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# ABBREVIATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3G</td>
<td>Third generation turf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGP</td>
<td>Artificial grass pitch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASC</td>
<td>All Stars Cricket</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC</td>
<td>Bowls Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>Cricket Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EG</td>
<td>England Golf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECB</td>
<td>England and Wales Cricket Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EH</td>
<td>England Hockey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FA</td>
<td>Football Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FC</td>
<td>Football Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIFA</td>
<td>Fédération Internationale de Football Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIS</td>
<td>Geographical Information Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC</td>
<td>Hockey Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOG</td>
<td>Institute of Groundsmanship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JFC</td>
<td>Junior Football Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KKP</td>
<td>Knight, Kavanagh and Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMS</td>
<td>Last Man Stands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGB</td>
<td>National Governing Body of Sport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPPF</td>
<td>National Planning Policy Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTP</td>
<td>Non-turf pitch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OAN</td>
<td>Objectively Assessed Need</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ONS</td>
<td>Office for National Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGA</td>
<td>Professional Golfers Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPS</td>
<td>Playing Pitch Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PQS</td>
<td>Performance Quality Standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIP</td>
<td>Pitch Improvement Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFU</td>
<td>Rugby Football Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUFC</td>
<td>Rugby Union Football Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S106</td>
<td>Section 106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC</td>
<td>Tennis Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TGR</td>
<td>Team Generation Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>Under</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PART 1: INTRODUCTION

Knight, Kavanagh & Page Ltd (KKP) has been commissioned by the South Essex authorities of Basildon, Castle Point, Rochford and Southend-on-Sea, together with Essex County Council and Sport England, to assess outdoor sport facility needs across the individual local authority areas.

The output is provision of four separate playing pitch needs assessments and strategies (including action plans) across the aforementioned authorities as well as one additional overarching strategy for South Essex, which will also encompass Thurrock. The intention for the overarching strategy document is to bring the individual strategies together, setting out key recommendations that relate to and impact on the wider South Essex region and encouraging the local authorities to work together in a partnership approach. It should be considered together with the individual strategies.

This is the Playing Pitch Strategy (PPS) for Southend-on-Sea. It has been developed in accordance with Sport England guidance and under the direction of a steering group led by the Council and including National Governing Bodies of Sport (NGBs). It builds upon the preceding Assessment Report and is capable of:

- Providing adequate planning guidance to assess development proposals affecting outdoor sports facilities, as appropriate, directing open space contributions secured through development and informing and shaping local planning policy.
- Informing the protection and provision of playing pitches.
- Informing land use decisions in respect of future use of existing playing pitch areas and playing fields (capable of accommodating pitches).
- Providing a strategic framework for the provision and management of playing pitches.
- Supporting external funding bids and maximising support for playing pitches.
- Providing the basis for ongoing monitoring and review of the use, distribution, function, quality and accessibility of playing pitches.

The PPS has been developed alongside an Indoor Sports and Leisure Strategy as part of a wider inter-related strategy for sport and recreation within the Borough. The inter-relationship between the strategies must be noted as some sports covered by the PPS also use indoor facilities for matches or training.

It is important that there is regular annual monitoring and review against the actions identified in the Strategy. This should be led by the Council and supported by the Steering Group. As a guide, if no review and subsequent update has been carried out within three years of the PPS being signed off, Sport England and NGBs will consider it to be out of date. If the PPS is used as a ‘live’ document and kept up to date, its lifespan can be extended.

The PPS should be reviewed on an annual basis from the date it is formally signed off by the Steering Group. This will help to maintain the momentum and commitment that was built up during its development. Taking into account the time to develop the PPS this should also help to ensure that the original supply and demand information is no more than two years old without being reviewed. To assist this, all information, databases and other tools used to inform the Strategy will be handed over to the Council and full training will be offered to assist in utilisation (see Part 5 for further details).
**Scope**

The PPS covers the following outdoor sports facilities:

- Football pitches (including 3G AGPs)
- Cricket pitches
- Rugby union pitches
- Rugby league pitches
- Hockey pitches (sand/water-based AGPs)
- Outdoor tennis courts
- Outdoor netball courts
- Outdoor bowling greens
- Outdoor athletics tracks
- Golf courses
- Outdoor cycling tracks
- Parkour
- Multi-use games areas (MUGAs)

Playing pitch sports (i.e. football, cricket, rugby union and hockey) were assessed using the guidance set out in Sport England’s PPS Guidance: An approach to developing and delivering a PPS.

For the remaining sports/facilities, the supply and demand principles of Sport England methodology: Assessing Needs and Opportunities Guide for Indoor and Outdoor Sports Facilities (ANOG) were followed to ensure the process is compliant with the NPPF.

**Study area**

The study area for the PPS will be the whole of the Council’s administrative area. Further to this, analysis areas have been created to allow for a more localised assessment of provision and examination of playing pitch supply and demand at a local level. These areas are based upon ward boundaries and have been agreed upon by the Steering Group.

*Table 1.1: Agreed analysis areas*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analysis area</th>
<th>Wards included</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>St Luke’s, Victoria, Milton, Kursaal, Southchurch, Thorpe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>West Shoebury, Shoeburyness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>Eastwood Park, Belfairs, West Leigh, St Lawrence, Blenheim Park, Leigh, Prittlewell, Westborough, Chalkwell</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A map of the analysis areas can be seen overleaf in Figure 1.1.
Figure 1.1: Analysis area map
1.1: Context

The rationale for undertaking this study is to identify current levels of provision within Southend-on-Sea across the public, education, voluntary and commercial sectors and to compare this with current and likely future levels of demand. The primary purpose of the PPS is therefore to provide a strategic framework that ensures the provision of outdoor sports facilities meets the local needs of existing and future residents.

Concern at national government level over the loss of playing fields prompted the development of localised playing pitch assessments and strategies which identify current and future requirements for playing fields. Developing a strategic approach to the analysis of playing pitch supply and demand is necessary to:

- Protect playing pitches against development pressures on land in, and around, urban areas.
- Identify pitch (natural grass and artificial) supply and demand issues in relation to predicated population changes.
- Address ‘demand’ pressures created as a result of specific sports development pressures e.g. growth of mini soccer and wider use of artificial grass pitches.
- Address budget pressures and public-sector cuts.

This strategy provides an evidence base for planning decisions and funding bids and background evidence to support Local Plan policies in relation to formal recreation. It will ensure that this evidence is sound, robust and capable of being scrutinised through examination and meets the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF, 2018).

One of the core planning principles of the NPPF is to improve health, social and cultural wellbeing for all and deliver sufficient community and cultural facilities and services to meet local needs.

Section 8 of the NPPF deals specifically with the topic of healthy communities; Paragraph 96 discusses the importance of access to high quality open spaces and opportunities for sport and recreation that can make an important contribution to the health and well-being of communities.

Paragraphs 97 and 98 discuss assessments and the protection of “existing open space, sports and recreational buildings and land, including playing fields”. A PPS will provide the evidence required to help protect playing fields to ensure sufficient land is available to meet existing and projected future pitch requirements.

Paragraphs 99 and 100 promote the identification of important green spaces by local communities and the protection of these facilities. Such spaces may include playing fields.

1.2: Structure

As this strategy is specific to Southend-on-Sea, it focuses on findings, recommendations and scenarios for outdoor sports facilities within the Borough; however, considerations that relate to the whole South Essex area are also included where appropriate. Such considerations are then expanded upon in the overarching strategy document.
This strategy has been developed from research and analysis of outdoor sports provision and usage to provide:

- A vision for the future improvement and prioritisation of outdoor sport facilities.
- Evidence to help protect and enhance outdoor sport provision.
- The need to inform the development and implementation of planning policy.
- The need to inform the assessment of planning applications.
- The need to provide evidence to help secure internal and external funding.
- A series of sport-by-sport recommendations that provide a strategic framework for improvements to provision.
- A series of strategic recommendations which provide a strategic framework for the improvement, maintenance, development and, as appropriate, rationalisation of the playing pitch stock.
- A prioritised area-by-area action plan to address key issues.

The Strategy and Action Plan recommends numerous priority projects for Southend-on-Sea that should be implemented over the course of its lifespan. It is outlined to provide a framework for improvement, with potential partners and possible sources of external funding identified in light of limited council resources.

The recommendations made in this strategy must be translated into local plan policy so that there is a mechanism to support delivery and secure provision and investment into provision where the opportunity arises.

There is a need to sustain and build key partnerships between the Council, Essex County Council, Active Essex, NGBs, Sport England, education providers, leisure contractors, maintenance contractors, community clubs and private landowners to maintain and improve outdoor sport provision. In these instances, the potential for the Council to take a strategic lead can be limited (except in terms of Section 106 agreements and developer contributions). This document will provide clarity with regard to the way forward and will allow organisations to focus on the key issues and objectives that they can directly influence and achieve.

1.3: Headline findings

The table below highlights the quantitative headline findings identified for all main pitch sports included in the preceding Assessment Report. For qualitative findings and site-specific findings, please see Part 3: Sport Specific Recommendations and Scenarios, and Part 4: Action Plan.
Table 1.2: Quantitative headline findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sport</th>
<th>Analysis area</th>
<th>Current demand shortfall</th>
<th>Future demand shortfall (2037)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Football (grass pitches)</td>
<td>Central</td>
<td>6.5 youth 11v11 match sessions 4 youth 9v9 match sessions 2 mini 7v7 match sessions</td>
<td>2.5 adult match sessions 11.5 youth 11v11 match sessions 7.5 youth 9v9 match sessions 3 mini 7v7 match sessions 3.5 mini 5v5 match sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>East</td>
<td>No current shortfalls</td>
<td>No future shortfalls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West</td>
<td>No current shortfalls</td>
<td>5 adult match sessions 1.5 youth 11v11 match sessions 2.5 youth 9v9 match sessions 1 mini 7v7 match session 4 mini 5v5 match sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>6.5 youth 11v11 match sessions 4 youth 9v9 match sessions 1.5 mini 7v7 match sessions</td>
<td>6 adult match sessions 13 youth 11v11 match sessions 10 youth 9v9 match sessions 4 mini 7v7 match sessions 7.5 mini 5v5 match sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football (3G AGPs)</td>
<td>Central</td>
<td>3 full size 3G pitches</td>
<td>4 full size 3G pitches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>East</td>
<td>No current shortfalls</td>
<td>No future shortfalls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West</td>
<td>1 full size 3G pitches</td>
<td>2 full size 3G pitches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>4 full size 3G pitches</td>
<td>6 full size 3G pitches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cricket</td>
<td>Central</td>
<td>No current shortfalls</td>
<td>No future shortfalls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>East</td>
<td>No current shortfalls</td>
<td>No future shortfalls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West</td>
<td>No current shortfalls</td>
<td>No future shortfalls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>No current shortfalls</td>
<td>No future shortfalls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rugby union</td>
<td>Central</td>
<td>11 match sessions</td>
<td>11 match sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>East</td>
<td>No current shortfalls</td>
<td>No future shortfalls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West</td>
<td>No current shortfalls</td>
<td>No future shortfalls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>11 match sessions</td>
<td>11 match sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hockey (Sand AGPs)</td>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>One full size hockey suitable AGP</td>
<td>One full size hockey suitable AGP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Based on accommodating 42 teams on one full size pitch
Conclusions

From a quantitative perspective, the existing position for all sports is either that demand is being met or that there is a shortfall, whereas the future position shows the creation of additional shortfalls for some pitch types and in some areas where demand is currently being met and the exacerbation of existing shortfalls.

For the most part, shortfalls can be met by better utilising current provision, such as through improving quality, installing additional floodlighting, improving ancillary facilities and enabling access to existing unused provision, such as at unavailable school sites. Another example of how to develop existing provision to overcome shortfalls is pitch re-configuration (or re-designation).

Notwithstanding the above, a shortfall of 3G pitches can only be met through new provision. With resources to improve the quality of grass pitches being limited, an increase in 3G provision could also help reduce grass pitch shortfalls through the transfer of play, thus reducing overplay, which in turn can aid pitch quality improvements. This is the case for both football and rugby.

The shortfall of sand-based AGPs could be rectified through the existing stock via resurfacing the pitch at St Thomas More High School (as hockey suitable), or by providing an additional full size pitch is required, potentially at Warners Bridge Park.

Where demand is being met, this does not equate to a surplus of provision, with any spare capacity instead considered as a solution to overcoming current shortfalls and accommodating existing or future demand. As such, there is a clear need to protect all existing outdoor sports provision until all demand is met, or these is a requirement to replace provision to an equal or better quantity and quality before it is lost.

For low value playing pitch sites, e.g. single pitch sites that are rarely used and are without appropriate ancillary facilities, there could be a case for rationalisation providing that there is no net loss of playing pitch space. As an example, where sites are disposed of (as there will be some cases where the saving is only from a maintenance perspective and the sites continue to be provided as open space) the capital receipts acquired could contribute towards the creation of a multi-pitch site or the extension/improvement of an existing multi-pitch site. However, no such sites have been identified as being suitable for this in Southend-on-Sea.
PART 2: VISION

2.1: Vision

Below is Southend-on-Sea’s vision for its sport and leisure provision. It sets out the vision and objectives for the period 2017-2037.

‘For Southend-on-Sea to be a healthy, active Borough; making participation in an active healthy lifestyle the social norm for people who live and work in Southend-on-Sea, particularly for under-represented and inactive groups’.

To achieve this vision, the Council sets out the following strategic aims:

- To reduce inactivity and increase participation in physical activity for everyone, giving priority to the more inactive populations and to look at more ways for people in Southend-on-Sea to be more active more often at work, at home and during leisure time.
- To improve marketing and communications about physical activity and to increase the knowledge, awareness and understanding of people of all ages in Southend-on-Sea about the health benefits of physical activity, and where and how to be active.
- To promote the built and natural environment and its contribution to supporting people to be more active in daily life, promoting facilities and the active travel network that enhance opportunities for people to get and stay active.
- To work collaboratively with a wide range of partners, including statutory organisations, businesses, the third sector and community groups, to help people to be more active, strengthening partnership working and making effective use of combined resources.

2.2: Aims

The following overarching aims are based on the three Sport England themes. It is recommended that they are adopted by the Council and partners to enable delivery of the overall PPS vision and Sport England planning objectives.

AIM 1
To protect the existing supply of outdoor sports facilities where it is needed to meet current and future needs.

AIM 2
To enhance outdoor sports provision and ancillary facilities through improving quality and management of sites.

AIM 3
To provide new outdoor sports facilities where feasible and there is current or future demand to do so.
Figure 2.1: Sport England themes

Source: Sport England (2015)
PART 3: SPORT SPECIFIC ISSUES SCENARIOS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In order to help develop the recommendations/actions and to understand their potential impact, a number of relevant scenario questions are tested against the key issues in this section for each playing pitch sport; resulting in sport specific recommendations.

Football – grass pitches

Summary

- The audit identifies a total of 115 grass football pitches within Southend-on-Sea across 36 sites, of which 109 are available for community use across 31 sites.
- There are 21 youth 11v11 teams playing on adult sized pitches meaning they are playing on the incorrect pitch type.
- Southend United FC has submitted a planning application proposing to relocate its stadium to Fossetts Farm.
- Garon Park CIC has aspirations to develop Norman Garon Trust Football Pitches, Garon Park and the Youth Ground.
- In total, 24 community available pitches are assessed as good quality, 66 as standard quality and 19 as poor quality.
- Southend High School for Boys reports permission has recently been granted to improve the quality of the drainage of its football pitches.
- Blenheim Park, Victory Sports Ground, the Youth Ground, Bridgewater Drive Playing Fields, Ekco Social and Sports Club Association and Jones Memorial Ground are considered to have poor quality changing facilities.
- Through the audit and assessment, 285 teams from within 63 clubs are identified as playing within Southend-on-Sea consisting of 86 adult men's, four adult women's, 100 youth boys', five youth girls' and 90 mini mixed teams.
- Based on data collated, there are two teams based outside of Southend-on-Sea that play matches and/or train at venues within the Borough.
- There are six teams based outside of the Borough that play matches and/or train at venues within neighbouring authority Rochford.
- Team generation rates predict that there will be a possible increase of six senior men’s, 12 youth 11v11 boys’, 10 youth 9v9 boys’, six mini 7v7 and one mini 5v5 teams across Southend-on-Sea.
- The total future demand expressed by clubs amounts to 32 teams.
- In total, 20 pitches across seven sites are considered to contain some level of actual spare capacity equating to 13.5 match equivalent sessions.
- There are 16 pitches across seven sites that are overplayed by a combined total of 21.5 match equivalent sessions.
- It is determined that there are both current and future shortfalls of youth 11v11, youth 9v9 pitches and mini 7v7 pitches, whereas a future shortfall is also evident for mini 5v5 pitches and adult pitches.
- Should pitches with unsecure tenure be taken out of use, current shortfalls are greatly exacerbated, whilst shortfalls are created on pitch types with current spare capacity.
Scenarios

Alleviating overplay/improving pitch quality

In total, there are 16 community available pitches in Southend-on-Sea that are overplayed, with only one these assessed as good quality. Improving quality of the remaining pitches (i.e. through increased maintenance or improved drainage) will therefore increase capacity and as a consequence reduce current and future shortfalls.

To illustrate the above, Table 3.1 highlights that current levels of overplay would be alleviated on 14 of the 16 overplayed pitches if quality improved to good at each site. As a reminder, the capacity rating for each type and quality rating is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site ID</th>
<th>Site name</th>
<th>Pitch type</th>
<th>No. of pitches</th>
<th>Current quality</th>
<th>Current Capacity rating</th>
<th>Good quality capacity rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Belfairs Park</td>
<td>Adult</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Blenheim Primary School and Childrens Centre</td>
<td>Mini 5v5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mini 7v7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Ekco Social and Sports Club Association</td>
<td>Adult</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Victory Sports Ground</td>
<td>Adult</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Westcliff High School for Boys</td>
<td>Adult</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Youth Ground</td>
<td>Adult</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mini 7v7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Youth 11v11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Youth 9v9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Norman Garon Trust Football Pitches</td>
<td>Youth 11v11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The only pitches that would remain overplayed are an adult pitch at Belfairs Park and an adult pitch at Westcliff High School for Boys. To alleviate this, play should be encouraged to transfer to alternative provision with actual spare capacity.

Table 3.1: Levels of overplay if quality improved to good

2 Match equivalent sessions
3 Match equivalent sessions
In addition, 3.5 match equivalent sessions of what would be actual spare capacity is discounted due to poor quality at Southend High School for Boys. Improving such provision will provide and increase overall levels of actual spare capacity, which can be used to accommodate latent and future demand.

Notwithstanding the above, given the costs of improving pitch quality, alternatives also need to be considered that can offer a more sustainable model for the future of football. The alternative to grass pitches is the use of 3G pitches for competitive matches, which can not only alleviate overplay of grass pitches but it can also aid quality improvements through the transfer of play and therefore reduced use.

Providing security of tenure

Currently, 29 match equivalent sessions take place at sites considered as unsecure. If these were to fall out of use, shortfalls would be significantly exacerbated as the demand would have to relocate to other sites, thus increasing overplay or resulting in more exported demand.

Of the 29 match equivalent sessions played on unsecured pitches, 20.5 match equivalent sessions are played at peak time, suggesting that 21 pitches would be required to accommodate the demand.

Table 3.2: Summary of supply and demand without unsecure sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pitch type</th>
<th>Demand (match equivalent sessions)</th>
<th>Current total</th>
<th>Play at unsecured sites</th>
<th>Future total without unsecured sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adult</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth 11v11</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth 9v9</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mini 7v7</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mini 5v5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All unsecure usage takes places at education sites. Whilst not always possible, creating community use agreements between providers and users would ensure that such demand continues to be provided for in the long-term. Where there is 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 accessible at peak time and affordable.

Accommodating youth 11v11 demand

As it stands, 21 youth 11v11 matches in Southend-on-Sea are played on adult pitches. If this demand was to be transferred to the correct pitch type, increased actual spare capacity would exist on adult pitches; however, the current stock of youth 11v11 pitches is not sufficient to accommodate the demand with shortfalls already in existence.

Given the above, the actual spare capacity found on adult pitches should be used to reconfigure the supply to better accommodate youth 11v11 demand. An example of this is found at Westcliff High School for Boys, which is used solely by youth 11v11 teams, meaning a pitch re-configuration will not adversely affect adult demand.
Jones Memorial Ground contains three adult pitches that are used by just two adult teams as well as numerous youth 11v11 teams. It is therefore considered that two of the pitches could be re-configured to better accommodate the youth 11v11 demand, as the adult demand could be hosted on one pitch.

Southchurch Park contains two adult pitches that are used by youth 11v11 teams; however, these pitches are not suitable for a conversion given the amount of adult demand also serviced. As such, the youth 11v11 demand should be encouraged to transfer to a site with dedicated youth 11v11 provision.

