 2013 report on swimming pools provision in Chesterfield Borough and all the local authorities which border Chesterfield
- the fpm report has two parts to its assessment. The first is the assessment of need in 2013 and the second part is the assessment of need based on the impact of the projected increase in population and aging of the core resident population to 2028, this ensures the strategy is future proofed and builds in predicted growth. For context the findings for East Midlands Region and Derbyshire County are also included in the tables; and
- site visits to the sports halls and swimming pools in Chesterfield and consultations with the Borough Council, schools, NGBs, further education college and other key providers or partners in sports facility provision in the Borough

### **Quantity of swimming pool provision**

Chesterfield has a shortfall of swimming pool provision both in 2013 and in 2028. This equates to 145 sqm of water space in 2013 and by 2028, with planned population growth, this shortfall increases to – 270 sq m of water (For context a 25m x 4 lane swimming pool is 212 sq metres of water). However this assessment does not include the closure of the Brookfield Community Centre pool. With that site included the overall deficit increases to 310 sq metres of water in 2014 and to 435 sq metres of water in 2028.

The Sport England assessment is based on a proposed new but smaller Queens Park Leisure Centre of 325 sq metres of water a 25 m x 6 lane pool. Given the overall findings on quantity of swimming pool provision updated to 2014 and the projected deficit in waterspace in 2014 and 2028, then the Borough Council's proposed new Queens Park Leisure centre of a 25m x 8 lane pool (420 sq metres of water) and learner pool of 80 sq metres of water is very much justified. The proposed new Queens Park Leisure Centre pool will reduce the current and projected deficit in waterspace across the Borough and ensure *future proofing*.

Furthermore based on the comparative standard of waterspace per 1,000 population, Chesterfield Borough has the third lowest provision in Derbyshire County and is below the East Midlands and England wide provision in 2013. This is not to say Chesterfield should have what already exists elsewhere. It is saying that based on a consistent comparative measure Chesterfield does have a low level of waterspace. An 8-lane pool at the new Queens Park Sports Centre will help to address this. Whether additional pools are required needs to be considered alongside other factors.

### **Quality of swimming pool provision**

Chesterfield has an old stock of pools. The Queens Park Sports Centre opened in 1968 and the most recent pool is the Healthy Living Centre pool opened in 2008. So the stock spans 45 years in terms of age.

Replacement of the Queens Park Sports Centre with a new pool is therefore justified in terms of the age and quality of the pool stock overall. Conditions survey work has confirmed the poor quality of the existing facility and the preference for a new build solution. The Healthy Living Centre also has some challenges in terms of accessible swimming provision due to the lack of a learner pool in part mitigated by a moveable floor, which needs to be addressed going forward through innovative programming and potential investment in technology or structure to facilitate increased participation and demand.

The new Queens Park Sports Centre will be the only site in the Borough with more than one pool tank and which can provide for the full range of swimming activities: recreational

swimming; lane and fitness swimming; learn to swim programmes and club use all at one venue. As such it does mean that all swimming customers are provided with the opportunity to participate in their activity and there is the full range of activities at one venue. This is an important quality aspect for customers as swimming is a family based activity.

### **Accessibility of swimming pool provision**

The location of the swimming pool sites in Chesterfield means they are all very accessible to the Chesterfield population. So much so that in 2013 the estimate is that for 84% of the Chesterfield demand the nearest pool to where residents live is a pool in Chesterfield. In short, over eight of ten visits to pools in Chesterfield are from people in the borough – the pools are very accessible in terms of their drive and walk to catchment areas and where residents live.

All of the swimming pool sites in Chesterfield (bar the HLC) are in the SW corner of the authority. However for the reasons set out, that for 84% of the Chesterfield demand the nearest pool to where residents live is in the borough, then the location of all the pools being in this one area of the Borough is not an issue.

For all these location and access reasons retaining the same site for the new Queens Park Sports Centre is therefore a very sensible decision in terms of residents accessing pools based on where they live and their travel patterns to pools. It is very doubtful if any alternative location would increase accessibility for Chesterfield residents. Queens Sports Park Centre is also in the catchment of Brookfield, reducing the impact in accessibility terms of its closure. This is also the area of highest participation in the borough.

Exporting 16% of the Chesterfield demand for swimming in 2013 and 18% by 2028 is a slight concern. If the pool supply in neighbouring authorities was to reduce and most importantly in North East Derbyshire which has 3 pool sites, it would displace around 6% of the Chesterfield demand for swimming estimated to be met in North East Derbyshire.

Unmet demand for swimming pools because of lack of pool access is insufficient to justify considering additional swimming pool provision. It equates to 84 sq metres of water in 2013 and 94 sq metres of water by 2018. Of this total some 82% is made up of residents who have no access to a car, i.e. would have to walk or get a bus to a pool, this falls to 70% by 2028. The areas of highest unmet demand in 2013 is located around Newbold and Brimington, settlements which do not have a pool. However the amount of unmet demand is insufficient to justify provision of a new pool in either location, certainly in the short-term.

### **Availability of swimming pool provision**

Availability of swimming pools is the second most important category of findings after quantity. Availability is on two counts: firstly the hours of community use which are available at each site and; secondly how full the pools are.

On the first count the Chesterfield public pools have very high availability and the variation is only 9 hours a week across the three public swimming pool sites (Sport England Pool Classification). The lowest is 93 hours a week at Queens Park Sports Centre and the highest 102 hours a week at Chesterfield Fitness and Well Being Centre.

On the second count the Chesterfield average pools capacity used is 86% in 2013 and projected to increase to 89% by 2026. This varies from the lowest at the Brampton Manor pool at 36% of capacity used – but this is by its membership not full public access - to 100% of capacity used at the Chesterfield Fitness and Well Being Centre. The Queens Park Sports Centre is at 96% of capacity used at peak times. The Queens Park Sports Centre Pool is also utilised for club use outside normal opening hours for specialist performance training needs.