Sites for consideration to further increase youth 11v11 provision include:

- Blenheim Park
- Eastwood Park
- Priory Park
- Shoebury Park

These sites all contain multiple adult pitches that are currently under-utilised, meaning the existing adult demand could be amalgamated onto a lesser number of adult pitches to enable the creation of youth 11v11 pitches.

**Recommendations**

- Protect existing quantity of pitches (unless replacement provision is agreed upon and provided).
- Where pitches are overplayed and/or assessed as poor quality, prioritise investment and review maintenance regimes to ensure it is of an appropriate standard to sustain use and improve quality.
- Where pitches are overplayed and assessed as good quality, pursue transfer of demand to sites with actual spare capacity.
- Work to accommodate future demand as well as expressed exported, unmet and latent demand at sites which are not operating at capacity or at sites not currently available for community use that could be moving forward.
- Provide security of tenure for clubs using educational sites through community use agreements.
- Ensure all teams are playing on the correct pitch sizes and explore reconfiguration of adult pitches to accommodate youth 11v11 teams where possible.
- Improve ancillary facilities where there is a demand to do so and where it can benefit the wider footballing offer.
- Ensure that any large housing developments are provided for and assess the need for new pitch provision through master planning on an individual basis.
- Where a development is of a size to justify on-site football provision, focus on the creation of multi-pitch sites that reduce existing shortfalls, with accompanying clubhouse provision included given that single pitch sites without appropriate ancillary facilities can be unsustainable.
- Where a development is not of a size to justify on-site football provision, consider using contributions to improve existing sites within the locality.
- If required, explore ground sharing possibilities across Southend-on-Sea and the wider South Essex region that can provide a more sustainable long-term future for the senior club network.
3G pitches

Summary

- There are two full size 3G pitches in Southend-on-Sea (the Len Forge Centre and Playfootball), both of which are floodlit and available to the community.
- In addition, there are 11 smaller sized 3G pitches, of which nine are available for community use located across two sites.
- There are plans to create an additional two full size 3G pitches in the Central Analysis Area, one as part of the proposed relocation of Southend United FC, with the other at Garon Park.
- The full size 3G pitch at Len Forge Centre is FA approved to host competitive matches; the full size 3G pitch at Playfootball is not.
- None of the 3G pitches are World Rugby compliant.
- The 3G pitch at The Len Forge Centre is considered good quality, whereas the pitch located at Playfootball is considered standard quality.
- Both full size 3G pitches are accompanied by ancillary facilities that are considered adequate with no issues raised during consultation or via site assessments.
- Of football clubs responding to consultation, 63% report that they require additional training facilities, and 80% of these specifically mention demand for 3G pitches.
- With 285 teams currently affiliated to Southend-on-Sea there is a need for six full size 3G pitches, meaning a current shortfall of four pitches.
- Based on future demand, there will be a shortfall of six pitches.
- A total of 17 teams currently play matches on the 3G pitch stock; however, four of these play at Playfootball which should not be happening as it is not FA approved.
- Given rugby union grass pitch shortfalls, evidence exists to support the creation of a World Rugby compliant 3G pitch.

Scenarios

Accommodating football training demand

As evidenced in the preceding Assessment Report, in order to satisfy current football training demand for the 285 teams playing in Southend-on-Sea (based on the FA’s model of one full size 3G pitch being able to cater for 42 teams) there is a need for an additional four full size 3G pitches, with a further two required when accounting for future demand (based on a current supply of two) to fully satisfy training demand.

Table 3.3: Demand for full size 3G pitches in Southend-on-Sea

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current number of teams</th>
<th>Current 3G requirement</th>
<th>Future number of teams</th>
<th>Future 3G requirement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>285</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When studying demand by analysis area (based on where teams currently play competitive fixtures), the shortfall can be more specifically attributed to the Central and West analysis areas, with no provision required in the East Analysis Area. This provides a good indication as to where new provision should be located to best service demand.

---

4 Rounded to the nearest whole number
5 Rounded to the nearest whole number
Table 3.4: Future demand for 3G pitches by analysis area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analysis area</th>
<th>Future number of teams</th>
<th>3G requirement 6</th>
<th>Current number of 3G pitches</th>
<th>Potential shortfall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southend-on-Sea</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Moving football match play demand to 3G pitches

Moving match play to 3G pitches is supported by the FA. In Southend-on-Sea, the 3G pitch at Len Forge Centre has undergone appropriate testing and is therefore approved to host competitive matches, whereas the 3G pitch at Playfootball has not been tested albeit it is being used. A total of 17 teams are currently identified as playing matches on the stock, which is relatively good given the number provided.

To further the use of 3G pitches for matches, the FA is particularly keen to work with local authorities to understand the potential demand for full size floodlit 3G pitches should all competitive matches that are currently played on council pitches be transferred. The following table therefore calculates the number of teams currently using council facilities in Southend-on-Sea for each pitch type at peak time.

Table 3.5: Number of teams currently using council pitches (peak time)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pitch type</th>
<th>Pitch size</th>
<th>Peak period</th>
<th>No. of teams</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adult</td>
<td>11v11</td>
<td>Sunday AM</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth</td>
<td>11v11</td>
<td>Sunday AM</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth</td>
<td>9v9</td>
<td>Sunday AM</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mini</td>
<td>7v7</td>
<td>Sunday AM</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mini</td>
<td>5v5</td>
<td>Sunday AM</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The FA suggests an approach for estimating the number of full size, floodlit 3G pitches required to accommodate the above demand for competitive matches, as seen in the table below.

Table 3.6: Full size 3G pitches required for the transfer of council pitch demand

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Format</th>
<th>No teams per time (x)</th>
<th>No matches at PEAK TIME (y) = x/2</th>
<th>3G units per match (z)</th>
<th>Total units required formats (A)=(y)*(z)</th>
<th>3G pitches required B= (A)/64</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adult</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11v11</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>5.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9v9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7v7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5v5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6 Rounded to the nearest whole number
Given that peak time is the same for each pitch type, the number of 3G pitches required needs totalling together. This equates to the demand for ten full size 3G pitches (rounded down from 10.22).

As the number required is more than the number of full size 3G pitches required for training, it would be unfeasible to create the additional provision due to sustainability issues (as mid-week usage could be limited). As such, it may be more beneficial to transfer certain formats of football in a phased approach rather than all play, such as youth 11v11 demand given the youth 11v11 grass pitch shortfalls. This would require five 3G pitches.

An alternative approach is to transfer all mini demand (not just that played on council pitches) to 3G pitches; the FA has an ambition to transfer 50% of mini play on to 3G pitches nationally. Thus, a programme of play has been created to determine how many 3G pitches would be required to accommodate this, given that peak time for both mini 7v7 and mini 5v5 football is Sunday AM.

**Table 3.7: Full size 3G pitches required for transfer of all mini demand**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Pitch markings</th>
<th>Total games/teams</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.00 – 10.00</td>
<td>4 x 5v5</td>
<td>4/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.00 – 11.00</td>
<td>4 x 5v5</td>
<td>4/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00 – 12:00</td>
<td>2 x 7v7</td>
<td>2/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00 – 13:00</td>
<td>2 x 7v7</td>
<td>2/4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the above programming and separate start times for mini 5v5 and mini 7v7 matches, the overall need is for six full size 3G pitches (exactly). This is calculated based on 42 mini 5v5 teams and 48 mini 7v7 teams currently playing within Southend-on-Sea.

As the number of 3G pitches required to accommodate all mini demand is less than the number of 3G pitches required to accommodate current and future training needs, it suggests that all mini match play demand could be catered for if training shortfalls were alleviated.

**Creating additional full size 3G pitches for football**

First and foremost, the creation of additional full size 3G pitches should work towards alleviating the shortfall for training. Any development over and above the demand for training must have a robust business plan in place to warrant creation given that it could create an oversupply, thus reducing potential usage, especially during mid-week.

As a reminder, training shortfalls equate to a shortfall of three 3G pitches in the Central Analysis Area a shortfall of one 3G pitch in the West Analysis Area, with future demand resulting in the need for four 3G pitches in the Central Analysis Area and two in the West Analysis Area.

If the proposed developments at Garon Park (Garon CIC) and the new Southend United Football Club facilities take place it is considered that the shortfall within the Central Analysis Area could reduce by two full size 3G pitches. That being said, concern exists in regards to the long-term community availability at the latter given the management of the site.
To fully alleviate current shortfalls in the Central Analysis Area, Garon Park could be suitable to become a double 3G site if the first 3G pitch is successful. Similarly, creating a second full size 3G pitch at the Len Forge Centre is seen as the best solution to alleviating current shortfalls in the West Analysis Area.

For future shortfalls, no suitable sites have yet been identified. If it is not possible to provide such provision within the Borough, it is considered that neighbouring local authorities could assist with sites close to the Southend-on-Sea border.

**World Rugby compliant 3G pitches**

World Rugby has produced a ‘performance specification for artificial grass pitches for rugby’, more commonly known as ‘Regulation 22’. This contains the necessary technical detail to produce pitch systems appropriate for rugby union. The RFU investment strategy for AGPs considers sites where grass rugby pitches are over capacity and where an AGP would support the growth of the game at the host site and for the local rugby partnership, including local clubs and education establishments.

There are currently no World Rugby compliant 3G pitches in Southend-on-Sea; however, the Borough is considered to be a viable option for provision given the grass pitch shortfalls identified. This would satisfy shortfalls for Southend RFC and also Westcliff RFC (a Southend-on-Sea club playing in Rochford), and the RFU is assessing the eligibility and feasibility of sites in the area within its Rugby 365 programme.

If it is not possible to provide a World Rugby compliant 3G pitch on site at Southend Rugby Club, the RFU should work in partnership with the FA so that a new 3G pitch is also compliant for rugby usage when alleviating football shortfalls.

**Recommendations**

- Protect current stock of 3G pitches.
- Explore options of providing new 3G pitches first and foremost to meet football training shortfalls, focusing on the Central and West analysis areas.
- Carry out a feasibility study across the wider South Essex sub-region to ensure that 3G deficiencies across all local authorities are relieved via a partnership approach.
- When assessing 3G pitch suitability, give preference to opportunities for multi 3G pitch sites.
- Support creation of additional 3G pitches above and beyond football training shortfalls if it can satisfy rugby demand as well as football demand; or, explore creation of 3G pitches that are both football and rugby appropriate when alleviating shortfalls.
- Consider the need for further 3G pitch provision above and beyond football training shortfalls if certain scenarios become reality e.g. the loss of unsecured sites.
- Ensure that any new 3G pitches are constructed to meet FA/RFU recommended dimensions and quality performance standards to meet performance testing criteria.
- Carry out consultation with England Hockey when deciding upon the location of new 3G pitches to ensure the sustainability of existing sand-based AGPs.
- Ensure that any new 3G pitches have community use agreements in place (especially at the new Southend United Football Club facility).
- Ensure all providers put in place a sinking fund to ensure long-term sustainability.
- Encourage more match play demand to transfer to 3G pitches, where possible, and ensure that pitches remain suitable to accommodate such demand through appropriate certification when it is required.
Encourage appropriate FA testing at Playfootball so that match play demand can be retained at the site.

Where a development is of a size to justify on-site football provision, consider the potential for 3G provision on multi-pitch sites, and as a minimum requirement, design new sites so that they could accommodate 3G provision at a later date, if required.

Cricket pitches

Summary

- There are 15 grass wicket squares in Southend-on-Sea located across ten sites, all of which are available for community use.
- There are NTPs accompanying the grass wicket squares at three sites and standalone NTPs at six sites.
- Garon Park CIC has an aspiration to create an additional grass wicket square at the Youth Ground as part of a wider site development.
- Southend-on-Sea & EMT CC leases one of its squares but rents its other, whereas all other clubs also access squares via a rental agreement.
- The non-technical assessment of grass wicket squares found five grass wicket squares to be good quality and ten to be standard quality; none are assessed as poor.
- The audit of ancillary facilities determined that three grass wicket squares are accompanied by good quality changing rooms, seven squares by standard quality changing rooms and three squares by poor quality changing rooms (two squares are without dedicated provision).
- Old Southendians & Southchurch CC reports that it has aspirations to relay its three nets at Garon Park, whilst Southend-on-Sea & EMT CC is not currently serviced by cricket nets.
- There are six clubs competing in Southend-on-Sea generating 39 teams, which as a breakdown equates to 26 senior men’s and 13 junior boys’ teams.
- There is no LMS franchise in operation.
- In addition to the demand from Old Southendians & Southchurch CC, the square at Garon Park regularly hosts demand from Essex County CC as well as finals matches for junior age groups and Essex District matches.
- Eastwood CC is looking to expand by one senior men’s and two junior teams, whereas Old Southendians & Southchurch CC reports wanting to introduce a senior women’s team and one junior team.
- Six of the 12 squares with potential spare capacity are considered to provide actual spare capacity for an increase in senior demand amounting to 235 match equivalent sessions.
- These squares are also considered to have actual spare capacity for an increase in junior cricket as matches can be spread across numerous days, as are Ekco Social and Sports Association and the Victory Sports Ground.
- Two squares at Chalkwell Park are overplayed by eight match equivalent sessions, whereas the square at Garon Park is overplayed by 37 match equivalent sessions.
- Overall spare capacity exists currently for senior cricket amounting to 198 match equivalent sessions and for junior cricket amounting to 272 match equivalent sessions.
- Taking into account future demand, actual spare capacity reduces to 174 match equivalent sessions for senior cricket and to 240 match equivalent sessions for junior cricket.
- Notwithstanding overall spare capacity, there remains a need to alleviate overplay at Chalkwell Park and particularly at Garon Park, as well as a need to improve the situation at other sites.
The Indoor Sports and Leisure Strategy finds that there is increasing demand for high quality cricket provision for both practice and match play across South Essex; Essex Cricket and the ECB’s main objective is to increase access to indoor cricket facilities across the region, however, local clubs are increasingly finding access to indoor facilities a significant challenge, particularly at school sites.

**Scenarios**

**Addressing overplay**

Although a regular, sufficient maintenance regime can sustain sites with minimal levels of overplay, a reduction in play is recommended to ensure that there is no detrimental effect on quality over time.

In order to reduce overplay at Chalkwell Park, greater use of the accompanying NTP on one of the squares is recommended so that there is less play on the grass wickets. If this is not possible, another NTP could be installed on the second square.

Whilst an NTP could also reduce overplay at Garon Park, this is not considered to be ideal due to the level of play that the site hosts. As such, support should be offered to the proposed creation of a square at the Youth Ground to enable play to be transferred.

**Accommodating future demand**

Two clubs express future demand; Old Southendian & Southchurch CC and Eastwood CC, and it is considered that the current stock of squares available to the clubs are sufficient to accommodate growth. For Eastwood CC, capacity exists for additional teams to be fielded at both of the sites it currently uses (Belfairs Park and Ekco Social and Sports Club Association), whereas for Old Southendian & Southchurch CC, capacity exists at two of its sites (Shoebury Park and Victory Sports Ground).

**Increasing stock of NTPs**

The ECB has created a local authority NTP scheme aiming to create a substantial number of new cricket pitches at local authority sites in areas of need and to facilitate a partnership approach between local authorities and county cricket boards. It is expected that the primary source of identified strategic need will be an up-to-date PPS, with the scheme able to offer capital grants towards the cost of construction of NTPs, periodic maintenance for a period of five years and equipment to engage new participants.

The above scheme is considered to be a possibility in Southend-on-Sea by the ECB. An increase of NTPs within the Borough would not only better accommodate junior demand, but it would also assist in the possible expansion of the Last Man Stands franchise as well as other non-traditional formats of the game.

**Recommendations**

- Protect existing quantity of cricket squares, including protection from development that may prejudice the use of a cricket square such as residential development in close proximity to a cricket outfield (ball strike issues).
- Work with clubs and grounds staff to review quality issues on squares to ensure appropriate quality is achieved at sites assessed as standard and sustained at sites assessed as good.
Ensure security of tenure for all clubs with lease arrangements in place by ensuring agreements have over 25 years remaining.

For clubs without lease arrangements, explore opportunities for long-term asset transfer or as a minimum ensure community use agreements are entered into to enable long-term access.

Ensure expressed future demand can be accommodated on existing supply of squares.

Explore options of alleviating overplay at Chalkwell Park through greater utilisation of the existing NTP or via installing another NTP.

Support proposal for a square to be created at the Youth Ground to alleviate overplay at Garon Park, provided that it does not negatively impact on football activity at the site.

Seek refurbishment of training facilities where required, particularly at Garon Park.

Explore options of refurbishment of ancillary facilities where provision is assessed as poor quality (Ekco Social and Sports Club Association, Shoebury Park and Shoebury Garrison Ground).

Where a development is of a size to justify on-site cricket provision, ensure that any proposals for new squares will attract adequate demand.

Where a development is not of a size to justify on-site cricket provision, or if sufficient demand cannot be attracted, consider using contributions to improve existing sites within the locality.

In line with the Indoor Sports and Leisure Strategy, support investment at sites where sports halls are being refurbished or new sports halls are being developed to ensure cricket is catered for, regularly evaluate programming at sports halls to ensure there is capacity to support cricket, and develop relationships between schools and clubs to ensure good access to indoor provision.

**Rugby union - grass pitches**

**Summary**

Within Southend-on-Sea there are nine senior pitches and three mini pitches provided, with all but two senior pitches and two mini pitches available for community use.

In addition, Westcliff RFC is located just outside of Southend-on-Sea but considers itself to be a Southend-on-Sea club, with it accessing five mini and five senior pitches in Rochford.

Of the community available pitches in Southend-on-Sea, two are assessed as standard quality and six as poor quality, whilst all pitches servicing Westcliff RFC are good quality.

Southend RFC rents its pitches from the Council but would prefer to have a long-term lease agreement in place; Westcliff RFC rents its pitches from the Council but has aspirations for a long-term lease.

A clubhouse is provided at Southend RFC, however, the Club reports this to be of poor quality due to its age and lack of dedicated female/referees provision.

Southend RFC is the only club within Southend-on-Sea; it currently consists of five senior men’s, one senior women’s, six junior boys’ and six mini teams.

Westcliff RFC caters for 16 teams across senior, junior and mini formats but has no dedicated female teams.

As well as match play demand, Southend RFC utilises two of its three floodlit pitches for training demand, whereas Westcliff RFC utilises one floodlit pitch.

The RFU is assessing the eligibility and feasibility of sites in the area within its Rugby 365 programme.

The only pitch identified as containing potential spare capacity in Southend-on-Sea is at Southend Rugby Club; however, this spare capacity has been discounted due to the poor quality of the pitch.
The Gables (Westcliff Rugby Club) contains three senior pitches that are considered to have actual spare capacity, amounting to 1.5 match equivalent sessions, as well as all of its mini pitches.

Whilst currently unused but available pitches at school sites are likely to contain some spare capacity, this should not be considered as actual spare capacity due to security of tenure and quality issues.

The remaining three pitches at Southend Rugby Club are identified as being substantially overplayed equating to a total of 11 match equivalent sessions.

One senior pitch servicing Westcliff RFC is overplayed by five match equivalent sessions.

Having considered supply and demand, an overall shortfall is evident to service Southend RFC, meaning priority should be focused on alleviating overplay at Southend RFC.

An overall shortfall is also evident for Westcliff RFC; however, this is considered to be less of an issue as all excess demand is concentrated on its training pitch.

**Scenarios**

*Improving pitch quality*

All four senior pitches at Southend Rugby Club are rated as poor quality (M0/D1 or M0/D0), with total overplay amounting to 11 match equivalent sessions. Coincidentally, maximising the quality (to M2/D3) would create 11 match equivalent sessions of additional capacity, thus providing enough capacity to eliminate overplay. That being said, the training pitch would likely remain overplayed as such demand could not be transferred to another pitch without the presence of floodlighting. Furthermore, such major quality improvements across the site are considered unrealistic due to financial constraints and the ongoing maintenance required for sustainability.

Quality improvements are not considered viable at Westcliff Rugby Club as the pitches have only recently been created and have been provided to specific RFU specification.

*Increasing access to floodlit training provision*

As three of the four pitches at Southend Rugby Club are overplayed, and as the remaining pitch is predominately reserved for first team matches, providing additional floodlighting on existing grass pitches is unlikely to resolve overplay issues (without significant quality improvements also taking place). Instead, access to a World Rugby compliant 3G pitch is considered to be the best solution (in addition to some quality improvements).

At Westcliff RFC, providing additional floodlighting on each senior pitch would result in overplay of the Club’s training pitch reducing to 3.5 match equivalent sessions (discounting spare capacity on the first team pitch, which should be retained). This is a reduction from five match equivalent sessions but remains substantial, meaning the Club would also benefit from accessing a World Rugby compliant 3G pitch.