These findings do suggest additional provision, which would offer more scope to share demand around more pools and reduce the used capacity of each pool. However the key finding in relation to this option is the level of unmet demand, as reported under the access heading. This is not sufficient in itself to justify additional pool provision. It is only 96 sq metres of water in 2013 and 128 sq metres of water by 2018. This assessment did however include the now closed Brookfield School Community pool.

So the option to consider in addressing this capacity issue is to co-ordinate pool programming across the public sites and in effect to try and make more use of the total pool time. In effect providing more pool time for the most popular activities and ensuring there is not a choice of pools for the same activity at the same time but at different pools and thereby duplicating the programme.

These availability findings do however suggest that the concerns raised in consultation about accommodating all the activities of public recreational swimming, learn to swim programmes, fitness swimming and club use at the new Queens Park Sports Centre is going to be a management and programming challenge.

More so for the Queens Park Sports Centre because it is the only site with two pools and which can accommodate all swimming activities. However the size of each pool and the configuration is about right in terms of the overall demand for swimming across the Borough projected by Sport England up to 2028. The issue to address is about programming and management of pool time across the pool sites it is not about additional swimming pool provision or an even larger main pool at the new Queens Park Sports Centre – at this stage. The innovative addition of a moveable floor to the leaner pool at the new Queens Park Sports Centre site will support a more accessible and useable programme of swimming opportunity being provided.

In the longer term however the Council should be aware and keep a watching brief on the level of unmet demand for swimming estimated by Sport England as set out under the access heading. Should this increase to a level of over 250 sq metres then provision of an additional swimming pool of a 25m x 4 lane is most likely required. The priority locations for unmet demand at present are in the Newbold and Brimington settlements which do not have a pool.

In the current economic climate it is also important that the Council considers future outcomes in terms of commercial viability and the increasing pressure for services to be self sustainable. Sport England recognise that investment should be closely aligned to needs and evidence for future provision but the facilities must also be clearly capable of delivering the required services in the most efficient and ideally cost neutral manner.

### **Consultation**

Building on the baseline data analysis consultation was held with the following as part of the overall needs and evidence process and strategy development. The consultation focussed on supply and demand issues:

- Mick Blythe, Sport and Leisure Manager, Chesterfield Borough Council
- Alan Moray, Planning Manager, Chesterfield Council
- Darren Townsend, Healthy Living Centre Manager
- Paul Chambers, Derbyshire County Sports Partnership Facilities Manager
- Mark Tournier, School Sport Partnership Manager
- Darren Norwood, Facilities for All

- Alex Fraser, Sporting Futures
- Alistair Meikle, Wheelyfun Wheels and Chesterfield Cycle Campaign
- Kay Adkins, Chesterfield FC Community Trust
- Dave Simmonds Chesterfield College
- James Creaghan, Public Health Manager
- Sport England – Strategic Fund team.
- Sport England – Planning Team

Consultation was also undertaken with relevant National Governing Bodies (NGBs) and a consultation workshop was also held with Active Chesterfield.

Key issues raised in relation to swimming pool provision included the following:

- The proposed new pool at Queens' Park Annexe was supported by all consultees
- The scale of provision proposed will help to address the current and future waterspace deficit in Chesterfield
- The ASA and clubs support the new Queens Park Sports Centre commenting that it will provide greater swimming space and more versatile swimming area, which will enable the club to expand and grow
- The closure of Brookfield will provide a challenge in ensuring all waterspace users can be accommodated across the pool stock
- The growth of triathlon will place even greater demands on the borough's water space
- Swim Chesterfield who is the umbrella body for all swimming interests across the borough are committed to developing a co-ordinated approach to swimming across Chesterfield. At this point it is felt that the 8-lanes proposed at the new Queens Park Sports Centre including the learner pool with movable floor should provide the flexibility to meet all needs.
- Capacity to accommodate and increased participation by addressing the challenges with water space and temperature at the Healthy Living Centre and seeking to develop a more versatile pool provision and environment. This should be pursued alongside the proposed growth in the Staveley area.

Bringing all the evidence together it is therefore evident that the new Queens Park development is fully supported and the level of provision proposed will address the issues of quantity, particularly following the closure of Brookfield and will raise the quality of the swimming offer in Chesterfield significantly. Local surveys undertaken as part of the new Queens Park Sports Centre development and consultation with clubs and the ASA support this view.

It is clear the existing Queens Park Sports Centre has reached the end of its useful life. In terms of accessibility the new Queens Park Sports Centre site is well located and accessible to serve resident needs. There will clearly need to be a co-ordinated approach to programming to ensure the pool stock is available to meet the needs of all swimming disciplines.

There is no case at present, based on the supply and demand analysis to develop new / additional pool provision over and above the new Queens Park Sports Centre however capacity could be increased by potential further investment at the Healthy Living Centre funded in part through the predicted growth in the area.

Set out overleaf are the key issues and priorities which flow from the needs and evidence for swimming pools.

Strategic Recommendation	Justification	Action	Timescales	Responsibilities
<p><b>SP1. Develop the new Queen's Park Sports Centre as an 8-lane 25m pool and 16.5 x 7m learner pool with movable floor.</b></p>	<p>The new Queen's Park development is fully supported and the level of provision proposed will address the issues of quantity, particularly following the closure of Brookfield and will raise the quality of the swimming offer in Chesterfield significantly.</p> <p>It is clear the existing Queen's Park centre has reached the end of its useful life. In terms of accessibility the Queens Park site is well located and accessible to serve resident needs.</p> <p>Local surveys undertaken as part of the Queen's Park development and consultation with clubs and the ASA support this view.</p>	<p>Continue to drive forward the build programme.</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>CBC</p>
<p><b>SP2. Adopt a co-ordinated approach to programming to ensure the pool stock is available to meet the needs of all swimming disciplines.</b></p>	<p>Capacity will still be tight, particularly and the will be a need to adopt a co-ordinated approach to programming to ensure the pool stock is available to meet the needs of all swimming disciplines. Swimming participation is growing and is the most popular sport in Chesterfield.</p>	<p>Through Swim Chesterfield seek to ensure a co-ordinated approach to programming, which meets the needs of all swimming disciplines across the borough. The Council are committed to this and the work is on-going.</p>	<p>Short Term</p>	<p>CBC with Swim Chesterfield</p>
<p><b>SP3. Protect all remaining swimming pool provision up to 2028</b></p>	<p>There will still be future pool deficit but not sufficient to warrant new pool provision however any future closures will impact on this. Swimming participation is growing and is the most popular sport in Chesterfield.</p>	<p>Monitor and seek to resist any pool closure proposals as this will place significant pressure on the pool stock.</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>CBC and providers</p>



Strategic Recommendation	Justification	Action	Timescales	Responsibilities
<p><b>SP4. Seek to develop increased participation at the Healthy Living Centre through more innovative use of the pool linked with technology and investment adding to the flexibility offered by the moveable floor.</b></p>	<p>Even with the new Queen's Park Sports Centre there will still be a water deficit, whilst not significant to require additional / new pools in the short-term. Capacity could be increased by developing the water space at the Healthy Living Centre. The predicted growth in Staveley further supports this and could provide in part funding. Any potential for adding waters pace should be first carefully explored and establishing a sustainable business case. Swimming participation is increasing and is the most popular sport in Chesterfield.</p>	<p>Seek to identify opportunities to improve or enhance provision linking with new investment projects in the borough and future s106 or CIL allocations.</p> <p>Undertake cost / benefit analysis , feasibility and continue to monitor the need in line with other developments in the catchment..</p>	<p>Medium Term</p>	<p>CBC</p>
<p><b>SP5. Monitor the future needs up to 2028 to evaluate if the provision additional swimming pools are required over the life of the Strategy.</b></p>	<p>The areas of highest unmet demand in 2013 is located around Newbold and Brimington, settlements which do not have a pool. However the amount of unmet demand is insufficient to justify provision of a new pool in either location, certainly in the short-term. Swimming participation is growing and is the most popular sport in Chesterfield.</p>	<p>Monitor changes in supply and demand over the long-term life of the Strategy.</p>	<p>Long Term</p>	<p>CBC</p>

## **Sports Halls**

The sports hall analysis follows the same approach as swimming pools and draws upon the same evidence base.

### **Quantity of sports hall provision**

The quantity of sports hall provision is that Chesterfield has a surplus of supply over demand of 14 badminton courts in 2013 and reducing to 11 courts in 2018. This is based on the sports hall supply being unchanged between the two years and demand increasing based on the population growth between the two years. The new Queens Park Sports Centre sports hall will have 2 more courts than the current venue and so the supply surplus will increase by a further 2 badminton courts.

The most telling finding on the quantity of sports hall provision is that 8 of the total 9 venues which have some community use are on education – school or college sites. Maintaining this supply of sports halls is contingent on continuing access to the venues (considered under the access and availability headings) for community use. The surplus of supply over demand could be eliminated if 2 – 3 of these venues do not continue with community use, or if the rate of participation in hall sports increases and thereby increases demand.

Seven of the 9 venues are 4 badminton court size sports halls, so the quantity of provision is very good in providing the size of venue which can cater for all the indoor hall sports at community level. The Queens Park venue is the only venue that can provide for multi sports use and that will be enhanced by the new 8 court sports hall which includes event seating provision.

Based on the comparative standard of badminton courts per 10,000 population Chesterfield Borough has 5.3 courts per 10,000 population in 2013, reducing to 4.6 courts in 2028. This is higher by around 1 court per 10,000 population than courts across Derbyshire County and East Midlands Region.

The Community Hall network (village halls, church halls and community halls) is also an important part of the provision mix across Chesterfield. They provide opportunities for residents who do not want formal sporting opportunities in larger sports halls, but more activity based opportunities in small flexible spaces. This is very much in line with the more elderly sports participation profile across Chesterfield. Community based provision is also particularly important for delivering to the health agenda where local accessible opportunities in the community reflect the approach of getting the inactive more active. Loundsley Green Community Centre is an example of the type of provision, which is critical across the borough and provide a vital resource for local 'doorstep' activity. Community based provision will be further considered in the councils planned Sport and Physical Activity strategy.

### **Quality of sports hall provision**

The quality of sports hall in Chesterfield is very modern. All the stock, excepting the Chesterfield College sports hall opened between 2004 – 2013. So a very modern stock of 8 venues constructed in the last decade and 7 of these 8 centres are a 4 badminton court size sports hall. Furthermore the Chesterfield College sports hall which is the oldest venue and opened in 1993 was modernised in 2001 and again in 2013.

Replacement of the Queens Park Sports Centre with a new sports hall of 8 badminton courts is justified on quality grounds because it will provide the only venue in the Borough which can provide for multi sports activities at the same time and have substantial supporting spectator provision.. It will also be the sports events venue for the borough. It will therefore complement the other borough venues which have a modern 4 badminton court size sports hall.

### **Accessibility of sports hall provision**

A key finding is that 90% of Chesterfield's demand, rising to 91% in 2028, is retained at Chesterfield sports halls. In short, nine out of ten visits to Chesterfield's sports halls are by local residents. So there are accessible sports hall locations and sports halls with sufficient supply to meet demand.

Car travel is the dominant travel mode to access sports halls, with 74% of all visits by car in both years. Between 1 – 10 sports halls are accessible from all areas of Chesterfield based on car travel. Residents in around 40% of the land area of the borough have access to between 10 – 20 sports halls based on car travel and the location of venues – very high accessibility.

Around 60% of the land area of Chesterfield is within the walk to catchment area of a sports hall. This is important given 17% of all visits to sports halls are by walkers.

Unmet demand from lack of access and demand located outside the walk to catchment area of a sports hall is not an issue. It equates to 2 badminton courts in both years. Given there are 42 badminton courts at 9 sites available for public use in Chesterfield this is not significant.

The location of the Queens Park Sports Centre is well placed to serve as the borough wide centre. Any alternative location would not provide better accessibility for residents.