The RFU is assessing the eligibility and feasibility of sites in the area for a World Rugby compliant 3G pitch within its Rugby 365 programme.
Transferring demand

If World Rugby compliant pitches are not provided to satisfy demand from Westcliff RFC and Southend RFC, the only alternative way to alleviate overplay is through the transfer of demand. As the only pitches not currently used by the clubs are located at school sites, this is considered to be unlikely due to the cost of pitch hire, the travel involved and the current unsecure nature of the schools in question. Traditionally, rugby clubs prefer to be based entirely from one location due to the social aspects of the sport.

Recommendations

- Protect existing quantity of rugby union pitches.
- Improve pitch quality at Southend Rugby Club to reduce overplay, primarily through improved maintenance and the installation of an effective drainage system where appropriate.
- Ensure quality is sustained at Westcliff RFC to ensure that overplay does not worsen.
- Explore the creation of a World Rugby compliant 3G pitch that can be utilised by both clubs to fully alleviate overplay, potentially at Southend Rugby Club, or in partnership with the FA.
- Ensure that any proposals for the creation of World Rugby complaint 3G pitches are progressed in co-ordination with proposals for meeting 3G needs for football given that the solutions can help meet the needs of both sports.
- Improve changing facilities at Southend Rugby Club.
- Ensure security of tenure for Westcliff RFC via a long-term lease agreement.
- Retain supply of rugby pitches at school sites for curricular and extra-curricular purposes and encourage secure community availability should demand exist in the future.

Rugby league

- There is just one grass rugby league pitch currently identified in Southend-on-Sea, located at Shoeburyness High School.
- The pitch is available to the community but is assessed as poor quality.
- There was one rugby league club in Southend-on-Sea; however, Southend Spartans RLFC folded last season due to players deciding to pursue rugby union at a local club.
- The Club feels that there is no demand to re-establish rugby league participation.
- Consultation with the RFL suggests that it would be keen to support the re-establishment of demand within South Essex.
- It is unlikely that any further dedicated rugby league provision is required, with the pitch at Shoeburyness High School and the stock of rugby union pitches considered sufficient to cater for any activity.

Scenarios

N/a

Recommendations

- Ensure rugby league demand can be accommodated should it exist in the future.
Hockey pitches (sand/water-based AGPs)

Summary

- There are two full size hockey suitable AGPs in Southend-on-Sea, one at St Thomas More High School and one at Warners Bridge Park.
- Both are floodlit, however, there are restrictions applied to this at St Thomas More High School whereby they have to be turned off by 8pm.
- The AGP at Warners Bridge Park is managed by Old Southendians HC and is on a long-term lease to the Club via the Council, with approximately 50 years remaining.
- Southend HC is without security of tenure across the three sites that it accesses.
- The AGP at Warners Bridge Park is considered to be good quality, whilst the AGP at St Thomas More High School is poor quality and in need of resurfacing.
- There are two clubs based in Southend; Old Southendians HC and Southend HC.
- Old Southendians HC fields six senior men’s, two senior women’s and five junior teams, with all activity taking place at Warners Bridge Park.
- Southend HC fields three senior men’s, three senior women’s and two junior teams, and splits its activity across three sites, two in Rochford (Sweyne Park School and King Edmund Business and Enterprise School) and one in Southend-on-Sea (Warners Bridge Park).
- Southend HC wants to return all of its demand to Southend-on-Sea.
- Southend & Benfleet HC also considers itself to be a Southend-on-Sea club; however, expresses no desire to return to the Borough as it is happy playing in Rochford.
- Old Southendians HC reports no future demand; Southend HC has aspirations to redevelop the teams that it has recently lost (two senior teams).
- Southend HC runs Back to Hockey sessions at Warners Bridge Park.
- There is a requirement for two full size, floodlit, hockey suitable AGPs, meaning a shortfall is evident given the quality issues at St Thomas More High School.
- Given the shortfall, an additional full size pitch is required, or the AGP at St Thomas More High School needs resurfacing, in order to meet demand from Southend HC.
- In addition, the AGP at Warners Bridge Park requires protection for continued hockey use.

Scenarios

Reducing shortfalls

In order to reduce shortfalls and return all exported demand to Southend-on-Sea, there is a requirement for two useable full size sand-based AGPs. Given the quality issues at St Thomas More High School, only one AGP is currently deemed suitable (at Warners Bridge Park).

To alleviate the shortfall, either the AGP at St Thomas More High School needs resurfacing to bring it up to an appropriate level, or a new pitch is required. The latter option could be achieved by providing another full size sand-based AGP at Warners Bridge Park given that the management structure is already in place at the site, making it a Hub site for hockey. Consideration would, however, need to be given to the master-planning of the site in the context of potential proposals for the adjoining Southend Rugby Club site. A feasibility study is therefore advised.
Converting sand-based AGPs to 3G pitches

Given that two full size sand-based AGPs are required in Southend-on-Sea, it is imperative that Warners Bridge Park and St Thomas More High School are protected for hockey use and not converted to 3G as this would be detrimental to hockey, unless suitable replacement provision could be found elsewhere and agreed to be EH.

Recommendations

- Ensure that there is no net loss of hockey suitable AGPs and ensure that no 3G conversions take place that are detrimental to hockey.
- Resurface the AGP at St Thomas More High School as hockey suitable to alleviate shortfall and accommodate Southend HC or provide a new full size sand-based AGP within the District, ideally at Warners Bridge Park following a feasibility study.
- If the AGP at St Thomas More High School is resurfaced, provide security of tenure to users via a community use agreement.
- Improve access to and quality of ancillary facilities at the site to better support post-match and social activities.
- If a new AGP is proposed at Warners Bridge Park, ensure it is feasible in the context of other possible developments at the site.
- Ensure a collective view is gathered from local clubs in regards to current and future provision, and that any new pitch creates a hockey hub/multi-pitch site.
- Ensure sinking funds are in place for long-term sustainability.
- Seek to maximise hockey usage where hockey is being played.

Golf

Summary

- There are three golf courses within Southend-on-Sea that cater for four different clubs.
- Both Thorpe Hall Golf Club and Belfairs Golf Course provide 18-hole courses, whilst Garon Park Golf Complex provides three 9-hole courses as well as Par 3 course.
- Quality is considered to be good at Thorpe Hall Golf Club and Garon Park Golf Complex, whereas Belfairs Golf Course has issues relating to maintenance and vandalism.
- Thorpe Hall Golf Club and Garon Park Golf Complex provide clubhouse provision with an array of facilities; Belfairs Golf Course has no clubhouse.
- Thorpe Hall Golf Club is primarily a membership club, whereas Southend and Belfairs golf clubs are geared more towards pay and play users; Garon Park Golf Club tends to cater for the needs of both members and visitors given the variety of courses and facilities offered.
- Thorpe Hall Golf Club has a substantial membership base when compared to the national average, whilst the remaining three clubs have less, significantly so in the case of Belfairs and Southend golf clubs.
- In total, an average of 85,548 people are identified as current or potential users of golf courses within Southend-on-Sea.
- Demand is likely to be highest for Garon Park Golf Complex, which has 105,006 potential users.
- It is considered that the current supply of facilities in Southend-on-Sea can meet current and future demand.
- It is also clear that all three golf courses should be protected given the different profiles attracted to each one of them.
Emphasis should therefore be placed on ensuring sites are able to retain current members and users as well as assisting them in capitalising on any untapped demand and future demand.

**Scenarios**

N/A

**Recommendations**

- Retain all current golf courses and facilities.
- Sustain course quality and seek improvements where necessary through implementation of appropriate maintenance regimes.
- Support clubs in membership in retention and potential growth.
- Encourage clubs and providers to work more collaboratively in terms of creating pathways for existing and new players.

**Bowls**

**Summary**

- There are 17 bowling greens in Southend-on-Sea located across 12 sites.
- Additionally, there is indoor bowls activity taking place within Southend-on-Sea at two sites.
- The majority of greens in Southend-on-Sea are owned and managed by the Council.
- Following a non-technical assessment of greens and consultation with the clubs, 14 greens assessed as good quality and four as standard quality.
- Shoebury Park, Chalkwell and Eastwood Park bowling clubs all indicate the greens they access (Shoebury Park, Chalkwell Esplanade and Eastwood Park) have all worsened in quality since last season.
- Southchurch BC has aspirations to acquire a disused building at Southchurch Park and refurbish it to create additional ancillary facilities.
- Of the 14 clubs which responded to consultation requests, playing membership equates to 1,103.
- Using ONS projections, demand for bowling greens is likely to increase slightly in the future or at least remain static due to an increase in the population aged 65 and over.
- In total, clubs report ambitions for an additional 100 members across Southend-on-Sea.
- Greens at Belfairs Park, Cavendish Gardens, Southend-on-Sea Bowls Club and Thorpe Bay Lawn Tennis Club are all currently operative above Bowls England capacity guidance; however, no club express a need for additional greens.
- That being said, for this to remain the case, it is likely that all greens require protection.

**Scenarios**

**Consolidation of greens**

Bowls England indicates that one green can accommodate approximately 60 members before capacity becomes an issue, whereas at least 20 members are reportedly required for a green to be sustainable.
In Southend-on-Sea, only Alexandra BC is considered small enough to be able to merge with another club; however, its future demand aspirations will result in this no longer being possible. As no other two clubs could merge without membership exceeding 60, it is considered that all existing greens are required.

**Recommendations**

- Retain existing quantity of greens.
- Sustain good quality greens and explore improvements on greens assessed as standard quality.
- Support clubs with plans to increase membership so that growth can be maximised.
- Support Southchurch BC in its ancillary facility aspirations.

**Tennis**

**Summary**

- There are 119 tennis courts identified in Southend-on-Sea across 29 sites, with 84 courts available for community use across 20 sites.
- There are also nine permanent indoor courts in Southend-on-Sea with five located at David Lloyd Club and four located at Southend Leisure & Tennis Centre.
- No responding clubs’ express concerns with regards to security of tenure.
- The majority of community available courts are located at club sites (65%) with the remaining provision located at Council (27%), private (6%) or commercial sites (5%).
- The majority of clubs, with the exception of Leigh Road Baptist Church and St Peters tennis clubs, are serviced by some level of floodlit provision, with 45 floodlit courts existing across the Borough.
- The majority of courts have a macadam surface, with artificial and clay courts making up the rest of the supply.
- Following non-technical assessments, 54 community available courts are assessed as good quality, 11 as standard quality and 19 as poor quality.
- Westcliff Hard Court TC reports issues with limited car parking, whereas Crowstone & St Saviours TC state that its changing facilities are outdated and in need of modernisation.
- There are nine tennis clubs in Southend-on-Sea and of the seven that responded to consultation, combined membership equates to 1,763 members (1,144 seniors and 629 juniors).
- Total future club growth aspirations equate to an additional 76 juniors and 48 senior members, expressed by four clubs.
- There is also a Parks Tennis League currently operating in Southend-on-Sea, primarily based at Southend Leisure and Tennis Centre.
- Two council sites, Priory Park and Chalkwell Park, have the Clubspark fob access system, with 284 fobs purchased to date.
- There is a sufficient supply of courts at five club sites (Crowstone & St Saviours, Invicta, Southend, St Peters and Westcliff tennis clubs), whilst it is considered unlikely that either David Lloyd or Leigh Road Baptist Church tennis clubs exceed capacity.
- In contrast, the remaining two clubs (Thorpe Bay and Westcliff Hard Court tennis clubs) are operating above capacity; however, both clubs report that the current number of courts is adequate to meet their needs.
- As all remaining, non-club courts are deemed to have spare capacity, focus should be on improving quality to an adequate standard for informal play.
Scenarios

Informal tennis

In 2015, the LTA invested in two council sites in Southend-on-Sea; Priory Park and Chalkwell Park, as part of its ClubSpark initiative. If the Council wishes to extend this offer, Bonchurch Park, Shoebury Park and Southchurch Park could be considered as possible venues if floodlighting could be provided.

The initiative aims to change the way in which people access council courts. Instead of providing free access, courts are secured as per a membership scheme that allows members access through the use of a fob system following payment of a small yearly fee. Not only does this deter unofficial use of the courts but it also allows official use to be tracked, thus providing data on how well and how often courts are being accessed. In addition, it provides income generation that can go towards ongoing maintenance.

Recommendations

- Retain and sustain quality of club courts for competitive play through implementation of appropriate maintenance regimes.
- Sustain quality of club courts for competitive play through implementation of appropriate maintenance regimes.
- Ensure clubs operating above membership thresholds continue to have a supply that adequately meets needs.
- Support Crowstone & St Saviours TC in its ambitions to improve its changing facilities and Westcliff Hard Court TC in its ambitions to resolve car parking issues.
- Improve courts located at education sites to meet curricular and extra-curricular needs.
- Explore extension of ClubSpark scheme at suitable sites (Belfairs Park, Bonchurch Park, Chalkwell Park, Shoebury Park and Southchurch Park).

Netball

Summary

- There are 33 outdoor netball courts in Southend-on-Sea across 13 sites, of which five courts are available for community use across two sites.
- All outdoor netball courts in Southend-on-Sea have a macadam surface.
- Following site assessments, 13 netball courts are assessed as poor quality, 16 as standard quality and four as good quality.
- The courts at Westcliff High School for Girls are assessed as good quality having been recently resurfaced; the School has aspirations to host the Southend & District Netball League as it did previously.
- The Southend & District netball league generates the majority of netball demand from within Southend-on-Sea, although it currently exports to Castle Point.
- Southend Leisure and Tennis Centre hosts Back to Netball sessions every Tuesday and Thursdays.
- The Southend Primary School Sports Association plans on hosting a High 5 Netball tournament in April 2018 at Southend Leisure and Tennis Centre.
- There is currently community demand for outdoor netball provision in Southend-on-Sea generating from the Southend & District netball league.
- Given expressed exported demand, priority should be placed on returning the activity now that quality has improved at Westcliff High School for Girls.
**Scenarios**

**The Southend & District Netball League**

Westcliff High School for Girls previously hosted the Southend & District Netball League before quality issues resulted in demand exporting to Castle Point. The School has now refurbished the courts in order to encourage the League to return; however, it is unknown if the League intends on doing so. This should be further explored.

**Recommendations**

- Explore options for the Southend & District Netball League to return to Southend-on-Sea.
- Explore improving courts quality at remaining school sites where sufficient demand exists for curricular and extra-curricular activity.

**Athletics**

**Summary**

- There are currently two athletics tracks in Southend-on-Sea located at Southend Leisure and Tennis Centre and the Eastwood Academy.
- The tracks at both sites are rated as good quality.
- Southend-on-Sea has one athletics club; Southend-on-Sea Athletics Club.
- It also home to two large running clubs; Southend Flyers and Leigh-on-Sea Striders.
- There is one Parkrun event operating every Saturday which takes place at Gunners Park.
- In addition, there is an annual 10k run taking place as well as a children’s 3k run and a 5k Race for Life event.
- Southend-on-Sea Athletics Club is operating above track sustainability threshold of 200 members, therefore the track at Southend Leisure and Tennis Centre requires sustaining.
- Precedence should also be placed on sustaining and increasing the popularity of the numerous running events taking place within Southend-on-Sea as well as the growth of other initiatives.

**Scenarios**

N/A

**Recommendations**

- Retain track at Southend Leisure and Tennis Centre and sustain quality through appropriate maintenance.
- Retain track at Eastwood Academy for continued school usage.
- Ensure that sinking funds are in place to address future repairs and resurfacing of the track.
- Support the running events taking place as well as exploring the implementation of initiatives not currently serviced to increase participation in recreational running.
Cycling

Summary

- There are no purpose-built facilities within Southend-on-Sea with the nearest dedicated facility located approximately six miles away, at Hadleigh Park.
- Garon Park CIC has aspirations to obtain an area of unused scrubland and turn this into a Wellness Trail including dedicated walking and cycling paths.
- Sport England Market Segmentation makes it possible to identify that there are currently 11,743 people in Southend-on-Sea which are participating in regular cycling activity.
- Cycle Southend was established in 2008 with an aim to increase the usage of bikes both recreationally and as a preferable method of transport across Southend-on-Sea.
- Formal demand is accounted for by three clubs; Southend Wheelers, Just Ride Southend and Richardson-Trek RT.
- Three bike sharing stations are in place across Southend-on-Sea.
- Sport England’s Segmentation Tool identifies latent demand of 6,905 people who would like to participate in the sport within Southend-on-Sea.
- Although there is not requirement for a dedicated facility in Southend-on-Sea there is a need for the Councils to continue to engage with key stakeholders and clubs to further develop cycling across the authority.
- Cycle Southend offers a method for achieving the above.

Scenarios

N/A

Recommendations

- Continue and explore growth of Cycle Southend initiative.
- Support ambitions of Garon Park CIC to further benefit the wider cycling offer.
- Ensure any formal cycling activity can be accommodated within neighbouring local authorities.

MUGAs

Summary

- In total there are seven sites identified as providing MUGAs in Southend-on-Sea.
- Most provision is concentrated within the West Analysis Area (three MUGAs).
- Six of the MUGAs are owned by the Council, meaning the large majority provision is open access.
- Five MUGAs are assessed as poor quality with the remaining two evaluated as standard quality; none are considered to be good quality.
- Both Chalkwell Park and Leigh Marshes are serviced by floodlighting.
- Given the open access nature of the MUGAs, no usage is recorded.
- It is considered likely that there is an under provision, particularly in the Central Analysis Area.
- Furthermore, usage of current provision is likely to be limited given that the majority are poor quality and not accompanied by floodlighting.

Scenarios
Recommendations

- Protect existing supply of MUGAs and seek quality improvements where possible.
- Explore options to increase supply of MUGAs, particularly in urban areas with little current provision.
- Ensure any new MUGAs can be floodlit to maximise usage and explore floodlighting of existing MUGAs.

Parkour

Summary

- Consultation with Parkour UK highlights that in February 2017, an Active Lives Survey identified that 96,000 people were participating in Parkour throughout the UK.
- The prominent Parkour club in Southend-on-Sea is Southend Parkour which delivers classes at St Bernard’s High School for Girls and Hadleigh Park.
- Hadleigh Park is located in Castle Point which has a purpose-built Parkour facility, with equipment that meets both British and European standards; it is a popular destination for Parkour groups across South Essex.
- Southend Parkour has developed strong links with a number of schools and organisations across Southend-on-Sea and demand is relatively high.

Scenarios

N/A

Recommendations

- Support Parkour UK to grow parkour activity within Southend-on-Sea supported by provision at Hadleigh Park in Castle Point.
PART 4: STRATEGIC RECOMMENDATIONS

The strategic recommendations for the Strategy have been developed via a combination of information gathered during consultation, site visits and analysis which culminated in the production of an assessment report, as well as key drivers identified for the Strategy. They reflect overarching and common areas to be addressed, which apply across outdoor sports facilities and may not be specific to just one sport.

Recommendation (a) – Ensure, through the use of the Playing Pitch Strategy, that outdoor sports facilities are protected through the implementation of local planning policy.

The PPS Assessment shows that all currently used outdoor sports sites require protection or replacement and therefore cannot be deemed surplus to requirements because of shortfalls now and in the future. Lapsed, disused, underused and poor-quality sites should also be protected from development or replaced as there is a requirement for playing field land to meet the identified shortfalls. Therefore, based on the outcomes of the PPS, local planning policy should reflect this situation.

NPPF paragraph 97 states that 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.

Should outdoor sports facilities be taken out of use for any reason (e.g. council budget restraints), it is imperative that the land is retained so that it can be brought back into use in the future. This means that land containing provision should not be altered (except to improve play) and should remain free from tree cover and permanent built structures, unless the current picture changes to the extent that the site in question is no longer needed, or unless replacement provision is provided to an equal or greater quantity and quality.
Although there are identified shortfalls of match equivalent sessions, most demand is currently being met and most shortfalls are likely to be addressed through quality improvements. Including the need for additional facilities in the Local Plan is therefore not recommended as a priority, except in the case of 3G pitches where there is a discrete need for additional provision, or where there is significant housing growth.

The PPS should be used to help inform Development Management decisions that affect existing or new outdoor sports facilities and ancillary facilities. All applications are assessed by the Local Planning Authority on a case by case basis taking into account site specific factors. In addition, Sport England is a statutory consultee on planning applications that affect or prejudice the use of playing field and will use the PPS to help assess that planning application against its Playing Fields Policy.

Sport England’s playing field policy exception E1 only allows for development of lapsed or disused playing fields if a PPS shows a clear excess in the quantity of playing pitch provision at present and in the future across all playing pitch sports types and sizes.