There are several school venues close to the Queens Park Sports Centre. Given the overall surplus of sports hall supply over demand and the high accessibility to venues, then there could be a question as to whether the current scale of community use is required at all these venues (see findings under availability).

The new Queens Park Sports Centre is going to be an 8 court sports hall and so it has 33% more capacity than the existing venue.

Only 9% of Chesterfield's demand for sports halls is exported. This is around 420 visits and primarily to Bolsover and North East Derbyshire. The quantity and pattern of exports shows little change from 2013 to 2028.

### **Availability of sports hall provision**

Availability of sports halls is the second most important category of findings after quantity. Availability is on two counts: firstly the hours of community use which are available at each site and; secondly how full the sports halls are.

On the first count the Chesterfield sports halls have high availability, as all the 9 sites offer community use but this varies site by site and is dependent on the policy of each individual venue owner and operator. The crucial finding is that 8 of the 9 sports hall sites are on school or college sites and the policy/access for community use is determined by each individual school/college.

For example Springwell Community College is estimated to have 62% of its total sports hall capacity available and used for community use, whilst at St Mary's Catholic High School it is a much lower 32% of the venue's capacity available and used.

Overall the average estimated used capacity across all the venues in the borough is between 61% - 62% in the weekly peak period. This is well within the Sport England halls full comfort level of 80% of capacity used and before sports halls become uncomfortably full. It is

the variation in availability of sports halls which is the issue and creating highs and lows at individual venues not the total capacity of all the venues.

This becomes clearer when looking at the on the ground reality where sports halls appear fuller than the fpm analysis, those courts that have community use appear to be at capacity e.g. Brookfield, Netherthorpe and Springwell. There is however opportunity to look at opening up further St Mary's and Hasland Hall. It is important that provision is balanced and facilitates increased participation to support strong participation pathways and accessible activity as well as the critical impact on healthy lifestyles.

The Queens Park Sports Centre is the only public sports centre in the Borough and it has the highest level of availability and used capacity in both 2013 and 2028. This is because it has full availability for public access and clubs use (86% and 99% respectively). The decision to increase the size of the new Queens Park Sports Centre by 2 badminton courts is a prudent one. This is said because whilst it increases the overall supply and demand balance of sports halls in the borough, it is effectively protecting the only venue in the borough that can provide for full public access and availability.

This issue of variable availability of sports halls for community use across all the venues is likely to increase because effectively each one decides their own policy towards community use and the extent of the availability of the sports halls. Active Chesterfield and other stakeholders have a role to play in coordinating access and charging policies including concessionary pricing.

The question is whether this is an issue for Chesterfield Borough and it wishes to strategically intervene and establish a consistent pattern of use and availability of education based sports halls for community use?

The advice is this would be very sensible to do because if (say) 2-3 venues decide not to make their venue available for community use then the healthy surplus of supply over demand of 14 badminton courts in 2014 and 11 in 2028 across the borough will be reduced or even eliminated. Whilst the Queens Park Sports Centre is already estimated to be completely full.

It could be a selective approach - to intervene with strategic co-ordination of accessing the education sports hall and ensuring an agreed level of availability of sports halls for community use. Overall there is enough supply and it is not blanket negotiations with all venues/operators.

The emergence of *Facilities for All* which is a commercial community use specialist operator at several venues identifies the education site owners who are supportive of community use. They are or will be managing Netherthorpe School, Newbold Community College and Meadows Community School. So there are three venues where a co-coordinated and consistent pattern of access, availability and programming of community use maybe possible and negotiated with three owners but one operator. It is however important that these facilities do not become exclusive and fail to deliver in the widest community sense.

The need for this selective co-coordinated approach is underlined by Chesterfield College having exclusive use of 4 of the badminton courts at the new 8 court Queens Park Sports Centre during the day time (which is off peak). The new centre will have 8 courts (as distinct from the 6 courts in the current centre) available for public/club use weekday evenings and a balance of 4 courts for public use at off peak times.

To repeat, the decision to increase the new Queens Park Sports Centre from 6 to 8 courts seems a very sensible and prudent strategic one. In terms of guaranteeing and protecting public and club use at the only public centre in the Borough but also off-setting the impact of any decline in availability of the 8 remaining education based sites because of a change in policy of making venues available for community use.

The new Queens Park Sports Centre is positioned as the borough wide public/club use venue. It is the only sports hall site which is not only a public sports hall but it is the only venue which is larger than 4 badminton courts. It therefore offers full public access/availability and flexibility of uses at the same time of different sports and activities.

These scale, access and availability benefits/positions the centre as the borough wide venue. There could also be a network of a few education based centres providing for community recreation and club use at particular venues. All but one of the venues has a 4 badminton court size sports hall.

As with the swimming pool provision the council is in an emerging new economic environment and there is increasing demand for cost neutral services being provided. This brings an element of commercial pricing and programming into the future approach to facility programming, pricing and delivery. Sport England acknowledge the need for sustainable business models being developed in strategic planning for the future.

### **Consultation**

The consultation followed the same approach as for swimming pools. Key issues raised in relation to sports hall provision included the following:

- The proposed sports hall at the new Queens Park Sports Centre was supported by all consultees. It will provide flexible block booking options and pay and play access to sit alongside the school network which provides more of a block booking approach
- Indoor space is well provided for. After-school opportunities at Netherthorpe, Springwell and Newbold are good. Important community opportunities are provided at Inkersall Methodist Church and St Augustine's Church.
- Some schools provide a good service in opening up their facilities and working on a co-ordinated basis across the borough. The commissioning model could be extended to those schools which do not currently maximise community use
- Health funding and programmes will be targeted at local community based activities. Whilst facilities are not the panacea they are an important part of the jigsaw. Gaining affordable access to facilities in local community settings will be critical to deliver
- Opening up the school and community network will therefore be an important future priority to deliver local targeted activities and programmes and drive the health agenda. Coordinate policy will help this process.
- Daytime access to sports hall is problematic due to the reliance on school based provision. The importance of the community hall network alongside Queens Park is therefore evident in order to deliver daytime access and opportunities when the older Chesterfield resident profile will seeking opportunities to participate
- The Council are committed to maximising the potential of the sports hall network and smaller flexible community venues. Opportunities exist to create community hubs around pitches and indoor community provision linking with the Playing Pitch Strategy.
- Chesterfield is viewed as a deliverer of local active recreation opportunities linked with the Active Derbyshire plan and Derbyshire Plan for Sport. The sports hall at the new Queens Park Sports Centre will not play any significant sub-regional role however it will provide opportunities for growth and club and school

competition for sports hall sports such as basketball and badminton and sustained established activity such as martial arts and multisports provision.

Bringing all the evidence together it is therefore evident that the new Queens Park Sports Centre development is fully supported and the level of provision proposed will compliment and provide an exit route from the network of school and education sports halls, providing a quality 8-court facility. Queens Park Sports Centre and the school based sports hall network provide good access to sports hall for residents.

The school sport hall network is new and modern and of good quality. There is no case at present, based on the supply and demand analysis to develop new / additional sports hall provision over and above the new Queens Park Sports Centre. The level of provision is good and there is generally good access however a number of schools are at full-capacity. There is therefore a need to protect all halls and seek to open up access to those schools which currently provide limited use. School commissioning of service management provides a good model for delivering coordinated community use and could be extended to support other schools.

Alongside the formal sports hall network there is a good network of community halls and accessible venues with useable activity space. These are vital to provide local opportunities, particularly in the daytime, in line with the health agenda and the participation profile of Chesterfield.

Set out overleaf are the key issues and priorities which flow from the needs and evidence for sports halls.

Strategic Recommendation	Justification	Action	Timescales	Responsibilities
<p><b>SH1. Develop the new Queens Park Sports Centre as an 8 court sports hall facility.</b></p>	<p>The new Queens Park Sports Centre development is fully supported and the level of provision proposed will compliment the network of school and education sports halls, providing a quality 8-court facility, with pay and play access. Queens Park Sports Centre and the school based sports hall network provide good access to sports hall for residents.</p>	<p>Continue to drive forward the build programme.</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>CBC</p>
<p><b>SH2. Protect all sports hall provision up to 2028 and seek to open up those schools with current limited use.</b></p>	<p>There is no case at present, based on the supply and demand analysis to develop new / additional sports hall provision over and above the new Queens Park Sports Centre. The level of provision is good and there is generally good access however a number of schools are at full-capacity. There is therefore a need to protect all halls and seek to open up access to those schools which currently provide limited use.</p>	<p>Monitor and seek to resist any sports hall closure.</p> <p>Seek to develop and support improved access to the school sports hall network through a coordinated approach to management.</p> <p>Seek to deliver investment through s106 or CIL allocations to enhance the school network.</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>CBC and providers</p>
<p><b>SH3. Seek to maximise the opportunities for local sport and physical activity opportunities through the community centre network</b></p>	<p>The Community Hall network (village halls, church halls and community halls) are an important part of the provision mix across Chesterfield. They provide opportunities for residents who do not want formal sporting opportunities in larger sports halls, but more activity based opportunities in small flexible spaces. This is very much in line with the more elderly sports participation profile across Chesterfield. Community based provision is also particularly important for delivering to the health agenda where local accessible opportunities in the community reflect the approach of getting the inactive more active.</p>	<p>Undertake an audit of the existing community hall network and suitable community assets to understand the quality of provision and the sport and physical opportunities they offer.</p> <p>Seek to deliver investment through s106 or CIL allocations to enhance the community centre network based on the audit findings.</p>	<p>Short</p>	<p>CBC with Active Chesterfield</p>

## Artificial Grass Pitches (AGPs)

The AGP analysis follows the same approach as swimming pools and draws upon the same evidence base.

In Chesterfield, there are three full sized pitches with approved surfaces for hockey and one full sized 3g pitch. In addition, there are three small sided facilities, specifically at Queens Park Sports Centre and two at Hasland Hall Community School. The surface of the pitch at the existing Queens Park Sports Centre means that it is unsuitable for hockey use, however the pitches at Hasland Hall Community School would provide training opportunities for hockey.

In Chesterfield Borough, there is therefore one full sized pitch with a 3g surface (the preferred surface for football) located at Brookfield School. This pitch is on the FA register of 3g pitches, is approved for use in competitive fixtures and is a high quality facility with associated changing facilities. It was built during 2010 and several charter standard clubs are linked to the site. There is a further small sized 3g pitch at the existing Queens Park Sports Centre which can be used for training and small sided games. This was built in 2008 and is also of good quality.

The remaining pitches (3 full sized and 2 small sized) have sand based surfaces which can be used for football training but are not approved surfaces for competitive fixtures. While Springwell Community College is a new facility (built 2011), the pitch at St Marys High School is almost 15 years old and the surface is poor. The facility at Newbold Community School was built in 2006 and has a good surface but is not floodlit, restricting the overall use of the pitch outside of school hours.

Notably, only the pitch at the current Queens Park Sports Centre is managed by Chesterfield Borough Council. All other facilities are at school sites and managed internally, or by a commercial management company.

Through consultation there is a perception that facilities are inadequate, this was almost wholly attributed to the perceived lack of AGPs in the borough (and in particular 3g AGPs) and resulting challenges in accessing these facilities. This suggests that facilities are at capacity. The cost of using AGPs was highlighted as a barrier by some, in particular adult teams who would need to hire the whole facility but would have fewer players to spread the cost.

The conclusions of the fpm modelling therefore suggest that:

- the existing stock of AGPs is at capacity
- there is a future shortfall of 0.5 AGP in the borough
- there is a poor balance between the different types of surface given the shift to 3g surfaces by the FA; and
- there is a need to consider supplementing the existing stock through either a small AGP, an additional 3g AGP. The replacement of the carpet at St Marys RC High School in 2014 creates a sustainable position for Hockey .

The additional consultation undertaken on top of the PPS work confirmed the need for additional 3g provision. Set out overleaf are the key issues and priorities which flow from the needs and evidence for AGPs.