Policy Exception E1:

‘A carefully quantified and documented assessment of current and future needs has demonstrated to the satisfaction of Sport England that there is an excess of playing field provision in the catchment, and the site has no special significance to the interests of sport’.

Where the PPS cannot demonstrate the site, or part of a site, is clearly surplus to requirements then replacement of the site, or part of a site, will be required to comply with Sport England policy exception E4.

Policy Exception E4:

‘The playing field or fields to be lost as a result of the proposed development would be replaced, prior to the commencement of development, by a new playing field site or sites:

- of equivalent or better quality and
- of equivalent or greater quantity;
- in a suitable location and
- subject to equivalent or better management arrangements.

Any disused/lapsed sites are included within the Action Plan together with a recommendation in relation to the need to bring the site back into use or mitigate the loss on a replacement site to address the shortfalls identified within the Assessment.

It may be appropriate to consider rationalisation of some existing outdoor sport sites (that are of low value i.e. one/two pitch sites with no changing provision) to generate investment and focus resources towards creating bigger, better quality sites (hub sites). Such sites could then be re-purposed to meet other recreational needs or, if appropriate and agreed upon, lost for development. However, no suitable sites for this have been identified as part of the PPS, meaning the situation should be re-visited as part of the ongoing monitoring and reviewing of the project.

Recommendation (b) – Secure tenure and access to sites through a range of solutions and partnership agreements.

A number of education sites are being used in Southend-on-Sea for competitive play, predominately for football. In some cases, use of pitches has been classified as secure,
however, use is not necessarily formalised and further work should be carried out to ensure an appropriate community use agreement is in place (including access to changing provision where required).

Sites which are currently classified as being unsecure in Southend-on-Sea include:

- Alleyn Court School
- Eastwood Academy
- Hamsted Junior School
- Prince Avenue Academy and Nursery
- Southend High School for Boys
- St Thomas More High School
- Belfairs Academy
- Edward Hall Primary School
- Heycroft Primary School
- Shoeburyness High School
- South Essex College

In the case of Belfairs Academy and Hamstel Junior School, existing community use agreements are in place albeit they are not being adhered to.

For the remaining providers, NGBs, Sport England and other appropriate bodies such as Active Essex and the Football Foundation can often help to negotiate and engage with providers where the local authority may not have direct influence. This is particularly the case at sites that have received funding from these bodies or are going to receive funding in the future as community access can be a condition of the agreement.

In the context of the Comprehensive Spending Review, which announced public spending cuts, it is increasingly important for the Council to work with voluntary sector organisations to enable them to take greater levels of ownership and support the wider development and maintenance of facilities. To facilitate this, where practical, it should support and enable clubs to generate sufficient funds, providing that this is to the benefit of sport.

The Council should also further explore opportunities where security of tenure could be granted via lease agreements (minimum 25 years as recommended by Sport England and NGBs) so clubs are in a position to apply for external funding. This is particularly the case at poor quality local authority sites, possibly with inadequate ancillary facilities, so that quality can be improved and sites developed.

Local sports clubs should be supported by partners including the Council and NGBs to achieve sustainability across a range of areas including management, membership, funding, facilities, volunteers and partnership work. For example, support club development and encourage clubs to develop evidence of business and sports development plans to generate income via their facilities. All clubs could be encouraged to look at different management models such as registering as Community Amateur Sports Clubs (CASC)\(^7\). They should also be encouraged to work with partners locally – such as volunteer support agencies or local businesses.

For clubs with lease arrangements already in place, these should be reviewed when fewer than 25 years remain on existing agreements to secure extensions, thus improving security of tenure and helping them attract funding for site developments. Any club with less than 25 years remaining on an agreement is unlikely to gain any external funding.

Each club interested in leasing a site should be required to meet service and/or strategic recommendations. An additional set of criteria should also be considered, which takes into account club quality, aligned to its long-term development objectives and sustainability, as seen in the table below.

---

\(^7\) [http://www.cascinfo.co.uk/cascbenefits](http://www.cascinfo.co.uk/cascbenefits)
Table 4.1: Recommended criteria for lease of sport sites to clubs/organisations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Club</th>
<th>Site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clubs should have Clubmark/FA Charter Standard accreditation award.</td>
<td>Sites should be those identified as 'Club Sites' (recommendation d) for new clubs (i.e. not those with a City-wide significance) but that offer development potential.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clubs commit to meeting demonstrable local demand and show pro-active commitment to developing school-club links.</td>
<td>For established clubs which have proven success in terms of self-management 'Key Centres' are also appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clubs are sustainable, both in a financial sense and via their internal management structures in relation to recruitment and retention policy for both players and volunteers.</td>
<td>As a priority, sites should acquire capital investment to improve (which can be attributed to the presence of a Clubmark/Charter Standard club).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideally, clubs should have already identified (and received an agreement in principle) any match funding required for initial capital investment identified.</td>
<td>Sites should be leased with the intention that investment can be sourced to contribute towards improvement of the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clubs have processes in place to ensure capacity to maintain sites to the existing, or better, standards.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Council could establish a series of core outcomes to derive from clubs taking on a lease arrangement to ensure that the most appropriate clubs are assigned to sites. As an example, outcomes may include:

- Increasing participation.
- Supporting the development of coaches and volunteers.
- Commitment to quality standards.
- Improvements (where required) to facilities, or as a minimum retaining existing standards.

In addition, clubs should be made fully aware of the associated responsibilities/liabilities when considering leases of multi-use public playing fields. It is important in these instances that the site, to some degree, remains available for other purposes or for other users.

**Community asset transfer**

The Sport England Community Sport Asset Transfer Toolkit is a bespoke, interactive web based tool that provides a step by step guide through each stage of the asset transfer process: [http://archive.sportengland.org/support__advice/asset_transfer.aspx](http://archive.sportengland.org/support__advice/asset_transfer.aspx)

**Recommendation (c) - Maximise community use of education facilities where there is a need to do so.**

In order to maximise community use of educational facilities it is recommended to establish a more coherent, structured relationship with schools. The ability to access good facilities within the local community is vital to any sports organisation, yet many clubs struggle to find good quality places to play and train. In Southend-on-Sea pricing policies at facilities can be barrier to access at some of the education sites but physical access and resistance from schools, especially some academies, to open up provision is also an issue.
A large number of sporting facilities are located on education sites and making these available to sports clubs can offer significant benefits to both the schools and the local clubs. The Council and other key partners must work with schools to develop an understanding of the issues that restrict or affect community access. Support should be provided, where appropriate, to address underlying problems. Consideration should be given to a centralised booking system for community use of schools to minimise administration and make access easier for the users.

The following is a list of schools that have outdoor sports facilities in Southend-on-Sea but do not allow for community use of all their pitches:

- Belfairs Academy
- Darlingtonhurst School
- Hamstel Junior School
- Prince Avenue Academy and Nursery
- St Helens Catholic Primary School
- St Nicholas School

In many instances, grass pitches are unavailable for community use due to poor quality and therefore remedial works and improved maintenance will be required before community use can be established. The low carrying capacity of these pitches sometimes leads to them being played to capacity or overplayed simply due to curricular and extra-curricular use, meaning they cannot accommodate any additional use by the community.

As a priority, community use options should be explored at large schools offering numerous pitches such as Belfairs Academy. Securing access to these sites will significantly reduce grass pitch shortfalls throughout the analysis areas that they are based within. This also ties in with recommendations made in the Indoor Leisure Facilities Strategy, which makes a recommendation to work with selected schools to increase their availability for community use, particularly relating to sports hall.

It is recommended that the schools that are considered priorities for securing access to in both the PPS and the Indoor Built Facilities Strategy are identified to identify overlap and to provide focus. Where possible, a strategic approach to working with schools should be taken across the local authority and the wider South Essex region, with support from the education authorities provided. For schools that form part of multi-academy trusts, these should be addressed on a collective basis, with securing community access a co-ordinated approach with other engagement that takes place between the schools and relevant stakeholders e.g. sports development initiatives.

Another recommendation made in the Indoor Leisure Facilities Strategy is to work with colleagues in Education to ensure that any new schools or improvements to sports facilities in existing schools are accompanied by a community use agreement. This should also apply to outdoor sports facilities in order to provide greater security of tenure to club users.

Where new schools are provided in major new residential developments, they should be designed to facilitate community access, with opportunities for meeting the community’s outdoor sports needs explored at the outset to maximise the potential for facility provision to be made within the developments, if appropriate. An example of this is ensuring the provision of a 3G pitch, given current shortfalls, or youth 11v11 grass football pitches.
As detailed earlier, NGBs, Active Essex and Sport England can often help to negotiate and engage with schools where the local authority may have limited direct influence i.e. at academies. This is particularly the case at sites that have received funding from the relevant bodies or are going to receive funding in the future as community access can be a condition of the funding agreement.
Recommendation (d) – Improve quality

There are a number of ways in which it is possible to improve quality, including, for example, addressing overplay and improving maintenance. Given that the majority of councils’ face reducing budgets it is currently advisable to look at improving key sites as a priority (e.g. the largest sites that are the most overplayed or the poorest).

The Action Plan within this document provides a starting point for this, identifying key sites, poor quality sites and/or sites that are overplayed which should be prioritised for improvement. Such sites include:

- Ecko Social and Sports Club
- Shoebury Park
- Norman Garon Trust Football Pitches
- Southend Rugby Club
- Southchurch Park
- St Thomas More High School
- Victory Ground
- Youth Ground

In addition, focus should not just be on improving pitch quality but also on improving ancillary facility quality, where there is a need to do so. The priority for this should on well used, multi-pitch sites that are currently serviced by poor quality changing facilities, or have no provision. Such sites include:

- Bridge Water Drive Playing Fields
- Ekco Social and Sports Club Association
- Youth Ground

With such pressures on budgets any wide-ranging direct investment into quality is challenging and other options for improvements should be considered. This could be via asset transfer as highlighted in Objective 1, with clubs taking on maintenance, whilst other options may include equipment banks and the pooling of resources for maintenance.
Addressing quality issues

Quality in Southend-on-Sea is variable but generally pitches are assessed as standard quality. Where facilities are assessed as standard or poor quality and/or overplayed, maintenance regimes should be reviewed and, where possible, improved to ensure that what is being done is of an appropriate standard to sustain/improve pitch quality. Ensuring continuance of existing maintenance of good quality sites is also essential.

It is also important to note the impact the weather has on quality. The worse the weather, the poorer facilities tend to become, especially if no drainage systems are in place or if existing drainage systems are inadequate. This also means that quality can vary, year on year, dependent upon the weather and levels of rainfall.

Based upon an achievable target using existing quality scoring to provide a baseline, a standard should be used to identify deficiencies and investment should be focused on those sites which fail to meet the proposed quality standard (using the site audit database as provided in electronic format). The Strategy approach to outdoor sports facilities achieving these standards should be to enhance quality and therefore the planning system should seek to protect them.

For the purposes of quality assessments, the Strategy refers to outdoor sports facilities and ancillary facilities separately as being of ‘Good’, ‘Standard’ or ‘Poor’ quality. For example, some good quality sites have poor quality elements and vice versa (e.g. a good quality pitch may be serviced by poor quality changing facilities).

Good quality refers to pitches that have, for example, good grass cover, an even surface, are free from vandalism and litter. For rugby, a good quality pitch is also pipe and/or slit drained. In terms of ancillary facilities, good quality refers to access for disabled people, sufficient provision for referees, juniors/women/girls and appropriate provision of showers, toilets and car parking.

Standard quality refers to pitches that have, for example, adequate grass cover, minimal signs of wear and tear and goalposts may be secure but in need of minor repair. For rugby, drainage is natural but adequate. In terms of ancillary facilities, standard quality refers to adequately sized changing rooms, storage provision and provision of toilets.

Poor quality refers to provision with, for example, inadequate grass cover, uneven surfaces and poor drainage. For rugby, pitches will have inadequate natural drainage. In terms of ancillary facilities, poor quality refers to inappropriate changing rooms with no showers, no running water and/or old, dated interiors. If a poor quality site receives little or no usage that is not to say that no improvement is needed, it may instead be the case that it receives no demand because of its quality, thus an improvement in said quality will attract demand to the site, potentially from overplayed standard or good quality sites.

Without appropriate, fit for purpose ancillary facilities, good quality pitches may be underutilised. Changing facilities form the most essential part of this offer and therefore key sites should be given priority for improvement.

In order to prioritise investment into key sites it is recommended that the steering group works up a list of criteria, relevant to the Borough and the wider South Essex region, to provide a steer on future investment.
Addressing overplay

In order to improve the overall quality of the outdoor facility stock; it is necessary to ensure that provision is not overplayed beyond recommended carrying capacity. This is determined by assessing quality (via a non-technical site assessment) and allocating a match limit to each (daily for hockey, weekly for football and rugby union and seasonal for cricket).

The FA, the RFU, the ECB and EH all recommend a number of matches that pitches should take based on quality, as seen in the table below. For other grass pitch sports, no guidelines are set by the NGBs although it can be assumed that a similar trend should be followed.

Table 4.2: Capacity of pitches

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sport</th>
<th>Pitch type</th>
<th>No. of matches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Good quality</td>
<td>Standard quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football</td>
<td>Adult pitches</td>
<td>3 per week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Youth pitches</td>
<td>4 per week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mini pitches</td>
<td>6 per week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rugby union</td>
<td>Natural Inadequate (D0)</td>
<td>2 per week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Natural Adequate (D1)</td>
<td>3 per week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pipe Drained (D2)</td>
<td>3.25 per week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pipe and Slit Drained (D3)</td>
<td>3.5 per week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cricket</td>
<td>One grass wicket</td>
<td>5 per season</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One synthetic wicket</td>
<td>60 per season</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For all remaining non-pitch sports (e.g. bowls and tennis) there are no capacity recommendations set out by the NGBs. Instead, potential capacity is evaluated on a site-by-site basis following consultation and site assessments.

It is imperative to engage with clubs to ensure that sites are not played beyond their capacity. Play should therefore be encouraged, where possible, to be transferred to alternative venues that are not operating at capacity. This may include transferring play to 3G pitches or to sites not currently available for community use but which may be in the future.

A cost-effective way to reduce unofficial use (and therefore overplay), particularly for football, could be to remove goalposts in between match days, principally at open access, high traffic sites that are managed by clubs. This will, however, require adequate, secured storage to be provided.

For cricket, an increase in the usage of NTPs is key to alleviating overplay as this allows for the transfer of junior demand from grass wickets. It also does not require any additional playing pitch space as NTPs can be installed in situ to existing squares.
For rugby union, additional floodlighting can mitigate some of the overplay as it allows training demand to be spread across a greater number of pitches or unmarked areas. If permanent floodlighting is not possible, portable floodlighting is an alternative, as is the installation of a World Rugby compliant 3G pitch.

**Increasing maintenance**

Standard or poor grass pitch quality may not just be a result of poor drainage. In some instances, ensuring there is an appropriate maintenance for the level/standard of play can help to improve quality and therefore increase pitch capacity. Each NGB can provide assistance with reviewing pitch maintenance regimes.

The FA has a Pitch Improvement Programme (PIP) which has been developed in partnership with Institute of Groundsmanship (IOG) to develop a grass pitch maintenance service that can be utilised by grassroots clubs with the aim of improving knowledge, skills and therefore the quality of pitches. The key principles behind the service are to provide clubs with advice/practical solutions in a range of areas, with the simple aim of improving playing surfaces. The programme is designed to help clubs on sites that they themselves manage and maintain but can also be used to advise council-maintained sites.

In addition, PIP also aims to focus on developing an improved maintenance programmes with local authorities that can be utilised at local authority maintained sites.

For cricket and the ECB, the equivalent is the Grounds and Natural Turf Improvement Programme (GaNTIP), which is jointly funded by the ECB, FA, Football Foundation and the IOG. Its aim is to raise the standards of sports surfaces as well as the understanding of sports turf management practices among grassroots sports clubs across England Wales.

In relation to cricket specifically, maintaining high pitch quality is the most important aspect of the sport. If the wicket is poor, it can affect the quality of the game and, in some instances, become dangerous. The ECB recommends full technical assessments of wickets and pitches available through a Performance Quality Standard Assessment (PQS). The PQS assesses a cricket square to ascertain whether it meets the standards that are benchmarked by the IOG.

All local authority sites in Southend-on-Sea receive a relatively standard maintenance regime that, for playing pitch sites, consists of regular grass cutting, end of season seeding and limited sand-dressing and weed-killing. This could be improved through increasing the sand-dressing and weed-killing regime as well as carrying out fertilisation.

**Recommendation (e) – Adopt a tiered approach (hierarchy of provision) to the management and improvement of sites**

To allow for facility developments to be programmed within a phased approach the Council should adopt a tiered approach to the management and improvement of playing pitch sites and associated facilities. Please refer to Part 5: Action Plan for the proposed hierarchy.

**Recommendation (f) – Work in partnership with stakeholders to secure funding**

Partners, led by the Council, should ensure that appropriate funding secured for improved sports provision are directed to areas of need, underpinned by a robust strategy for improvement in outdoor sports facilities.
In order to address the community’s needs, to target priority areas and to reduce duplication of provision, there should be a coordinated approach to strategic investment. In delivering this recommendation the Council should maintain a regular dialogue with local partners and through the Steering Group.

Although some investment in new provision will not be made by the Council directly, it is important that the Council seeks to direct and lead a strategic and co-ordinated approach to facility development by education sites, NGBs, sports clubs and the commercial sector to address community needs whilst avoiding duplication of provision.

One of sport’s greatest contributions is its positive impact on public health and it is therefore important to lever in investment from other sectors such as health and wellbeing, for example. Sport and physical activity can have a profound effect on peoples’ lives, and plays a crucial role in improving community cohesion, educational attainment and self-confidence. Please refer to Appendix One for further funding information which includes details of the current opportunities, likely funding requirements and indicative project costs.

**Recommendation (g) – Secure developer contributions**

It is important that this strategy informs policies and supplementary planning documents by setting out the approach to securing sport and recreational facilities through new housing development.

For playing pitches, the Council should use Sport England’s Playing Pitch New Development Calculator as a tool for determining developer contributions linking to sites within the locality. This uses team generation rates (TGRs) from the Assessment Report to determine how many new teams would be generated from an increase in population derived from hosing growth. It then converts this into pitch requirements and gives the associated costs (both for providing the provision and for its life cycle).

The PPS should be used to help determine the likely impact of a new development on demand and the capacity of existing sites in the area, and whether there is a need for improvements to increase capacity of existing provision or if new provision is required. Where a development is located within access of existing high-quality provision, this does not necessarily mean that there is no need for further provision or improvement to existing provision, as additional demand arising from the development is likely to result in increased usage (which can result in overplay or quality deterioration).

Where it is determined that new provision is required to accompany a development, priority should be placed on providing facilities that contribute towards alleviating existing shortfalls within the locality. To determine what supply of provision is provided, it is imperative that the PPS findings are taken into consideration and that consultation takes place with the relevant NGBs. This is due to the importance of ensuring that the stock of facilities provided is correct to avoid provision becoming unsustainable and unused, such as single grass pitch football sites without adequate ancillary facilities or new cricket/rugby grounds located away from existing clubs. Instead, multi-pitch and multi-sport sites should be developed, supported by a clubhouse and adequate parking facilities which consider the potential for future AGP development.
The guidance should form the basis for negotiation with developers to secure contributions to include provision and/or enhancement of appropriate playing fields and subsequent maintenance. Section 106 contributions could also be used to improve the condition and maintenance regimes of the pitches in order to increase pitch capacity to accommodate more matches.

A number of planning policy objectives could be implemented to enable the above to be delivered:

- Planning consent should include appropriate conditions and/or be subject to specific planning obligations. Where developer contributions are applicable, a Section 106/CIL Agreement or equivalent must be completed that should specify, when applied, the amount that will be linked to Sport England’s Building Cost Information Service from the date of the permission and timing of the contribution/s to be made.
- Contributions should also be secured towards the first ten years of maintenance on new pitches. NGBs and Sport England can provide further and up to date information on the associated costs.
- External funding should be sought/secured to achieve maximum benefit from the investment into appropriate playing pitch facility enhancement and its subsequent maintenance.
- Where new multiple pitches are provided, appropriate changing rooms and associated car parking should be located on site.
- All new or improved outdoor sports facilities on school sites should be subject to community use agreements.

Developer contributions - step by step guide

For any application warranting a developer contribution the following processes should be followed in order to help inform the potential needs a new housing development may require and/or should look to consider.

In accordance with National Planning Policy Guidance, contributions should not be sought from developments of 10 units or less, and which have a maximum combined gross floor space of no more than 1,000 square metres (gross internal area).