Strategic Recommendation	Justification	Action	Timescales	Responsibilities
<p><b>AGP1 Seek to develop a new 3g pitch as a focus for football</b></p>	<p>There is only one full sized 3g pitch in the borough and a second smaller facility although over 85% of use of all AGPs is football. Shortages of 3g AGPs was highlighted as a concern by 63% of responding clubs and some clubs are travelling outside of the borough to use facilities. Existing facilities are at capacity midweek. The lack of 3g pitches also means that there is minimal scope to use 3g pitches as an alternative to grass pitches for competitive fixtures, which is a key FA policy. Demand for additional AGPs (particularly 3g) was one of the key issues emerging through consultation.</p> <p>In terms of access a gap exists in the east. Netherthorpe School have expressed a desire of a 3g.</p>	<p>Work with the FA and Netherthorpe school to explore the feasibility of delivering a new 3g on the site.</p> <p>Explore other opportunities should delivery not be possible.</p>	<p>Medium</p>	<p>CBC and potential partner</p>
<p><b>AGP2. Protect all AGP provision up to 2028</b></p>	<p>Even with the delivery of AGP 1 and AGP2 pitches will be at or near capacity.</p>	<p>Monitor and seek to resist any future AGP closure.</p> <p>Seek to deliver investment through s106 or CIL allocations to enhance the AGP network through re-surfacing</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>CBC and providers</p>

## Implementation and Delivery

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) clearly establishes the requirement that local plans ensure that there is proper provision of community and cultural facilities to meet local needs.

Chesterfield Borough Council has an adopted Local Plan (2013). The Council are now developing sites and allocations, which may lead to a partial review of the Local Plan. The current plan has limited policies for open space and playing pitches and nothing in terms of indoor sport. There is an opportunity to develop policies for indoor sport based on the needs and evidence set out and in turn use these to deliver investment for sport.

In the current and emerging economic environment it is also clear that facility provision should be focussing on achieving a cost neutral position for service sustainability. This introduces an element of commercial evaluation and assessment for the council to consider as part of deliberations in future provision. It is therefore important that the council considers increasing pressure regarding , need, demand , affordability and sustainability in relation to any future investment or re investment in existing or proposed projects.

## National Planning Policy Framework

The start point for the development of local planning policy for sport and physical activity/recreation is therefore the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and in particular paragraphs 73 and 74. These are set out below and the significant parts of these paragraphs are underlined.

### Paragraph 73

*'Access to high quality open spaces and opportunities for sport and recreation can make an important contribution to the health and well-being of communities. Planning policies should be based on robust and up-to-date assessments of the needs for open space, sports and recreation facilities and opportunities for new provision. The assessments should identify specific needs and quantitative or qualitative deficits or surpluses of open space, sports and recreational facilities in the local area. Information gained from the assessments should be used to determine what open space, sports and recreational provision is required.'*

### Paragraph 74

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

- an assessment has been undertaken which has clearly shown the open space, buildings or land to be surplus to requirements; or*
- the loss resulting from the proposed development would be replaced by equivalent or better provision in terms of quantity and quality in a suitable location; or*
- the development is for alternative sports and recreational provision, the needs for which clearly outweigh the loss.'*

So the NPPF is saying planning policy based on the establishment of an up to date needs assessment of provision now and in the future, with identified specific quantitative and qualitative deficits of surpluses and by different types of provision. It is setting out that existing provision should not be built on unless it meets one of the three bullet points.

## **Sport England Assessing Needs and Opportunities Guidance**

In order to apply the direction set by the NPPF Sport England developed and published in 2014 the Assessing Needs and Opportunities Guidance (ANOG) as the industry wide guidance and methodology for assessing needs and developing an evidence base for indoor and built sports and recreational facilities. The ANOG guidance has 4 headings in its assessment: *Quantity; Quality; Access and Availability.*

The evidence base for the Chesterfield Indoor Sports Facilities Strategy for swimming pools and sports halls has been developed applying the ANOG methodology.

The direction under ANOG is to then set out the evidence base findings for planning policy purposes under the three headings of: *Protect and Retain; Enhance; and Provide*

Applying the findings from the ANOG evidence base for Chesterfield some suggested planning policies are.

### **Protect and Retain**

*'The Council will seek to retain provision of the existing supply of sports halls, swimming pools and AGPs at the existing sites and the site for development of the new Queens Park Sports Centre. This is based on the needs assessment identifying there is a present and continuing need for this scale of provision. Also the locations provide very good accessibility for the residents of the borough and any changes in provision/locations is unlikely to improve on the accessibility for residents.'*

### **Reasoned justification for sports halls**

The assessment on quantity of sports hall provision is that Chesterfield has a surplus of supply over demand of 14 badminton courts in 2013 and this reduces to 11 courts in 2028. This is based on the sports hall supply being unchanged between the two years and demand increasing based on the population growth between the two years.

There is however a need to retain this level of provision because 8 of the total 9 sports halls venues which have some community use are on education – school or college sites. Maintaining this supply of sports halls to meet demand is contingent on continuing availability of the venues and this is at the decision and discretion of the school and college sports hall owner and operator. The projected surplus of supply over demand could be eliminated if 2 – 3 of these venues do not continue with community use, or if the rate of participation in hall sports increases and thereby increases demand.

In terms of access the assessment of need has identified the location and catchment area of the sports halls correlates very well with the location of 90% of the Chesterfield demand for sports halls. In short 90% of the demand for a sports hall by Chesterfield residents is located within the catchment area of a Chesterfield sports hall. Furthermore there is enough capacity at the sports halls to absorb this level of demand. Changing the location of sports halls in the borough is very unlikely to improve on access to sports halls by Chesterfield residents.

### **Reasoned justification for swimming pools**

In terms of swimming pools the needs assessment has identified Chesterfield has a shortfall of swimming pool provision both in 2013 and in 2028. This equates to 145 sqm of water space in 2013 and by 2028, with planned population growth, this shortfall increases to 270 sq m of water).