Any obligations sought should be based on a tailored approach to each development, considering the population derived from the development, determining if the demand can be met by existing facilities and identifying the project/s that any required contribution will be used towards. All of this should be carried out using the robust evidence base provided as part of the PPS to help with clearly justifying the needs arising and how they are to be met.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th>Determine the playing pitch requirement resulting from the development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The main tool for determining this is Sport England’s Playing Pitch New Development Calculator which is a Sport England tool provided on completion of the Strategy. The calculator will be pre-populated with the current population of the local authority and the current demand data from the PPS. Until this requires updating, to determine the playing pitch requirement resulting from a development, all that is required is the input of the new population that will derive from a development in Part 1 of the calculator tab.
Part 4 provides an estimation of the number of new pitches that would be required to meet the match equivalent sessions presented in Part 2. Part 4 also presents an estimate of the associated costs for providing these new pitches. Please note that these are indicative costs only and appropriate local work should be undertaken to determine the true costs involved.

**Step 2**

| Determine whether new provision is required and whether this should be on or off site |

Consideration should be given to whether the nearest site/s to the development containing that type of provision could benefit from a contribution towards increasing capacity to meet likely need generated from the development. If there are no potential options to improve or extend existing provision to create additional capacity, or if capacity cannot be increased to a sufficient level, then new provision will likely be required.

Where the calculator does not create demand for a whole pitch, which is often the case for smaller sized developments, it is recommended to make a contribution to increasing the capacity of an existing site to meet demand generated from the development.

When identifying a site for off-site contributions, consider the proximity and location of existing playing pitch sites and whether it could help serve the new development. Identify the analysis area in which the development sits and identify if there are any hub sites or key centres within the locality. Initially, a one-mile radius could be drawn around the site in order to help identify the nearest priority sites, which may require consultation with neighbouring authorities when the development sites to close to the boundary.

This decision should be based on the potential to improve existing facilities within an appropriate catchment of a development to create additional capacity, and how realistic it is given the nature of the local area to provide new provision. For example, there may be some poor quality playing fields that could potentially be improved with additional drainage and long-term maintenance works, along with enhanced changing provision, to enable use to be increased, thereby creating additional capacity to meet the increased demand generated from the development.

Discussions should be held with relevant parties (e.g. NGBs, landowners, facility operators and user groups), and any further necessary evidence gathered (e.g. a feasibility study), to help identify the specific works that are required, and to ensure they will provide the necessary additional capacity to meet the needs. It will also be important to demonstrate that the specific works can be delivered within an appropriate timescale in relation to the occupation of the development site.

When on site provision is required, priority should be placed on the creation of multi-pitch and multi-sport sites with appropriate ancillary facilities such as a clubhouse and adequate car parking, as well as ensuring the provision contributes towards reducing current shortfalls. This will ensure that the provision is sustainable and attractive to potential users. Emphasis should also be on ensuring the site can accommodate an AGP given current sporting trends.

Other useful questions when deciding on new provision include:

- Are there any teams/clubs playing outside of the local area (displaced demand) which could utilise provision at the site?
- Do any local clubs identify existing plans/demand for access to new provision?
Are there any overplayed sites in the local area where existing demand could be transferred to a new site?
Do any local clubs identify any latent demand (i.e. if they had access to more pitches they could they field more teams?)

To further help determine the sustainability of establishing new provision, consideration should be given to the potential management opportunities which may be available onsite:

Is the local authority (or town/parish council) in a position to take on further outdoor sports facilities from a financial point of view?
Is an education establishment to be provided as part of the development which offers a potential management option of outdoor sports facilities?
Is there a leisure trust in place which has the capacity to take on the management of outdoor sports facilities?
Is there an opportunity for a trust based model of management, for example, by formation of a Community Interest Company (CIC) or Charitable Incorporated Organisation (CIO)?
Is there an existing sports club that has the capacity to take on the management of another site?

At this point, further dialogue with the relevant NGB may be required to help determine options available.

Step 3  Determine the other pitch and non-pitch requirements resulting from the development

The calculator does not calculate demand for other types of pitches (outside of football, rugby, cricket and hockey) or non-pitch provision which may be played in the area. However, the PPS identifies (where relevant) current and future demand for the additional types of outdoor sporting provision. As such, this should be used to determine if contributions are required towards these sports or if new provision is required.

Where there is no identified shortfall in provision or future demand for new provision within an area relevant to the development (e.g. an analysis area or settlement), consideration should be given to the nearest site to the development containing that type of provision. If this could accommodate the increased demand from the development, no action is required; if it could not accommodate the demand, consider if the site could benefit from a contribution towards increasing capacity to meet likely need. For example, this could include increasing quality and/or addition of ancillary facilities such as floodlighting, changing rooms or car parking. The PPS action plan should be used as a starting point to identify site by site recommendations.

Where there is an identified shortfall that could not be overcome through contributions, new provision may be required within or nearby to the development as part a multi-sport development.

Step 4  Consider design principles for new provision

The exact nature and location of provision associated with onsite developments should be fully determined in partnership with each relevant NGB. Further to this, each pitch sport NGB provides national guidance in relation to provision of new pitches.
There is also a need to ensure that the location of outdoor sports pitches and ancillary facilities are appropriately located in the context of indoor sports provision (if also being provided onsite) to ensure a cohesive approach to the whole sporting offer.

## Step 5  Calculate the financial contribution required

After using the PPS New Development Calculator as a starting point for cost, the local cost of provision should be fully determined in order to calculate the financial contributions required.

A clear and transparent methodology for calculating up to date costs for the specific works, including appropriate ancillary provision, should be presented. Where appropriate, depending on how the needs are to be met, the cost of any required land purchase should be included in the financial contribution. If an obligation will be directed to an off-site project it should be ensured the costs are limited to meet the needs of the individual development.

Along with any capital costs for the works, an obligation should ensure an appropriate level of lifecycle costs towards the new or enhanced provision. This is required to cover the day to day maintenance for an agreed long-term period and to help ensure a sinking fund exists for any major replacement work, e.g. the future resurfacing of an artificial grass pitch.

Wherever possible, specific local costs should be used, especially if the works are to improve the existing quality of a site to increase capacity as there may be a number of site specifics to consider. Sport England does provide indicative costs for new provision: [https://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/design-and-cost-guidance/cost-guidance/](https://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/design-and-cost-guidance/cost-guidance/)

For all developments community use agreements between providers and users would ensure that such demand continues to be provided for in the long-term.

**Developer contributions – worked example**

The table below shows the additional demand for pitch sports that could be generated overall from a housing development in Southend-on-Sea. This is based on a housing development of 500 dwellings and an expected occupancy rate of 2.5 people per dwelling, resulting in a population growth of 1,250 people.

### Table 4.3: Housing growth scenario

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pitch Sport</th>
<th>Estimated demand by sport</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adult football</td>
<td>0.17 match equivalent sessions per week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth football</td>
<td>0.12 match equivalent sessions per week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mini soccer</td>
<td>0.19 match equivalent sessions per week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rugby union</td>
<td>0.03 match equivalent sessions per week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rugby league</td>
<td>0.00 match equivalent sessions per week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hockey</td>
<td>0.36 match equivalent sessions per week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cricket</td>
<td>1.42 match equivalent sessions per season</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The estimated capital cost of providing for this demand equates to £118,371 with a total estimated life cycle cost per annum amounting to £11,011.
As there is not enough demand to create an entire pitch for any of the sports, it would be advisable that off-site contributions were sought from such a development rather than creating new provision within the development.
Recommendation (h) - Identify opportunities to add to the overall stock to accommodate both current and future demand

The Steering Group should use the Action Plan within this Strategy for improvements to the Council’s own outdoor sports facilities whilst recognising the need to support partners. The Action Plan lists improvements to be made to each site focused upon both qualitative and quantitative improvements as appropriate for each area.

Although there are identified shortfalls of match equivalent sessions, most current and future demand is currently being met and most shortfalls can be addressed via quality improvements and/or improved access to sites that are presently used minimally or currently unavailable. Adding to the current stock, particularly in the short term, is therefore not recommended as a priority, except in the case of 3G pitches, sand-based AGPs and NTPs where there is a discrete need, where there is significant housing growth, or where sites fall out of use and require mitigation.

For 3G pitches, it is considered that all existing shortfalls can be alleviated if full size provision is provided at the following sites:

- Garon Park (x2)
- Southend United Football Club
- Len Forge Centre (making it a multi-3G pitch site)

Notwithstanding the above, there may be a requirement for additional 3G pitches to be provided to satisfy demand from neighbouring local authorities, or if key grass pitch sites fall out of use. Demand arising from new housing developments may also result in the need for additional 3G pitch provision over and above what has already been identified.

Emphasis should be placed when selecting sites for 3G provision on those that have the potential to become football hubs with multiple 3G pitches. Of the aforementioned sites, both Garon Park and Len Forge Centre are considered able to accommodate more than one full size 3G pitch if enough demand warranted such development, especially Len Forge Centre Centre given that it already provides one 3G pitch.

A feasibility study should be carried out across the South Essex region to look at opportunities for such football hub sites as well as conventional sites with single AGPs. It is important that there is a joined-up approach between the relevant authorities to ensure that 3G pitches are developed at the most appropriate sites, such as by selecting sites that can contribute towards accommodating demand from neighbouring authorities. This approach will also ensure there is no duplication of provision that will compete against each other to attract demand.
Recommendations in regards to 3G provision should be checked, and if required updated, with the emerging Local Football Facility Plan for Southend-on-Sea to enable the recommendations to be consistent.

For sand-based AGPs, there is a requirement for one additional, accessible pitch in order to satisfy all hockey demand, particularly demand currently exported to Rochford. This could be achieved either by resurfacing the existing provision at St Thomas More High School, bringing it up to an appropriate standard, or by providing an additional pitch at a suitable location, agreed upon by EH. Such developments should be explored in partnership with Rochford District Council.

For football, there also remains an isolated need to reconfigure pitches at certain sites, in particular in relation to the lack of dedicated youth 11v11 football pitches.

**Recommendation (i) - Rectify quantitative shortfalls through the current stock**

The Council and its partners should work to rectify identified inadequacies and meet identified shortfalls as outlined in the preceding Assessment Report and the sport by sport specific recommendations (Part 3) as well as the following Action Plan (Part 5).

It is important that the current levels of provision are protected, maintained and enhanced to secure provision now and in the future. For most sports the current and future demand for provision identified in Southend-on-Sea can be overcome through maximising use of existing stock through a combination of:

- Improving quality in order to improve the capacity to accommodate more demand.
- Transferring demand from overplayed sites to sites with spare capacity.
- The re-designation of facilities.
- Securing long term community use at school sites including those currently unavailable.
- Working with commercial and private providers to increase usage.

Unmet demand, changes in sport participation and trends and proposed housing growth should be recognised and factored into future facility planning. Assuming that an increase in participation and housing growth occurs, it will impact on the future need for certain types of playing pitches.
PART 5: ACTION PLAN

The site-by-site action plan seeks to address key issues identified in the preceding Assessment Report. It provides recommendations based on current levels of usage, quality and future demand, as well as the potential of each site for enhancement. It should be reviewed in the light of staff and financial resources in order to prioritise support for strategically significant provision and provision that other providers are less likely to make. The Action Plan is separated by analysis area.

The Council should make it a high priority to work with NGBs and other partners to comprise a priority list of actions based on local priorities, NGB priorities and available funding. To allow for facility developments to be programmed within a phased approach, the Council should adopt a tiered approach to the management and improvement of outdoor facility sites and associated provision.

The identification of sites is based on their strategic importance in a Borough-wide context i.e. they accommodate the majority of demand, or the recommended action has the greatest impact on addressing shortfalls identified either on a sport-by-sport basis or across the Council area as a whole.

Table 5.1: Proposed tiered site criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Hub sites</th>
<th>Key centres</th>
<th>Local sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site location</td>
<td>Strategically located in the Borough. Priority sites for NGBs.</td>
<td>Strategically located within the analysis area.</td>
<td>Services the local community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site layout</td>
<td>Accommodates three or more grass pitches, including provision of an AGP.</td>
<td>Accommodates two or more grass pitches.</td>
<td>Accommodates one or more pitches.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of sport</td>
<td>Single or multi-sport provision. Could also operate as a central venue.</td>
<td>Single or multi-sport provision. Could also operate as a central venue.</td>
<td>Single or multi-sport provision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>Management control remains within the local authority/other provider or with an appropriate lease arrangement through a committee or education owned.</td>
<td>Management control remains within the local authority/provider or with an appropriate club on a lease arrangement.</td>
<td>Management control remains within the local authority/provider or with an appropriate club on a lease arrangement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance regime</td>
<td>Maintenance regime aligns with NGB guidelines.</td>
<td>Maintenance regime aligns with NGB guidelines.</td>
<td>Standard maintenance regime either by the club or in house maintenance contract.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ancillary facilities</td>
<td>Good quality ancillary facility on site, with sufficient changing rooms and car parking to serve the number of pitches.</td>
<td>Good quality ancillary facility on site, with sufficient changing rooms and car parking to serve the number of pitches.</td>
<td>No changing room access on site or appropriate access to accommodate both senior and junior use concurrently (if required).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hub sites are of strategic Borough-wide importance where users are willing to travel to access the range and high quality of facilities offered and are likely to be multi-sport. These have been identified on the basis of the impact that the site will have on addressing the issues identified in the assessment.

Key centres although these sites are more community focused, some are still likely to service a wider analysis area. There may be more of a focus on a specific sport.

Additionally, it is considered that some financial investment may be necessary to improve the ancillary facilities at both hub sites and key centre sites to complement the pitches in terms of access, flexibility (i.e. single-sex changing if necessary), quality and that they meet the rules and regulations of local competitions.

Local sites refer to those sites offering minimal provision or that are of minimal value to the wider community. Primarily they are sites with one facility or a low number of facilities that service just one or two sports. The level of priority attached to them for external investment may be relatively low.

For local authority sites, consideration should be given, on a site-by-site basis, to the feasibility of a club taking on a long-term lease (if not already present), in order that external funding can be sought. Such sites will require some level of investment, either to the outdoor sport facilities or ancillary facilities and is it anticipated that one of the conditions of offering a hire/lease is that the Club would be in a position to source external funding to improve/extend the provision.

Other sites considered in this tier may be primary school sites or secondary school sites that are not widely used by the community or that do not offer community availability.

Some local sites are suitable for rationalisation providing that capital receipts are allocated to replace the lost provision at larger, multi-pitch sites.

Management and development

The following issues should be considered when undertaking sports related site development or enhancement:

- Financial viability.
- Security of tenure.
- Planning permission requirements and any foreseen difficulties in securing permission.
- Adequacy of existing finances to maintain existing sites.
- Business Plan/Masterplan – including financial package for creation of new provision where need has been identified.
- Analysis of the possibility of shared site management opportunities.
- The availability of opportunities to lease sites to external organisations.
- Options to assist community groups to gain funding to enhance existing provision.
- Negotiation with landowners to increase access to private hub sites.
- Football investment programme/3G pitch development with the FA and Football Foundation.
The column indicating partners refers to the main organisations that the Council would look to work with to support delivery of the actions. Given the extent of potential actions it is reasonable to assume that partners will not necessarily be able to support all of the actions identified but where the action is a priority and resource is available the partner will endeavour to provide support.

The Council is considered to a partner within each action so is therefore not referenced.

An important point to note, the Action Plan is not solely for delivery by Southend-on-Sea Borough Council but is designed to be pursued and adhered to by all relevant stakeholders and partners.

Priority

Although hub sites are mostly likely to have a high priority level as they have wide importance, high priority sites have been identified on the basis of the impact that the site will have on addressing the key issues identified in the assessment. Therefore, some key centres and local sites are also identified as having a high priority level. It is these projects/sites which should generally, if possible, be addressed within the short term (1-2 years).

The majority of key centres are a medium priority, have analysis area importance and have been identified on the basis of the impact that the site will have on addressing the issues identified in the assessment.

The low priority sites tend to be single pitch or single sport sites and often club or education sites with local specific importance but that may also contribute to addressing the issues identified in the assessment for specific users.

Costs

The strategic actions have also been ranked as low, medium or high based on cost. The brackets are:

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

These are based on Sport England’s estimated facility costs which can be found at: https://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/design-and-cost-guidance/cost-guidance/

Timescales

The Action Plan has been created to be delivered over a ten-year period. The information within the Assessment Report, Strategy and Action Plan will require updating as developments occur.

The indicative timescales relate to delivery times and are not priority based:

- (S) - Short (1-2 years);
- (M) - Medium (3-5 years);
- (L) - Long (6+ years).
Aim