The Borough Council's new Queens Park Sports centre of a 25m x 8 lane pool (420 sq metres of water) and learner pool of 80 sq metres of water is very much justified and is larger than

the current QPLC. The proposed new Queens Park Sports Centre pool will keep down the current and projected deficit in waterspace across the Borough.

Given these findings the Council needs to protect the current quantity of swimming pool provision at the existing locations. The Council does not consider there is a need to provide additional waterspace/pools to meet the projected deficit and will seek to increase the capacity of the existing pools by changes in programming to provide more pool time and increase supply/capacity by these programming change. The new Queens Park Sports Centre pool moveable floor will offer greater flexibility in swimming pool programming to allow 2 or more activities to take place at the same time. This scope to increase capacity does not exist with the current Queens Park Sports Centre.

In terms of accessibility the location and catchment areas of the Chesterfield swimming pools makes them very accessible to Chesterfield residents in both 2013 and 2028. The nearest pool to where most residents live is located in Chesterfield. For some 84% of the Chesterfield resident demand the nearest pool to where residents live is located in Chesterfield.

### **Reasoned justification for AGPS**

The capacity of AGPs is relatively constrained, particularly during midweek at peak times. Increases in participation are likely to result in higher demand for training facilities and there is currently little scope to accommodate this within the existing infrastructure. There is also an identified increase in demand for Junior play within the County generally.

### **Enhance**

*'The Council will seek to support the enhancement of the quality of the Healthy Living Centre to address demand for improved capacity of the swimming pool accessibility through considering options to improve options for use of the pool including considering feasibility of additional provision. The Council will enhance provision of the pool by investment of section 106 monies or the CIL, based on a viable business case being established and the predicted growth in Staveley.*

*The Council will seek to support the enhancement of the quality of the existing sports halls stock. It is recognised the Council is not the owner or operator of the vast majority of sports halls in the borough. Therefore the Council will seek to work with the school and college owners and operators to enhance the existing provision and programme accessibility.*

*The Council will expect the existing owners to set out a reasoned business case for enhancement of its facilities in terms of financial viability and the type and programme of community use it will deliver. The Council will seek to make strategic interventions and partnerships based on the Borough wide assessment of need for sports halls over the plan period. The Council will consider enhancing provision of the stock by investment of section 106 monies or the CIL, based on a business case developed by the provider and which meets the Council's community use requirements identified in its assessment of need.*

*The Council will seek to support funding being accessed for the protection and enhancement of facilities such as the recently refurbished St Mary's pitch for hockey use.*

*Based on further audit and analysis the Council will seek to support investment in the community centre network to provide sustainable local active recreation opportunities'*

### **Reasoned justification for swimming pools**

Even with the new Queens Park Sports Centre there will still be a water deficit, whilst not significant to require additional / new pools in the short-term. Capacity could be increased by developing or supporting further pool provision linked with appropriate feasibility and business case development. This could include supporting options such as replacement of Brookfield School pool. The predicted growth in the borough further supports this and could provide in part funding. Swimming participation is growing and is the most popular sport in Chesterfield borough.

### **Reasoned justification for sports halls and community centre provision**

The needs assessment has identified that the Council does not own or manage sports halls. 8 of the total 9 venues which have some community use are on education – school or college sites. Furthermore all the stock, excepting the Chesterfield College sports hall was opened between 2004 – 2013. So it is a very modern stock of 8 venues constructed in the last decade. Finally seven of these eight centres are a 4 badminton court size sports hall with the new Queens Park Sports Centre an 8 badminton court size sports hall. The oldest sports hall at Chesterfield College opened in 1993 and was modernised in 2001.

So in all aspects it is a quality stock with very little immediate need for enhancement.

The evidence base and consultation work has identified that schools are committed to community use. However each school develops its own programme of the type and level of community use. It is effective but responsive to local needs identified and provided by schools and sports clubs responding to their own needs and opportunities. There is an individual site by site approach to the provision and management of sports facilities by schools and a varying level of expertise in the planning, delivery and management of these facilities for public use.

This approach needs to be enhanced, strategically developed and co-ordinated across the borough, so as to maximise the potential of school sites for community use. To do this effectively it requires a co-ordinated management programme of community use and delivery.

It is fully recognized the independence of schools and colleges to determine and manage their own arrangements for community use of sports facilities. It is also fully recognised the schools lack sufficient capital funding to further improve and enhance facilities. Given the age and quality of the stock this is not an immediate issue. However as the stock ages it will need to be enhanced and modernised. Future growth in population and residents of new housing will make use of the school based sports facilities. It is most cost and sports effective to invest in what already exists at existing sites to meet the continuing need for community use and access to sports halls over the plan period.

The Community Hall network (village halls, church halls and community halls) are an important part of the provision mix of community assets across the borough. They provide opportunities for residents who do not want formal sporting opportunities in larger sports halls, but more activity based opportunities in small flexible spaces. This is very much in line with the more elderly sports participation profile across the borough. Community based provision is also particularly important for delivering to the health agenda where local accessible opportunities in the community reflect the approach of getting the inactive more active.

Hence the application of Sec 106 funding or CIL funding from new housing development to pay for part modernisation of the community infrastructure of school sports halls and community centres over the plan period. In terms of schools, in return for any CIL investment the Council will develop a formal joint use agreement and a contractual arrangement between the Council and the school/college based on a business case for investment and

setting out the programme for the type, hours and philosophy of community use that will be delivered.

### **Reasoned justification for AGPs**

St Mary's is a key focus for hockey. The surface at St Marys RC High School has recently been replaced and will enable ongoing use of the facility.

### **Provision**

*'The Council will seek to support prioritised provision of a new 3g pitch or hub in the borough to increase the capacity of the AGP stock for football. The Council will seek to enhance access to swimming by investment of section 106 monies or the CIL, based on the predicted growth in the borough.'*

*Support proposals for delivery of borough wide additional or enhanced community centre provision where any gaps are identified in the audit.'*

### **Reasoned justification AGPs**

There is only one full sized 3g pitch in the borough and a second smaller facility although over 85% of use of all AGPs is football. Shortages of 3g AGPs was highlighted as a concern by 63% of responding clubs and some clubs are travelling outside of the borough to use facilities. Existing facilities are at capacity midweek. The lack of 3g pitches also means that there is minimal scope to use 3g pitches as an alternative to grass pitches for competitive fixtures, which is a key new 2014 FA policy. Demand for additional AGPs (particularly 3g) was one of the key issues emerging through consultation. In terms of access a geographic gap exists in the east of the borough although the size and layout of the borough does allow it to be considered as one area for FPM travel purposes. Netherthorpe School have expressed a desire for a 3g.