Each action seeks to meet at least one of the three aims of the Strategy; Enhance, Provide, Protect.
### CENTRAL ANALYSIS AREA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site ID</th>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Sport</th>
<th>Management</th>
<th>Current status</th>
<th>Recommended actions</th>
<th>Partners</th>
<th>Site hierarchy tier</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Timescales</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Aim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Alleyn Court School Football School Three mini 7v7 pitches and one mini 5v5 pitch all of which are good quality. Pitches are available for community use but are currently unused. Spare capacity discounted due to unsecure tenure.</td>
<td>Ensure lack of community demand given local shortfalls and pursue security of tenure for any future users via community use agreement.</td>
<td>FA School</td>
<td>Local Site</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Protect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cricket</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>One standard quality grass cricket square with six wickets, accompanied by an NTP. Used by Mount CC. Spare capacity discounted due to unsecure tenure.</td>
<td>Pursue security of tenure for Mount CC via a community use agreement.</td>
<td>ECB School</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rugby union</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A standard quality mini pitch that is available for community use but is currently unused.</td>
<td>Retain for curricular and extra-curricular demand.</td>
<td>RFU School</td>
<td></td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Two standard macadam courts which are unavailable for community use and are not floodlit.</td>
<td>Retain for curricular and extra-curricular demand.</td>
<td>LTA School</td>
<td></td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Netball</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Two standard quality courts which are unavailable for community use and are not floodlit.</td>
<td>Retain for curricular and extra-curricular demand.</td>
<td>England Netball School</td>
<td></td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Boots and Laces Training Ground Football Club Four good quality adult pitches which are available for community use and have minimal spare capacity. Planning application has part full and part outline consent for a phased development for the relocation of Southend United FC. The footprint for the proposal would result in the replacement of the four adult pitches as well as Cecil Jones Academy’s unattached playing fields, which are disused. The mitigation for the proposed development would be a new training ground (four adult pitches), a new stadia pitch, one small sized indoor 3G pitch and one full size community available 3G pitch.</td>
<td>Support the proposed developed and ensure facilities are provided to a good, sustainable quality.</td>
<td>FA Club School</td>
<td>Key Centre</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Protect Provide Enhance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ensure long term secure community use of the full size 3G pitch.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Bournemouth Park Primary School 3G School One good quality smaller sized (35m x 30m) 3G pitch which is not available for community use and is not floodlit.</td>
<td>Retain for curricular and extra-curricular demand.</td>
<td>FA School</td>
<td>Local Site</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Protect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Bournes Green Park Football Council Three standard quality adult pitches which have actual spare capacity of 1.5 match equivalent sessions. Clubs report the site has inadequate parking.</td>
<td>Utilise actual spare capacity through the transfer of demand from overplayed sites or via future demand.</td>
<td>FA</td>
<td>Local Site</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Protect</td>
<td>Enhance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Explore options to improve car-parking issues.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ID</td>
<td>Site Name</td>
<td>Sport</td>
<td>Management</td>
<td>Current Status</td>
<td>Recommended Actions</td>
<td>Partners</td>
<td>Site hierarchy</td>
<td>Priority</td>
<td>Timescales</td>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>Aim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Cecil Jones Academy</td>
<td>Rugby union</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>One poor quality mini pitch which is unavailable for community use.</td>
<td>Improve pitch quality for curricular and extra-curricular demand.</td>
<td>RFU School</td>
<td>Local Site</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Protect, Enhance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AGP</td>
<td></td>
<td>One poor quality smaller sized (42m x 35m) sand-based AGP which is unavailable for community use and is not floodlit.</td>
<td>Retain for curricular and extra-curricular demand and explore options to resurface the pitch in order to improve quality, potentially as 3G.</td>
<td>FAEH School</td>
<td></td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Netball</td>
<td></td>
<td>Two standard quality courts which are unavailable for community use and are not floodlit.</td>
<td>Retain for curricular and extra-curricular demand.</td>
<td>England Netball School</td>
<td></td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Cecil Jones Academy Playing Fields</td>
<td>Football</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>A disused unattached School playing field which previously provided up to three adult pitches; anecdotal evidence suggests it has not been utilised for formal sports provision since 2014. A planning application has received part full and part outline consent for a phased development for the relocation of Southend United FC that will replace the unattached playing field. The mitigation for the proposed development would be a new training ground (four adult pitches), a new stadia pitch, one small sized indoor 3G pitch and one full size community available 3G pitch.</td>
<td>Support the proposed developed and ensure facilities are provided to a good, sustainable quality.</td>
<td>FA Club School</td>
<td>Key Centre</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Protect, Provide, Enhance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ensure long term secure community use of the full size 3G pitch.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Garon Park (Garon Park Trust)</td>
<td>Cricket</td>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>One good quality square with 12 grass wickets that is overplayed by 37 match equivalent sessions. Garon Park Community Interest Company (Garon Park CIC) is currently in negotiations with the Norman Garon Trust to formalise a long-term lease for both Norman Garon Trust Football Pitches and Garon Park, of which the Trust owns.</td>
<td>Sustain the quality of the cricket square through appropriate maintenance.</td>
<td>ECB Hub Site</td>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Protect, Provide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Explore the feasibility of installing an NTP in order to alleviate overplay and/or consider the creation of a secondary square in the locality (see the Youth Ground).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Support aspirations of Garon Park CIC in order to provide long-term security of tenure.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ID</td>
<td>Site Description</td>
<td>Sport</td>
<td>Management</td>
<td>Current status</td>
<td>Recommended actions</td>
<td>Partners</td>
<td>Site hierarchy tier</td>
<td>Priority</td>
<td>Timescales</td>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>Aim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Southchurch High School</td>
<td>Football</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>One adult pitch and one youth 11v11 pitch both of which are standard quality. The pitches are available for community use through a community use agreement and each pitch has actual spare capacity of one match equivalent session.</td>
<td>Utilise actual spare capacity through the transfer of demand from overplayed sites or via future demand.</td>
<td>FA School</td>
<td>Local Site</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Protect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cricket</td>
<td>A standalone NTP which is unavailable for community use.</td>
<td>Retain for curricular and extra-curricular demand.</td>
<td>ECB School</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Enhance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AGP</td>
<td>A standard quality smaller sized (42m x 35m) sand-based AGP which is available for community use but is not floodlit.</td>
<td>Retain for curricular and extra-curricular demand.</td>
<td>EH School</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Enhance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AGP</td>
<td>A standard quality smaller sized (42m x 35m) sand-based AGP which is available for community use but is not floodlit.</td>
<td>Encourage the provider to establish a mechanism for long-term sustainability.</td>
<td>EH School</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Enhance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rugby union</td>
<td>Three poor quality macadam courts which are available for community use and are without floodlighting.</td>
<td>Retain for curricular and extra-curricular demand and seek improvements where appropriate.</td>
<td>RFU School</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Enhance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td>Three poor quality macadam courts which are available for community use and are without floodlighting.</td>
<td>Retain for curricular and extra-curricular demand and seek improvements where appropriate.</td>
<td>LTA School</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Enhance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Netball</td>
<td>Three poor quality macadam courts which are available for community use and are not floodlit.</td>
<td>Retain for curricular and extra-curricular demand and seek improvements where appropriate.</td>
<td>RFU School</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Enhance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Netball</td>
<td>A poor quality mini 7v7 pitch which is unavailable for community use.</td>
<td>Improve pitch quality for curricular and extra-curricular demand.</td>
<td>FA School</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Enhance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AGP</td>
<td>A standard quality smaller sized (38m x 20m) sand-based AGP which is not available community use and is not floodlit.</td>
<td>Retain for curricular and extra-curricular demand and explore community use options in line with existing community use agreement.</td>
<td>EH School</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Enhance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Netball</td>
<td>A poor quality macadam court which is not available for community use and is not floodlit.</td>
<td>Retain for curricular and extra-curricular demand and seek improvements where appropriate.</td>
<td>England Netball School</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Enhance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Hamstel Junior School</td>
<td>Football</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>A poor quality mini 7v7 pitch which is unavailable for community use.</td>
<td>Improve pitch quality for curricular and extra-curricular demand and explore community use options in line with existing community use agreement.</td>
<td>FA School</td>
<td>Local Site</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Enhance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AGP</td>
<td>A standard quality smaller sized (38m x 20m) sand-based AGP which is not available community use and is not floodlit.</td>
<td>Retain for curricular and extra-curricular demand and explore community use options in line with existing community use agreement.</td>
<td>EH School</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Enhance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Netball</td>
<td>A poor quality macadam court which is not available for community use and is not floodlit.</td>
<td>Retain for curricular and extra-curricular demand and seek improvements where appropriate.</td>
<td>England Netball School</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Enhance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Jones Memorial Ground</td>
<td>Football</td>
<td>Council</td>
<td>Three adult pitches and three youth 9v9 pitches all of which are standard quality and are played to capacity. The adult pitches are being used solely by youth 11v11 teams. On site ancillary facilities are poor quality.</td>
<td>Look to reconfigure pitches to better accommodate youth 11v11 users.</td>
<td>Council FA</td>
<td>Local Site</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Enhance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ID</td>
<td>Site</td>
<td>Sport</td>
<td>Management</td>
<td>Current status</td>
<td>Recommended actions</td>
<td>Partners</td>
<td>Site hierarchy tier</td>
<td>Priority</td>
<td>TIMESCALES</td>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>Aim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Southchurch Park</td>
<td>Football</td>
<td>Council</td>
<td>Two adult pitches which are poor quality and one poor quality disused mini 7v7 pitch. Actual spare capacity is discounted due to quality issues.</td>
<td>Improve pitch quality to provide actual spare capacity and explore need to bring mini 7v7 pitch back into use given local shortfalls.</td>
<td>FA</td>
<td>Key Centre</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Enhance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cricket</td>
<td></td>
<td>Two squares that are both good quality; one with 11 grass wickets and an accompanying NTP and one with 12 grass wickets only. The former is leased to Southend-on-Sea EMT CC has is serviced by good quality changing facilities, whilst the latter is rented to the Club and has poor quality changing facilities. One of the squares is unused at peak time and therefore has spare capacity to accommodate two additional teams; the other is used to capacity at peak time.</td>
<td>Sustain quality through appropriate maintenance regime. Examine the feasibility of improving the poor quality ancillary facilities servicing the second square and then explore lease arrangement with Southend-on-Sea EMT.</td>
<td>ECB</td>
<td></td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td></td>
<td>Two poor quality macadam courts which are not floodlit.</td>
<td>Improve court quality and explore feasibility of floodlit installation to improve offer, potentially via the ClubSpark scheme.</td>
<td>LTA</td>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bowls</td>
<td></td>
<td>A good quality bowling green which is used by Southchurch Park BC. The Club has aspirations to acquire a disused building on site and refurbish it for additional ancillary facilities.</td>
<td>Sustain green quality through appropriate maintenance. Explore the feasibility of the Club acquiring and improving the disused building.</td>
<td>England Bowls</td>
<td></td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MUGA</td>
<td></td>
<td>A MUGA rated as poor quality and without floodlighting.</td>
<td>Retain as an informal, free to use facility and seek to improve quality to improve offer.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Southend High School for Girls</td>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>Six poor quality macadam courts which are unavailable for community use and are not floodlit. The School is increasing it building footprint and will relocate three of the courts. Once work has been completed, it reports plans to refurbish all six courts.</td>
<td>Assist the School in the relocation and refurbishment of tennis courts and explore community use options once complete.</td>
<td>LTA</td>
<td>Local Site School</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Protect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Netball</td>
<td></td>
<td>Four poor quality macadam courts which are unavailable for community use and are not floodlit. The School is increasing it building footprint and will relocate two of the courts. Once work has been completed it reports plans to refurbish all four courts.</td>
<td>Assist the School in the relocation and refurbishment of tennis courts and explore community use options once complete.</td>
<td>England Netball School</td>
<td></td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ID</td>
<td>Site Name</td>
<td>Sport</td>
<td>Management</td>
<td>Current status</td>
<td>Recommended actions</td>
<td>Partners</td>
<td>Site hierarchy</td>
<td>Priority</td>
<td>Timescales</td>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>Aim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Southend Rugby Club</td>
<td>Rugby union</td>
<td>Club</td>
<td>Four poor quality senior pitches, three of which are floodlit and overplayed by an accumulative 11 match equivalent sessions; the remaining pitch has spare capacity discounted due to quality issues. Serviced by poor quality ancillary facilities. The Club rents the pitches from the Council on an annual basis. Whilst this does provide some security of tenure, there is a need for a longer-term lease so that it can minimise expenditure and attract funding for site improvements. The RFU indicates that the site has the potential to receive funding for a World Rugby Compliant 3G pitch in the future. The Club has aspirations for a long-term lease of the pitches.</td>
<td>Improve pitch quality to reduce overplay, primarily through improved maintenance and the installation of an effective drainage system where appropriate. Provide the Club with a long-term lease of the pitches to aid it to attract the required funding. A lease of over 25 years is recommended to enable this. Identify funding opportunities to improve ancillary facilities. Explore the feasibility of the creation of an RFU World Rugby compliant 3G on site (in the context of potential proposals for an AGP pitch on adjoining Warners Bridge Park). If this is not possible, the RFU should work in partnership with the FA so that a new 3G pitch is also compliant for rugby usage when alleviating football shortfalls.</td>
<td>RFU Club</td>
<td>Key Centre</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Protect Enhance Provide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Warners Bridge Park</td>
<td>AGP</td>
<td>Club</td>
<td>A full size good quality sand-based AGP that was refurbished in 2012. Old Southendians HC has a long-term lease of the pitch and ancillary facilities, with the site also used by Southend HC which is currently using three separate sites to meet its demand.</td>
<td>Sustain quality through appropriate maintenance. Encourage the provider to establish a sinking fund to provide long-term sustainability. Consider providing a second full size AGP to alleviate hockey shortfalls (in the context of potential proposals for a 3G pitch on the site to service Southend RFC), or resurface the pitch at St Thomas More High School.</td>
<td>EH Club</td>
<td>Key centre</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Protect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>St Helens Catholic Primary School</td>
<td>Football</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>A poor quality mini 7v7 pitch which is unavailable for community use.</td>
<td>Improve pitch quality for curricular and extra-curricular demand.</td>
<td>School FA</td>
<td>Local Site</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Protect Enhance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>St Nicholas School</td>
<td>Football</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>A poor quality mini 7v7 pitch which is unavailable for community use.</td>
<td>Improve pitch quality for curricular and extra-curricular demand.</td>
<td>School FA</td>
<td>Local Site</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Protect Enhance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Temple Sutton Primary School</td>
<td>3G</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>A good quality smaller sized (40m x 35m) 3G pitch which is floodlit and available for community use. Pitch is FA registered and can host competitive mini matches.</td>
<td>Sustain pitch quality through appropriate maintenance and seek to maximise usage, particularly for matches. Ensure FA testing every three years so that the pitch remains suitable for match play. Ensure a sinking fund is in place for long-term sustainability.</td>
<td>School FA</td>
<td>Local Site</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Protect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ID</td>
<td>Sport (Management)</td>
<td>Sport (Tier)</td>
<td>Current status</td>
<td>Recommended actions</td>
<td>Partners</td>
<td>Site hierarchy</td>
<td>Priority</td>
<td>Timescales</td>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>Aim</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Thorpe Hall School (Football) School</td>
<td>Football School</td>
<td>A standard quality youth 11v11 pitch which has spare capacity discounted due to insecure tenure.</td>
<td>Provide actual spare capacity via implementation of a community use agreement.</td>
<td>FA School</td>
<td>Local site</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Protect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cricket</td>
<td>A standalone NTP which is available for community use but is not currently used.</td>
<td>Retain for curricular and extra-curricular demand and retain as community available should demand exist in the future.</td>
<td>ECB School</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Protect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td>Two standard quality macadam tennis courts which are not floodlit and are unavailable for community use. The School has recently received planning permission for a sports hall that will result in the loss of the courts.</td>
<td>Ensure any curricular and extra-curricular demand can continue to be met following the loss of the courts.</td>
<td>LTA School</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Protect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Netball</td>
<td>Two standard quality macadam netball courts which are not floodlit and are unavailable for community use. The School has recently received planning permission for a sports hall that will result in the loss of the courts.</td>
<td>Ensure any curricular and extra-curricular demand can continue to be met following the loss of the courts.</td>
<td>England Netball School</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Protect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Victory Sports Ground (Football) Council</td>
<td>Football Council</td>
<td>Three poor quality adult pitches which are overplayed by 0.5 match equivalent sessions. Pitches suffer from dog fouling, poor drainage and animal burrowing. On site ancillary facilities are poor quality and suffer from general vandalism.</td>
<td>Improve pitch quality to alleviate overlap.</td>
<td>FA Key site</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Protect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cricket</td>
<td>Two standard quality squares: one which hosts ten grass wickets and one which hosts eight grass wickets. Both are serviced by adequate ancillary facilities and both are played to capacity at peak time.</td>
<td>Seek quality improvements to bring the squares up to good quality.</td>
<td>ECB School</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Protect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Youth Ground (Football (Cricket)) Council</td>
<td>Football (Cricket)</td>
<td>Two adult, one youth 11v11, two youth 9v9, two mini 7v7 and two mini 5v5 pitches that are all assessed as poor quality. The adult pitches are overplayed by one match equivalent session, the youth 11v11 pitch by 5.5 match equivalent sessions, the youth 9v9 pitches by four match equivalent sessions and the mini 7v7 pitches by two match equivalent sessions (the mini 5v5 pitches are played to capacity). Serviced by poor quality ancillary facilities. Garon Park CIC has aspirations to acquire a long-term lease of the site and plans to develop a cricket square in situ.</td>
<td>Improve pitch quality to alleviate overlap. Explore the funding options to improve ancillary facility quality, particularly in regards to changing rooms and car parking. Support aspirations of Garon Park CIC but ensure the creation of a cricket square does not have a detrimental affect on football activity.</td>
<td>FA ECB Key centre</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Protect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td>Two poor quality macadam tennis courts which are floodlit and available for community use.</td>
<td>Retain for continued private use.</td>
<td>LTA Local Site</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Protect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>DW Sports Fitness (Thorpe Bay) (Tennis) Commercial</td>
<td>Tennis Commercial</td>
<td>Two poor quality macadam tennis courts which are floodlit and available for community use.</td>
<td>Retain for continued private use.</td>
<td>LTA Local Site</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Protect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ID</td>
<td>Site Name</td>
<td>Sport</td>
<td>Management</td>
<td>Current status</td>
<td>Recommended actions</td>
<td>Partners</td>
<td>Site hierarchy</td>
<td>Priority</td>
<td>Timescales</td>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>Aim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Milton Road Gardens Tennis Club</td>
<td>Two poor quality macadam tennis courts which are not floodlit but are available for community use.</td>
<td>Seek to improve court quality through resurfacing.</td>
<td>Club LTA</td>
<td>Local Site</td>
<td>M S L</td>
<td>Protect</td>
<td>Enhanced</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Southend Leisure and Tennis Centre</td>
<td>Four standard quality courts which are floodlit and available for community use.</td>
<td>Sustain court quality through continued maintenance.</td>
<td>LTA Key Centre</td>
<td>M L L</td>
<td>Protect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Southend-on-Sea Bowls Club Bowls</td>
<td>A good quality bowling green that is leased to Southend-on-Sea BC. The green is currently operating above capacity by 81 members.</td>
<td>Sustain green quality through appropriate maintenance and offer continued support to the Club given its high membership to ensure provision remains sufficient.</td>
<td>Bowls England Club</td>
<td>M L L</td>
<td>Protect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Bournemouth Park Bowls Club Bowls</td>
<td>A good quality bowling green used by Bournemouth Park BC.</td>
<td>Sustain green quality.</td>
<td>Bowls England Club</td>
<td>Local Site</td>
<td>L L L</td>
<td>Protect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Thorpe Bay Lawn Tennis Club</td>
<td>There are 12 good quality artificial courts which are not floodlit and four good quality artificial courts which are floodlit. Owned by Thorpe Bay Tennis Club, which reports that it has the funds to create a dedicated junior pavilion. Courts are currently operating over capacity.</td>
<td>Assist the Club in creating a dedicated junior pavilion.</td>
<td>Assists the Club in creating a dedicated junior pavilion.</td>
<td>Local Site</td>
<td>L L L</td>
<td>Protect</td>
<td>Provide</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L M M</td>
<td>Protect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L S M</td>
<td>Protect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M L L</td>
<td>Protect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Southend Lawn Tennis Club Tennis</td>
<td>Five good quality artificial courts which are floodlit and available for community use.</td>
<td>Sustain court quality.</td>
<td>LTA Club</td>
<td>Local Site</td>
<td>M L L</td>
<td>Protect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Norman Garon Trust Football Pitches</td>
<td>Two adult pitches, one youth 11v11 pitch, two youth 9v9 pitches, two mini 7v7 pitches and two mini 5v5 pitches all of which are standard quality. The youth 11v11 pitch is overplayed by two match equivalent sessions, whereas all remaining pitches are played to capacity at peak time. Garon Park CIC is currently in negotiations with Norman Garon Trust to formalise a long term lease the site. If successful, the CIC has aspirations to develop a full size floodlit 3G pitch to replace one of the adult grass pitches.</td>
<td>Improve youth 11v11 pitch quality to alleviate overplay.</td>
<td>FA Key centre</td>
<td>M S L</td>
<td>Protect</td>
<td>Enhance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H S H</td>
<td>Protect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M M H</td>
<td>Protect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>Alexandra Bowling Green Bowls Council</td>
<td>A good quality bowling green used by Alexandra BC. The Club reports public toilets servicing the green are poor quality.</td>
<td>Sustain green quality.</td>
<td>Council Bowls England</td>
<td>Local Site</td>
<td>L L L</td>
<td>Protect</td>
<td>Enhance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ID</td>
<td>Site Name</td>
<td>Sport</td>
<td>Management</td>
<td>Current Status</td>
<td>Recommended actions</td>
<td>Partners</td>
<td>Site hierarchy</td>
<td>Priority</td>
<td>Timescales</td>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>Aim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>Barons Court School</td>
<td>MUGA</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>A standard quality MUGA without floodlighting. Used solely for school use.</td>
<td>Retain for curricular and extra-curricular activity.</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>Local site</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Protect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ID</td>
<td>Site</td>
<td>Sport</td>
<td>Management</td>
<td>Current status</td>
<td>Recommended actions</td>
<td>Partners</td>
<td>Site hierarchy</td>
<td>Priority</td>
<td>Timescales</td>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>Aim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Garon Park Golf Complex</td>
<td>Golf</td>
<td>Club</td>
<td>Three 9-hole courses and a dedicated 9-hole par 3 course, accompanied by a large floodlit covered driving range. The Club serviced 330 members.</td>
<td>Retain course and sustain quality through appropriate maintenance</td>
<td>Club England Golf</td>
<td>Local Site</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Protect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Explore opportunities to increase membership.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Thorpe Hall Golf Club</td>
<td>Golf</td>
<td>Club</td>
<td>An 18-hole course that caters for 540 members.</td>
<td>Retain course and sustain quality through appropriate maintenance</td>
<td>Club England Golf</td>
<td>Local Site</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Protect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Explore opportunities to increase membership.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# SOUTHEND-ON-SEA BOROUGH COUNCIL
## PLAYING PITCH STRATEGY