### **Reasoned justification Community Halls**

If the audit and assessment work indicates gaps in provision consideration should be given to the development of new small community based halls to provide local community active recreation opportunities. These should form community hubs.

### **Role of developer contributions in part financing indoor sports facilities**

#### **Section 106 Agreements and Community Infrastructure Levy**

Local authorities have sought and secured developer contributions for local physical and social infrastructure through Section 106 (and other provisions) of the various Planning Acts. Strict regulations have controlled these contributions in order that they are reasonable and proportionate to the development, and in principle are necessary for the development to be acceptable in planning terms.

The Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) introduced in 2010 allows local authorities to charge a tariff, at a locally set rate, on many types of new development. The money can then be used to pay for a wide range of community infrastructure that is required as a result of development. This can include indoor sports facilities as an INTERGAL PART of community infrastructure. The council is finalising a policy for CIL and Sport England are a consultee in this process.

It is understood that CIL money does not need to be used for providing infrastructure on the geographical site it is collected from. The relationship between a site's infrastructure requirements and level of contributions made is broken although any infrastructure which is directly required as a result of a development can continue to be sought through Section

106 (Town and Country Planning Act 1990). S106 obligations will therefore remain alongside CIL but will be restricted to that infrastructure required to directly mitigate the impact of a proposal. CIL is for strategic infrastructure, S106 will still apply to onsite provision (such as recreation and sport) and to offsite provision that is to meet the requirements of that development (i.e. non –strategic) subject to the pooling limitations.

The two elements of provision could be treated as follows:

- Provision of facilities necessary to meet the needs of the new housing, or enhancement of existing facilities nearby (which can be achieved by S106 commuted payments and possibly CIL for larger schemes)
- Provision of significant enhanced facilities which serve major new housing developments or stand alone strategic schemes or both (CIL).

The Chesterfield assessment of need has not identified the need for new provision of swimming pools or sports halls. This is based on the assessed demand in 2013 and the projected demand up to 2028 based on population growth, aging of the core resident population and the committed new housing development.

The evidence base has identified the need to enhance existing sports halls over time and the most beneficial way to do this is to invest in the current stock over the plan period. This is based on the stock is modern (now) and the scale of provision and location does meet the needs of Chesterfield residents.

It is reasonable and proportionate to secure developers contributions to meet the cost of facility enhancements based on residents of new housing will make use of the existing indoor stock of facilities. Furthermore it is both sports and cost effective to invest in the existing facility locations given the needs assessment has identified that across the borough the existing sites provide excellent accessibility by the three travel modes of car (predominate) public transport and walking.

So the evidence case is that developer's contributions should contribute to enhancement of the existing stock based on where the housing allocations and developments will take place and the catchment area of an existing facility including this new housing area. Any investment should also be based on a sound sustainable business case addressing both participation and health impact linked with balanced affordability.

### ***Sports Facility Calculator***

It is possible to identify the scale of sports facility requirements and the costs from projected population growth by use of the Sport England Sports Facility Calculator (SFC). The SFC calculates the required provision from the population increase in terms of water area for swimming pools and number of badminton courts for sports halls. It can then calculate the cost of this scale of provision at 2014 prices.

Based on the Chesterfield Core Strategy setting out an estimated growth from the 101,200 population from the 2010 ONS projections to 110,300 by 2031, an increase of 9100. The requirement for swimming pools generated by this scale of population growth is for 35 sq metres of water at a capital cost of £1.3m at 2014 prices. For sports halls it is a requirement of 2.5 badminton courts at a capital cost of £1.5m at 2014 prices.

The scale and costs of providing for these facility types from population growth is therefore not extensive and does not equate to what is the effective size of provision. For a swimming pool this would be at least a 25m x 4 lane pool of 212 sq metres or a 4 badminton court size sports hall.

This only serves to underline that the focus for the expenditure should not be to provide new facilities but to contribute to the modernisation of the existing stock at locations accessible to the new population growth.

Finally three points are acknowledged and reinforced:

- CIL will fund only a proportion of strategic infrastructure, and spending will have to balance a number of competing priorities. Other priorities may outweigh sport. CIL will be only one of the ways in which new infrastructure is paid for and other funding streams will need to be sought and considered, under the auspices of the delivery plan. The rate of CIL must be based on the evidence of viability.
- CIL funding can only be sought for the committed housing development that does not already have consent. It is understood the Chesterfield Core Strategy has a new housing commitment of 7,600 housing units. Of this total some 1968 units already have consent and possibly have a developer contribution for indoor sports facilities either through CIL or as a Sec 106 agreement.
- Whilst the strategy sets out there is already a good supply of indoor sports facilities, some of which will accommodate future demand, this does not mean that developer contributions should not be sought. New development and the associated population growth will place pressures on the existing facility stock and generate new participants in both indoor hall sports, fitness and activity classes and in swimming – across all ages. Increased use of these venues places greater importance on their quality and capacity and as a consequence, it is concluded that contributions towards indoor sports facilities should be required from all new developments. Contributions should therefore be made towards the delivery of the strategy objectives in line with the needs and evidence base. This should be tempered with appropriate consideration around sustainability delivery assessment.

The strategy sets out key projects and priorities based on the needs and evidence, to deliver now and in the future. Delivery through the planning system and future grant-aid, using the strategy recommendations, can help to deliver the priorities set out.

*Neil Allen Associates Registered Office:  
20 Brook Road, Lymm, Cheshire, WA139AH*

*A limited company, registered in  
England and Wales no. 6165280*