### EAST ANALYSIS AREA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site ID</th>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Sport</th>
<th>Management</th>
<th>Current status</th>
<th>Recommended actions</th>
<th>Partners</th>
<th>Site hierarchy</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Timescales</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Aim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Shoebury Garrison Ground</td>
<td>Cricket</td>
<td>Council</td>
<td>A standard quality square with 14 grass wickets. It has spare capacity to accommodate one additional senior team at peak time. Accompanied by poor quality ancillary facilities.</td>
<td>Seek quality improvements to bring the square up to good quality. Look to utilise spare capacity to alleviate overplay from another site or to accommodate future demand. Explore improving ancillary facility quality if there is sufficient demand.</td>
<td>ECB</td>
<td>Local Site</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Protect Enhance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td></td>
<td>Two good quality macadam courts which are not floodlit. Courts are used by the Parks Tennis League.</td>
<td>Sustain court quality through appropriate maintenance. Explore floodlight installation to better accommodate demand and to maximise usage.</td>
<td>LTA</td>
<td></td>
<td>L</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Shoebury Park</td>
<td>Football</td>
<td>Council</td>
<td>Two standard quality adult pitches which have actual spare capacity of 1.5 match equivalent sessions. After recent investment from the Council, onsite ancillary facilities are considered to be good quality.</td>
<td>Utilise actual spare capacity via transfer of demand from overplayed sites or through future demand.</td>
<td>FA</td>
<td>Hub site</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Protect Enhance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cricket</td>
<td></td>
<td>A standard quality square with eight grass wickets. Spare capacity to accommodate one additional senior team at peak time.</td>
<td>Seek quality improvements to bring the square up to good quality. Look to utilise spare capacity to alleviate overplay from another site or to accommodate future demand.</td>
<td>ECB</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td></td>
<td>Two poor quality macadam tennis courts which are not floodlit. Courts are used by the Parks Tennis League.</td>
<td>Improve court quality and explore feasibility of floodlight installation to improve offer, potentially via the ClubSpark scheme.</td>
<td>LTA</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bowls</td>
<td></td>
<td>One standard quality green which is used by Shoebury BC. The Club reports the sprinkler system is not working effectively.</td>
<td>Sustain green quality and pursue improvements where necessary.</td>
<td>England Bowls</td>
<td></td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MUGA</td>
<td></td>
<td>A poor quality MUGA without floodlighting.</td>
<td>Retain as an informal, free to use facility and seek to improve quality to improve offer.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Shoeburyness High School</td>
<td>Football</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>Three youth 11v11 pitches, one youth 9v9 pitch and one mini 7v7 pitch all of which are good quality. Spare capacity discounted due to unsecure tenure.</td>
<td>Sustain pitch quality through appropriate maintenance. Provide security of tenure to provide actual spare capacity through the implementation of a community use agreement. Retain for curricular and extra-curricular demand and retain community availability should demand exist in the future. Improve pitch quality for curricular and extra-curricular demand and retain its ability for rugby league activity should demand exist in the future.</td>
<td>FA</td>
<td>Local Site</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Protect Enhance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cricket</td>
<td></td>
<td>A standalone NTP which is available for community use but is not currently used.</td>
<td>Retain for curricular and extra-curricular demand and retain community availability should demand exist in the future.</td>
<td>ECB</td>
<td></td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rugby union</td>
<td></td>
<td>One poor quality senior rugby pitch which is available for community use but currently unused. The pitch is dually used for rugby league.</td>
<td>Improve pitch quality for curricular and extra-curricular demand and retain its ability for rugby league activity should demand exist in the future.</td>
<td>RFU RFL</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ID</td>
<td>Site ID</td>
<td>Sport</td>
<td>Management</td>
<td>Current status</td>
<td>Recommended actions</td>
<td>Partners</td>
<td>Site hierarchy tier</td>
<td>Priority</td>
<td>Timescales</td>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>Aim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td></td>
<td>Six standard quality macadam courts which are not floodlit and are not available for community use.</td>
<td>Retain for curricular and extra-curricular demand.</td>
<td>LTA</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Netball</td>
<td></td>
<td>Six standard quality macadam courts which are not floodlit and are not available for community use.</td>
<td>Retain for curricular and extra-curricular demand.</td>
<td>England Netball</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Colne Drive MUGA</td>
<td>MUGA</td>
<td>Council</td>
<td>A standard quality MUGA without floodlighting.</td>
<td>Retain as an informal, free to use facility and seek to improve quality to improve offer, potentially via floodlight installation.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Local Site</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Protect</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### WEST ANALYSIS AREA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site ID</th>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Sport</th>
<th>Management</th>
<th>Current status</th>
<th>Recommended actions</th>
<th>Partners</th>
<th>Site hierarchy tier</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Timescales</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Aim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Belfairs Academy</td>
<td>Football</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>A poor quality youth 11v11 pitch which is unavailable for community use, however, Sport England reports the School does have an active community use agreement in place.</td>
<td>Improve pitch quality through an enhanced maintenance regime. Ensure the School adheres to the community use agreement.</td>
<td>FA School</td>
<td>Local Site</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Protect Enhance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cricket</td>
<td></td>
<td>A standalone NTP unavailable for community use.</td>
<td>Retain for curricular and extra-curricular demand.</td>
<td>ECB School</td>
<td></td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rugby union</td>
<td></td>
<td>One poor quality senior pitch which is unavailable for community use.</td>
<td>Improve pitch quality for curricular and extra-curricular demand.</td>
<td>RFU School</td>
<td></td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td></td>
<td>Three poor quality macadam courts which are unavailable for community use and are not floodlit.</td>
<td>Improve pitch quality for curricular and extra-curricular demand.</td>
<td>LTA School</td>
<td></td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Netball</td>
<td></td>
<td>Three poor quality macadam courts which are unavailable for community use and are not floodlit.</td>
<td>Improve pitch quality for curricular and extra-curricular demand.</td>
<td>England Netball School</td>
<td></td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Belfairs Park</td>
<td>Football</td>
<td>Council</td>
<td>One adult, two youth 11v11, two mini 7v7 and one mini 5v5 pitch all assessed as good quality. The adult pitch is overplayed by one match equivalent session, whereas the youth 11v11 pitches are played to capacity at peak time. The mini pitches contain actual spare capacity.</td>
<td>Sustain pitch quality through appropriate levels of maintenance. Transfer some demand from the adult pitches to a site with actual spare capacity.</td>
<td>FA Hub Site</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Protect Enhance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cricket</td>
<td></td>
<td>Three standard quality squares each hosting eight grass wickets. In total, there is spare capacity to accommodate an additional three teams.</td>
<td>Seek quality improvements to bring the squares up to good quality.</td>
<td>ECB</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bowls</td>
<td></td>
<td>Two good quality bowling greens accessed by Belfairs BC and Fairwood BC.</td>
<td>Sustain quality.</td>
<td>England Bowls</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td></td>
<td>Two poor quality macadam courts which are available for community use but are not floodlit.</td>
<td>Improve court quality and explore feasibility of floodlit installation to improve offer, potentially via the ClubSpark scheme.</td>
<td>LTA</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Blenheim Park</td>
<td>Football</td>
<td>Council</td>
<td>Three adult pitches, one youth 11v11 and one youth 9v9 all of which are standard quality. The adult pitches have actual spare capacity of two match equivalent sessions, whereas all remaining pitches are played to capacity at peak time. Site has poor quality ancillary facilities and inadequate car parking. Catholic United FC has aspirations to relocate to the site; however, this would require one of the pitches to be brought up to Step 7 standard.</td>
<td>Utilise actual spare capacity to accommodate future demand or to alleviate overplay from another site. Explore funding streams to improve the quality of ancillary facilities.</td>
<td>FA Key centre</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
<td>Protect Enhance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Consider improving one of the adult pitches to comply with Step 7 requirements.</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ID</td>
<td>Site ID</td>
<td>Sport</td>
<td>Management</td>
<td>Current status</td>
<td>Recommended actions</td>
<td>Partners</td>
<td>Site hierarchy</td>
<td>Priority</td>
<td>Timescales</td>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>Aim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Football</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>One mini 7v7 pitch and one mini 5v5 pitch both of which are poor quality and both are overplayed by one match equivalent session.</td>
<td>Improve pitch quality to alleviate overplay.</td>
<td>FA School</td>
<td>Local site</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Protect, Enhance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Football</td>
<td>Council</td>
<td>Two youth 11v11, two mini 7v7 and two mini 5v5 pitches all of standard quality and all are played to capacity at peak time. All mini pitches are overmarked inside the two youth 11v11 pitches. Onsite changing provision is poor quality and currently only utilised for storage.</td>
<td>Ensure appropriate maintenance to maintain pitch over markings.</td>
<td>Council FA</td>
<td>Local Site</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Protect, Enhance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Cricket</td>
<td>Council</td>
<td>A good quality square which hosts nine grass wickets accompanied by an NTP and a good quality square which hosts 12 grass wickets. Accumulatively, the two squares are overplayed by eight match equivalent sessions. Only one of the squares is accompanied by changing facilities.</td>
<td>Sustain quality through appropriate maintenance.</td>
<td>ECB Key Centre</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Rugby union</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>A poor quality senior pitch which is unavailable for community use.</td>
<td>Improve quality for curricular and extra-curricular demand.</td>
<td>RFU School</td>
<td>Local Site</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Protect, Enhance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Football</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>A poor quality mini 7v7 pitch which is unavailable for community use.</td>
<td>Improve quality for curricular and extra-curricular demand.</td>
<td>FA School</td>
<td>Local Site</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Protect, Enhance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3G</td>
<td></td>
<td>A standard quality smaller sized (25m x 15m) 3G pitch which is not available for community use and is not floodlit.</td>
<td>Retain for curricular and extra-curricular demand.</td>
<td>FA School</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Netball</td>
<td></td>
<td>A poor quality macadam court: not available for community use nor floodlit.</td>
<td>Improve quality for curricular and extra-curricular demand.</td>
<td>England Netball School</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Football</td>
<td>Council</td>
<td>Three standard quality adult pitches which have actual spare capacity of two match equivalent sessions available at peak time.</td>
<td>Utilise actual spare capacity to accommodate future demand or to alleviate overplay from another site.</td>
<td>Council FA Bowls England</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bowls</td>
<td></td>
<td>A standard quality bowling green used by Eastwood Park BC.</td>
<td>Improve bowling green quality through an enhanced maintenance regime.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ID</td>
<td>Site ID</td>
<td>Sport</td>
<td>Management</td>
<td>Current status</td>
<td>Recommended actions</td>
<td>Partners</td>
<td>Site hierarchy tier</td>
<td>Priority</td>
<td>Timescales</td>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>Aim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Edwards Hall Primary School</td>
<td>Football</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>A mini 7v7 pitch and three mini 5v5 pitches all of which are standard quality and all of which are played to capacity at peak time.</td>
<td>Pursue security of tenure for club users via implementation of a community use agreement.</td>
<td>FA School</td>
<td>Local Site</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Protect, Enhance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>One poor quality court which is not available for community use and is not floodlit.</td>
<td>Improve quality for curricular and extra-curricular demand, where possible.</td>
<td>England Netball School</td>
<td></td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Ekco Social and Sports Club Association</td>
<td>Football</td>
<td>Club</td>
<td>One adult, one youth 11v11, one youth 9v9 and one mini 5v5 pitch all of which are standard quality. The adult pitch is overplayed by 0.5 match equivalent sessions, whereas all remaining pitch types are played to capacity at peak time. There are no dedicated changing rooms on site.</td>
<td>Improve adult pitch quality to alleviate overplay. Explore potential funding streams to create dedicated changing facilities.</td>
<td>FA Club</td>
<td>Key Centre</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Enhance, Provide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A standard quality square which hosts ten grass wickets and is played to capacity at peak time. There are no dedicated changing rooms on site.</td>
<td>Seek quality improvements to bring the square up to good quality. Explore potential funding streams to create dedicated changing facilities.</td>
<td>ECB Club</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Heycroft Primary School</td>
<td>Football</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>Two standard quality mini 7v7 pitches which have spare capacity discounted due to unsecure tenure.</td>
<td>Pursue security of tenure for club users via implementation of a community use agreement.</td>
<td>FA School</td>
<td>Local Site</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Protect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Leigh Marshes</td>
<td>MUGA</td>
<td>Council</td>
<td>A poor quality MUGA which is serviced by floodlights.</td>
<td>Refurbish MUGA to increase usage potential given the presence of floodlighting.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Local Site</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Protect, Enhance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Playfootball (Southend)</td>
<td>3G</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>A full size floodlit 3G pitch which is of standard quality having been built in 2008. Pitch is not FA registered despite being used for matches. In addition, there are eight smaller sized 3G pitches which are also floodlit. Site is used by Chase High School.</td>
<td>Resurface the full size pitch in the near future before quality deteriorates and ensure a sinking fund is in place for long-term sustainability. Pursue FA testing every so it can accommodate competitive demand and remove existing demand if this does not take place. Retain smaller sized pitches for continued unaffiliated, recreational and informal activity.</td>
<td>FA Key centre</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Protect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Prince Avenue Academy and Nursery</td>
<td>Football</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>Two poor quality mini 5v5 pitches which have spare capacity discounted due to unsecure tenure.</td>
<td>Improve pitch quality and pursue security of tenure for club users via implementation of a community use agreement.</td>
<td>FA School</td>
<td>Local Site</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Protect, Enhance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ID</td>
<td>Site</td>
<td>Sport</td>
<td>Management</td>
<td>Current status</td>
<td>Recommended actions</td>
<td>Partners</td>
<td>Site hierarchy tier</td>
<td>Priority</td>
<td>Timescales</td>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>Aim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Priory Park</td>
<td>Football</td>
<td>Council</td>
<td>Two adult pitches and one youth 11v11 pitch all of which are standard quality. The adult pitches have spare capacity of 1.5 match equivalent sessions; the youth 11v11 pitch is played to capacity.</td>
<td>Utilise actual spare capacity to accommodate future demand or to alleviate over play from another site.</td>
<td>FA</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Protect</td>
<td>Enhance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td></td>
<td>Three good quality macadam courts which are floodlit. Courts are accessed through Clubspark scheme.</td>
<td>Sustain court quality through appropriate levels of maintenance.</td>
<td>LTA</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Protect</td>
<td>Enhance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Netball</td>
<td></td>
<td>One poor quality macadam court which is available for community use but is not floodlit.</td>
<td>Consider re-purposing court given lack of demand.</td>
<td>England Netball</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Protect</td>
<td>Enhance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bowls</td>
<td></td>
<td>Four good quality bowling greens which are used by Prittlewell and Victoria Ladies BC. Prittlewell BC is currently working with the Council to improve two greens to County standard.</td>
<td>Ensure quality is sustained and explore opportunities to improve quality in line with Prittlewell BC’s aspirations.</td>
<td>England Bowls</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Protect</td>
<td>Enhance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Roots Hall Stadium</td>
<td>Football</td>
<td>Club</td>
<td>One good quality stadia adult pitch used by Southend United FC. The Club has aspirations to relocate and develop a new home ground and training facility.</td>
<td>Retain until replacement provision is provided.</td>
<td>FA Club</td>
<td>Local Site</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Protect</td>
<td>Enhance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>South Essex College (Wellstead Gardens Sports Ground)</td>
<td>Football</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>Two standard quality youth 11v11 pitches which have actual spare capacity discounted due to unsecure tenure. Pitches are currently used by Catholic United FC which has aspirations to relocate due to not having a community use agreement.</td>
<td>Pursue security of tenure for club users via implementation of a community use agreement.</td>
<td>FA School</td>
<td>Local Site</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Protect</td>
<td>Enhance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td></td>
<td>Three poor quality macadam courts which are unavailable for community use and are not floodlit.</td>
<td>Improve quality for curricular and extra-curricular demand.</td>
<td>LTA School</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Protect</td>
<td>Enhance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Southend High School for Boys</td>
<td>Football</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>Two adult pitches and one youth 11v11 pitch all of which are standard quality. Spare capacity has been retained until planned improvements to the drainage have taken place.</td>
<td>Ensure planned improvement to the drainage system take place then seek to maximise usage.</td>
<td>FA School</td>
<td>Local Site</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Protect</td>
<td>Enhance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cricket</td>
<td></td>
<td>A standalone NTP which is available for community use but not currently in use.</td>
<td>Retain for curricular and extra-curricular demand and retain community availability should demand exist in the future.</td>
<td>ECB School</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Protect</td>
<td>Enhance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rugby union</td>
<td></td>
<td>A poor quality senior pitch which is unavailable for community use.</td>
<td>Improve pitch quality for curricular and extra-curricular demand</td>
<td>RFU School</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Protect</td>
<td>Enhance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ID</td>
<td>Site</td>
<td>Sport</td>
<td>Management</td>
<td>Current status</td>
<td>Recommended actions</td>
<td>Partners</td>
<td>Site hierarchy</td>
<td>Priority</td>
<td>Timescales</td>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>Aim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>St Thomas More High School</td>
<td>Football</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>Five youth 11v11 pitches and one mini 7v7 pitch all of which are standard quality. Spare capacity has been discounted due to unsecure tenure.</td>
<td>Pursue security of tenure for club users via implementation of a community use agreement, especially in regards to the youth 11v11 pitches given local shortfalls.</td>
<td>FA School</td>
<td>Key Centre</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Protect Enhance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AGP</td>
<td></td>
<td>A full size poor quality hockey suitable AGP. Floodlight restrictions after 8pm. The pitch was built in 2001 and was previously accessed by Southend HC until quality issues forced the Club to relocate. The Club reports that if the surface was resurfaced and it had secured community access it would return to the site.</td>
<td>Consider resurfacing the pitch to alleviate hockey shortfalls or provide a new full-size AGP.</td>
<td>EH School</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td></td>
<td>Six poor quality macadam courts which are unavailable for community use and are not floodlit. The School reports that it is in the process of increasing its building footprint to accommodate additional classrooms and as part of this process, it will be temporarily losing two courts, although it will then relocate them.</td>
<td>Ensure no net loss of tennis courts and ensure that the courts are provided to a good quality when re-established.</td>
<td>LTA School</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>The Eastwood Academy</td>
<td>Football</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>A standard quality adult pitch which has spare capacity discounted due to unsecure tenure.</td>
<td>Pursue security of tenure for club users via implementation of a community use agreement.</td>
<td>FA School</td>
<td>Key Centre</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Protect Enhance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AGP</td>
<td></td>
<td>A poor quality smaller sized (70m x 48m) sand-based AGP which is floodlit and available for community use.</td>
<td>Retain for school demand and community recreational activity and consider resurfacing to enable this, potentially as a 3G pitch.</td>
<td>FA EH School</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Athletics</td>
<td></td>
<td>A good quality 400m six lane synthetic athletics track which is not floodlit. The track is available for community use; however, it is currently only utilised by the School.</td>
<td>Retain for school use.</td>
<td>England Athletics LTA</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ID</td>
<td>Site Name</td>
<td>Sport</td>
<td>Management</td>
<td>Current status</td>
<td>Recommended actions</td>
<td>Partners</td>
<td>Site hierarchy</td>
<td>Priority</td>
<td>Timescales</td>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>Aim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>The Len Forge Centre</td>
<td>Football</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Four good quality adult pitches which have actual spare capacity of 2.5 match equivalent sessions. Clubs report the site has inadequate car parking.</td>
<td>Sustain pitch quality through an appropriate maintenance regime. Utilise actual spare capacity to accommodate future demand or to alleviate over play from another site. Consider utilising actual spare capacity to increase stock of youth 11v11 pitches, given local shortfalls. Explore potential funding streams to improve car parking facilities.</td>
<td>FA</td>
<td>Key Centre</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Protect Provide  Enhance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A full size floodlit 3G pitch which is of good quality. Pitch was built in 2015 and is FA registered.</td>
<td>Ensure pitch is maintained to a high standard to continue to meet demand and prolong carpet life. Ensure a sinking fund is in place for long-term sustainability. Ensure FA testing every three years so that the pitch can continue to accommodate competitive demand. Explore the opportunity to create a second full size 3G pitch onsite to alleviate identified shortfalls.</td>
<td>FA</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>The St Christopher's School Academy</td>
<td>AGP</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>A standard quality smaller sized (38m x 22m) sand-based AGP which is not available for community use or floodlit.</td>
<td>Retain for curricular and extra-curricular demand.</td>
<td>EH</td>
<td>Local Site</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Protect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Westcliff High School for Boys</td>
<td>Football</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>A standard quality adult pitch which is over played by 3.5 match equivalent sessions. Pitch is used solely by youth 11v11 teams.</td>
<td>Improve pitch quality to reduce overplay and transfer remaining overplay to a site with actual spare capacity. Reconfigure pitch to better accommodate for youth 11v11 football.</td>
<td>FA</td>
<td>Local Site</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Protect Enhance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cricket</td>
<td></td>
<td>A standalone NTP available for community use but currently unused and a standard quality square which hosts six grass wickets. Square is used by Westcliff CC; however, spare capacity is discounted due to unsecure tenure.</td>
<td>Retain NTP for curricular and extra-curricular demand and retain community availability should demand exist in the future. Pursue security of tenure for club users via implementation of a community use agreement.</td>
<td>ECB</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rugby union</td>
<td></td>
<td>A standard quality senior pitch which is available for community use but is currently unused.</td>
<td>Retain for curricular and extra-curricular demand</td>
<td>RFU</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ID</td>
<td>Site Name</td>
<td>Sport</td>
<td>Management</td>
<td>Current status</td>
<td>Recommended actions</td>
<td>Partners</td>
<td>Site hierarchy</td>
<td>Priority</td>
<td>Timescales</td>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>Aim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Westcliff High School for Girls Playing Fields</td>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>Four good quality macadam courts which are floodlit. Courts are unavailable for community use due to previous quality issues, although recent refurbishments have taken place.</td>
<td>Explore community use options now that quality has improved.</td>
<td>LTA School</td>
<td>Local Site</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Protect Provide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Four good quality macadam courts which are floodlit. Recently renovated after receiving a grant from Sport England. Previously accessed by the Southend &amp; District Netball League, however, due to their quality the League decided to relocate.</td>
<td>Explore options for the Southend &amp; District Netball League to return to the site now that quality has improved.</td>
<td>England Netball School</td>
<td>Local Site</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Bonchurch Park</td>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td>Council</td>
<td>Two poor quality macadam courts which are not floodlit. Courts are available for community use.</td>
<td>Improve court quality and explore feasibility of floodlit installation to improve offer, potentially via the ClubSpark scheme.</td>
<td>LTA</td>
<td>Local Site</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Enhance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Cavendish Gardens</td>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td>Council</td>
<td>Two poor quality macadam courts which are not floodlit. Courts are available for community use.</td>
<td>Seek to improve court quality, either through resurfacing or improved maintenance.</td>
<td>Bowls England</td>
<td>Local Site</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Protect Enhance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>One good quality bowling green which is used by White Hall BC. Green is operating over recommended capacity.</td>
<td>Sustain green quality through appropriate levels of maintenance in order to sustain minimal overplay.</td>
<td>LTA Club</td>
<td>Local Site</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Essex County Indoor Bowls Club</td>
<td>Bowls</td>
<td>Club</td>
<td>Two good quality bowling greens used by Essex County Indoor BC.</td>
<td>Sustain green quality through appropriate maintenance.</td>
<td>Bowls England Club</td>
<td>Local Site</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Protect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Invicta Tennis and Table Tennis Club</td>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td>Club</td>
<td>Three good quality macadam courts which are floodlit. Courts are used by Invicta TC.</td>
<td>Sustain court quality through appropriate maintenance.</td>
<td>LTA Club</td>
<td>Local Site</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Protect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Leigh and Westcliff Lawn Tennis Club</td>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td>Club</td>
<td>Three standard quality clay courts which are not floodlit, two standard quality macadam courts which are not floodlit and five good quality artificial courts, three of which are floodlit.</td>
<td>Sustain court quality through appropriate maintenance.</td>
<td>LTA Club</td>
<td>Local Site</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Protect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Westcliff Hard Court Tennis Club</td>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td>Club</td>
<td>Three macadam and four artificial courts all of which are floodlit and good quality. Courts are used by Westcliff Hard Court TC. The Club reports of limited on site car parking.</td>
<td>Sustain court quality through appropriate maintenance.</td>
<td>LTA Club</td>
<td>Local Site</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Protect Enhance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>St Peters Lawn Tennis Club</td>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td>Club</td>
<td>One standard quality macadam court which is not floodlit. Court is used by St Peters TC, which reports that it has limited members and may fold in the near future.</td>
<td>Sustain court quality through appropriate maintenance.</td>
<td>Club LTA</td>
<td>Local Site</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Protect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Earls Hall Primary School</td>
<td>Football</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>One mini 7v7 pitch and two mini 5v5 pitches all of which are poor quality. Spare capacity discounted due to insecure tenure.</td>
<td>Improve pitch quality to accommodate curricular and extra-curricular use.</td>
<td>School FA</td>
<td>Local Site</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Protect Enhance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>St. Laurence Park MUGA</td>
<td>MUGA</td>
<td>Council</td>
<td>A poor quality MUGA that comprises od an informal grass area accompanied by multipurpose goals.</td>
<td>Retain as an informal, free to use facility and explore quality improvements.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Local Site</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Protect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ID</td>
<td>Site Name</td>
<td>Sport</td>
<td>Management</td>
<td>Current status</td>
<td>Recommended actions</td>
<td>Partners</td>
<td>Site hierarchy</td>
<td>Priority</td>
<td>Timescales</td>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>Aim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>David Lloyd Club (Southend)</td>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td>Club</td>
<td>Five good quality artificial courts all of which are floodlit. Two courts can be covered by an Air Dome for greater utilisation. The site also hosts five permanent indoor courts.</td>
<td>Retain for continued private use.</td>
<td>LTA</td>
<td>Local Site</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Protect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>Leigh Road Baptist Church Tennis Club</td>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td>Club</td>
<td>Three good quality macadam courts which are not floodlit. Courts are used by Leigh Road Baptist Church TC.</td>
<td>Sustain court quality through appropriate maintenance.</td>
<td>LTA</td>
<td>Local Site</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Protect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>Crowstone and St Saviours Tennis Club</td>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td>Club</td>
<td>Three good quality macadam courts, one of which is floodlit. Courts are used by Crowstone and St Saviours TC, which reports that on site ancillary facilities are poor quality.</td>
<td>Sustain court quality through appropriate maintenance.</td>
<td>LTA</td>
<td>Local Site</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Protect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Explore potential funding streams to improve poor quality ancillary facilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Enhance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>Chalkwell Esplanade</td>
<td>Bowls</td>
<td>Council</td>
<td>Two standard quality bowling greens used by Chalkwell BC. The Club reports that the quality of the greens has worsened since last season.</td>
<td>Improve green quality through an enhanced maintenance regime.</td>
<td>Bowls England Club</td>
<td>Local Site</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Protect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>Eastwood Park</td>
<td>Bowls</td>
<td>Council</td>
<td>One standard quality bowling green used by Eastwood Park BC. The Club reports that the quality of the greens has worsened since last season.</td>
<td>Improve green quality through an enhanced maintenance regime.</td>
<td>Bowls England Club</td>
<td>Local Site</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Protect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>Alexandra Bowling Green</td>
<td>Bowls</td>
<td>Council</td>
<td>A good quality bowling green used by Alexandra BC. The Club reports public toilets servicing the green are poor quality.</td>
<td>Sustain quality.</td>
<td>Bowls England Club</td>
<td>Local Site</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Protect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Explore potential funding options to refurbish poor quality public toilets.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Enhance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Belfairs Golf Course</td>
<td>Golf</td>
<td>Club</td>
<td>An 18-hole course which hosts two clubs; Belfairs Golf Club with 113 members and Southend Golf Club with 76 members.</td>
<td>Retain course and sustain quality through appropriate maintenance.</td>
<td>England Golf Club</td>
<td>Local Site</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Protect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Explore opportunities to increase membership.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PART 6: DELIVER THE STRATEGY AND KEEP IT ROBUST AND UP TO DATE

Delivery

The PPS provides guidance for maintenance/management decisions and investment made across Southend-on-Sea. By addressing issues identified in the Assessment Report and using the strategic framework presented in this Strategy, the current and future sporting and recreational needs of Southend-on-Sea can be met. The Strategy identifies where there is a deficiency in provision and identifies how best to resolve this in the future.

Production of this Strategy is the start of the planning process. Successful Strategy implementation and the benefits to be gained depend upon regular engagement between all partners involved and the adoption of a mutually bought into, strategic approach. It is important that this document is used in a practical manner, supports engagement with partners and encourages partnerships to be developed, to ensure that outdoor sports facilities are regarded as a vital aspect of community life and which contribute to the achievement of Council priorities.

Each member of the Steering Group should take the lead to ensure the PPS is used and applied appropriately within their area of work and influence. The role of the Steering Group should not end with the completion of the PPS document.

To help ensure that the PPS is well used it should be regarded as the key document within the study area guiding the improvement and protection of playing pitch provision. It needs to be the document to which people and agencies regularly turn to for information in respect of how current demand should be met and what actions are required to improve the situation and meet future demand. To ensure that this is achieved the Steering Group need to have a clear understanding of how the PPS can be applied and therefore delivered.

The process of PPS development has already led to a number of benefits that assist its application and delivery. These include enhanced partnership work across different agendas and organisations, pooling of resources along with strengthened relationships and understanding between stakeholders, members of the Steering Group and the sporting community. The drivers behind the PPS and the work to develop the recommendations and action plan will have also highlighted, and helped the Steering Group to understand, the key areas to which its influence should be applied and strategy delivered enhanced.

Following sign off of the PPS, a short-term Action Plan should be prepared by the Council, in consultation with relevant partners, in order to distil the existing Action Plan and to give the Steering Group a short-term focus. This would then need to be revised through regular meetings.

Monitoring and updating

It is important that there is regular annual monitoring and review against the actions identified in the Strategy. This should be led by the Council and supported by all members of, and reported back to, the Steering Group. Understanding and learning lessons from how the PPS has been applied should be a key component of monitoring its delivery and be an on-going role of the Steering Group.
The Steering Group that takes the PPS forward should be a sub-regional group made up of the four local authorities included within the study (potentially as well as Thurrock and Brentwood) as well as other partners such as the NGBs, Active Essex and Essex County Council. This offers benefits in terms of joint working on strategic and cross-boundary issues and will also be more efficient in terms of administration when compared to each authority having its own individual Steering Group.

KKP will provide the tools used to produce the PPS to the Council as well as training on how to use such tools, such as the PPS database used to hold all information gathered. This will enable the monitoring and updating process to be carried out.

As a guide, if no review and subsequent update has been carried out within three years of the PPS being signed off by the steering group, Sport England and the NGBs will consider the PPS and the information on which it is based to be out of date.

The nature of the supply and in particular the demand for outdoor sports facilities will likely have changed over the three years. Therefore, without any form of review and update within this time period it would be difficult to make the case that the supply and demand information and assessment work is sufficiently robust.

Ideally the PPS should be reviewed on an annual basis from the date it is formally signed off by the Steering Group. This will help to maintain the momentum and commitment built up during its development. Taking into account the time to develop the PPS this should also help to ensure that the original supply and demand information is no more than two years old without being reviewed.

An annual review should not be regarded as a particular resource intensive task. However, it should highlight:

- How delivery of the recommendations and action plan has progressed and any changes required to the priority afforded to each action (e.g. the priority of some may increase or reduce following the delivery of others)
- How the PPS has been applied and the lessons learnt
- Any changes to particularly important sites and/or clubs in the area (e.g. the most used or high quality sites for a particular sport) and other supply and demand information, what this may mean for the overall assessment work and the key findings and issues
- Any development of a specific sport or particular format of a sport
- Any new or emerging issues and opportunities.

Once the PPS is complete the role of the Steering Group should evolve so that it:

- Acts as a focal point for promoting the value and importance of the PPS and outdoor sports provision in the area
- Monitors, evaluates and reviews progress with the delivery of the recommendations and action plan
- Shares lessons learnt from how the PPS has been used and how it has been applied to a variety of circumstances
- Ensures that the PPS is used effectively to input into any new opportunities to secure improved provision and influence relevant programmes and initiatives
- Maintains links between relevant parties with an interest in local outdoor sports provision;
- Reviews the need to update the PPS along with the supply and demand information and assessment work on which it is based. Further to review the group should either:
Alongside regular Steering Group meetings a good way to keep the PPS up to date and maintain relationships is to hold annual sport specific meetings with pitch sport NGBs and other relevant parties. These could be part of a process of updating key supply and demand information plus, if necessary, amending assessment work, tracking progress in respect of implementing action plan recommendations and highlighting new issues and opportunities.

Meetings could be timed to coincide with annual NGB affiliation processes. This would help to signal changes in the number and nature of sports clubs in the area. Other information that is already collected on a regular basis such as pitch booking records for local authority and other sites should also feed into these meetings.

NGBs will also be able to confirm any further performance quality assessments undertaken within the study area. Discussion with league secretaries may also indicate annual league meetings may be useful to attend to pick up on specific issues and/or enable a review of the relevant club details to be undertaken.

The Steering Group should regularly review and refresh area by area plans taking account of any improvements in pitch quality (and hence increases in pitch capacity) and also any new negotiations for community use of education sites in the future.

It is important that the Council maintains the data contained with the accompanying Playing Pitch Database. This will enable it to refresh and update area by area plans on a regular basis. The accompanying databases are intended to be refreshed on a season by season basis and it is important that there is cross-departmental work encompassing, for example, grounds maintenance and sports development departments, to ensure that this is achieved and that results inform subsequent annual sports facility development plans. Results should be shared with partners via a consultative mechanism.

**Checklist**

To help ensure the PPS is delivered and is kept robust and up to date, the steering group can refer to the new methodology Stage E Checklist: Deliver the strategy and keep it robust and up to date:


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 9: Apply &amp; deliver the strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Are steering group members clear on how the PPS can be applied across a range of relevant areas?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Is each member of the steering group committed to taking the lead to help ensure the PPS is used and applied appropriately within their area of work and influence?

3. Has a process been put in place to ensure regular monitoring of how the recommendations and action plan are being delivered and the PPS is being applied?

**Step 10: Keep the strategy robust & up to date**

1. Has a process been put in place to ensure the PPS is kept robust and up to date?

2. Does the process involve an annual update of the PPS?

3. Is the steering group to be maintained and is it clear of its on-going role?

4. Is regular liaison with the NGBs and other parties planned?

5. Has all the supply and demand information been collated and presented in a format (i.e. single document that can be filtered accordingly) that will help people to review it and highlight any changes?

6. Have any changes made to the Active Places Power data been fed back to Sport England?
Funding opportunities

In order to deliver much of the Action Plan it is recognised that external partner funding will need to be sought. 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. Below is a list of current funding sources that are relevant for community improvement projects involving sports facilities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Awarding body</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Big Lottery Fund <a href="http://www.biglotteryfund.org.uk/">http://www.biglotteryfund.org.uk/</a></td>
<td>Big invests in community groups and to projects that improve health, education and the environment. For example, Awards for All which is for small Lottery grants of between £300 and £10,000.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport England <a href="http://www.sportengland.org/funding/">http://www.sportengland.org/funding/</a></td>
<td>Sport England is keen to marry funding with other organisations that provide financial support to create and strengthen the best sports projects. Applicants are encouraged to maximise the levels of other sources of funding, and projects that secure higher levels of partnership funding are more likely to be successful.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football Foundation <a href="http://www.footballfoundation.org.uk/funding-schemes/">http://www.footballfoundation.org.uk/funding-schemes/</a></td>
<td>This trust provides financial help for football at all levels, from national stadia and FA Premier League clubs down to grass-roots local development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rugby Football Foundation <a href="http://www.rugbyfootballfoundation.org/index.php?option=com_content&amp;view=article&amp;id=14&amp;Itemid=113">http://www.rugbyfootballfoundation.org/index.php?option=com_content&amp;view=article&amp;id=14&amp;Itemid=113</a></td>
<td>The Grant Match Scheme in particular provides easy-to-access grant funding for playing projects that contribute to the recruitment and retention of community rugby players. Grants are available on a ‘match funding’ 50:50 basis to support a proposed project. Projects eligible for funding include: 1. Pitch Facilities – Playing surface improvement, pitch improvement, rugby posts, floodlights. 2. Club House Facilities – Changing rooms, shower facilities, washroom/lavatory, and measures to facilitate segregation (e.g. women, juniors). 3. Equipment – Large capital equipment, pitch maintenance capital equipment (e.g. mowers). Other loan schemes are also available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The England and Wales Cricket Trust (<a href="https://www.ecb.co.uk/be-involved/club-support/club-funding">https://www.ecb.co.uk/be-involved/club-support/club-funding</a>)</td>
<td>Interest Free Loan Scheme provides finance to clubs for capital projects and the Small Grant Scheme is also open to applications from affiliated cricket clubs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU Life Fund <a href="http://ec.europa.eu/environment/funding/intro_en.htm">http://ec.europa.eu/environment/funding/intro_en.htm</a></td>
<td>LIFE is the EU’s financial instrument supporting environmental and nature conservation projects throughout the EU.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Hockey Foundation <a href="http://www.thenationalhockeyfoundation.com/">http://www.thenationalhockeyfoundation.com/</a></td>
<td>The Foundation primarily makes grants to a wide range of organisations that meet one of the areas of focus: Young people and hockey, Enabling the development of hockey at youth or community level.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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Community Asset Fund

Whether it’s the park you run through, the hall you do classes in or the pitch you play on, welcoming and accessible spaces have a big impact on a person’s experience – and likelihood of coming back. Traditional sports facilities where people spend time getting active are an important part of this, but it can be much wider too. It doesn’t have to be a traditional space – or a traditional sport.

Sport England’s Community Asset Fund is a programme dedicated to enhancing the spaces in the local community that give people the opportunity to be active. There are a number of things it wants to achieve with this investment, but most importantly it wants to help local organisations to create good customer experiences and financially sustainable facilities that benefit their community for years to come – which may mean providing help to get things up and running too.

While it continues to invest in projects that help people get into sport and increase the number who are regularly taking part, it is also looking to invest in projects that look beyond this to how sport and physical activity can – and does – change lives and becomes a force for social good.

This change in approach is in response to Sport England’s Towards and Active Nation Strategy and its contribution towards delivering the five key outcomes:

- Physical wellbeing
- Mental wellbeing
- Individual development
- Social and community development
- Economic development

How much can you apply for:

- **Small-scale** investments typically ranging from £1,000 to £15,000. These will address emergency works due to something like storm or flood damage, or something unexpected that is stopping people from being able to stay active.
- **Medium-scale** investments typically ranging from £15,000 to £50,000. These will address more substantial charges, such as an upgrade to an existing facility or developing a new space in the community.

By exception, Sport England will also consider larger investments up to £150,000 when organisations can demonstrate a considerable impact or are targeting under-represented groups. They are also unlikely to have received Sport England funding previously.

If you think the Community Asset Fund might be for you, have a look at the Guide and Developing your Project documents at [http://sportengland.org/funding/community-asset-fund/](http://sportengland.org/funding/community-asset-fund/)

Strategic Facilities Fund

Facilities are fundamental in providing more people with the opportunity to play sport. The supply of the right facilities in the right areas is key to getting more people to play sport. Sport England recognises the considerable financial pressures that local authorities are currently under and the need to strategically review and rationalise leisure stock so that cost effective and financially sustainable provision is available in the long-term.
Sport England has a key role to play in the sector, from influencing the local strategic planning and review of sports facility provision to investing in major capital projects of strategic importance.

The Strategic Facilities Fund will direct capital investment into a number of key local authority projects that are identified through a strategic needs assessment and that have maximum impact on growing and sustaining community sport participation. These projects will be promoted as best practice in the delivery of quality and affordable facilities, whilst demonstrating long-term operational efficiencies. The fund will support projects that bring together multiple partners, including input from the public and private sectors and national governing bodies of sport (NGBs). The fund is also designed to encourage applicants and their partners to invest further capital and revenue funding to ensure sustainability. Sport England has allocated a budget of circa £30m of Lottery funding to award through this fund (2013-17).

Key features which applications must demonstrate are:

- A robust needs and evidence base which illustrates the need for the project and the proposed facility mix
- Strong partnerships which will last beyond the initial development of the project and underpin the long-term sustainability of the facility
- Multi-sport provision and activity that demonstrates delivery against NGB local priorities
- A robust project plan from inception to completion with achievable milestones and timescales.

Lottery applications will be invited on a solicited-only basis and grants of between £500,000 and £2,000,000 will be considered.

The Strategic Facilities Fund will prioritise projects that:

- Are large-scale capital developments identified as part of a local authority sports facility strategic needs assessment/rationalisation programme and that will drive a significant increase in community sports participation
- Demonstrate consultation/support from two or more NGBs and delivery against their local priorities
- Are multi-sport facilities providing opportunities to drive high participant numbers
- Are a mix of facility provision (indoor and/or outdoor) to encourage regular and sustained use by a large number of people
- Offer an enhancement, through modernisation, to existing provision and/or new build facilities
- Have a long-term sustainable business plan attracting public and private investment
- Show quality in design, but are fit for purpose to serve the community need
- Have effective and efficient operating models, combined with a commitment to development programmes which will increase participation and provide talent pathways.

Projects will need to demonstrate how the grant will deliver against Sport England’s strategic priorities. The funding available is for the development of the capital infrastructure, which can contribute to the costs of new build, modernisation or refurbishment and purchasing of major fixed equipment as part of the facility development.
Funder’s requirements

Below is a list of funding requirements that can typically be expected to be provided as part of a funding bid, some of which will fall directly out of the Playing Pitch Strategy:

- Identify need (i.e., why the Project is needed) and how the Project will address it.
- Articulate what difference the Project will make.
- Identify benefits, value for money and/or added value.
- Provide baseline information (i.e., the current situation).
- Articulate how the Project is consistent with local, regional and national policy.
- Financial need and project cost.
- Funding profile (i.e., Who’s providing what? Unit and overall costs).
- Technical information and requirements (e.g., planning permission).
- Targets, outputs and/or outcomes (i.e., the situation after the Project/what the Project will achieve)
- Evidence of support from partners and stakeholders.
- Background/essential documentation (e.g., community use agreement).
- Assessment of risk.

Indicative costs

The indicative costs of implementing key elements of the Action Plan can be found on the Sport England website:

https://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/design-and-cost-guidance/cost-guidance/

The costs are for the development of community sports facilities and are based on providing good quality sports facility based on the last quarter. The Facilities Costs are updated on the Sport England website every quarter. These rounded costs are based on schemes most recently funded through the Lottery (and therefore based on economies of scale), updated to reflect current forecast price indices provided by the Building Cost Information Service (BCIS), prepared by Technical Team Lead of Sport England.