

SOUTH STAFFORDSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

OPEN SPACE STUDY

STANDARDS PAPER

JANUARY 2020

QUALITY, INTEGRITY, PROFESSIONALISM

Knight, Kavanagh & Page Ltd Company No: 9145032 (England)

MANAGEMENT CONSULTANTS

Registered Office: 1 -2 Frecheville Court, off Knowsley Street, Bury BL9 0UF T: 0161 764 7040 E: mail@kkp.co.uk www.kkp.co.uk



CONTENTS

| PART 1: INTRODUCTION | .1 |
|--|----|
| PART 2: ASSESSMENT REPORT SUMMARY | .4 |
| PART 3: SETTING PROVISION STANDARDS | .6 |
| 3.1 Developing and setting standards | |
| 3.2 Quality and value | |
| 3.3 Accessibility | |
| 3.4 Quantity | .8 |
| PART 4: APPLICATION OF PROVISION STANDARDS | 11 |
| 4.1: Quality and value | |
| 4.2: Accessibility | |
| 4.3: Quantity | |
| PART 5: POLICY ADVICE AND STRATEGIC RECOMMENDATIONS | 18 |
| 5.1 Strategic recommendations | |
| 5.2 Implications | |
| 5.3 Approach to developer contributions | 21 |
| APPENDIX ONE: QUALITY AND VALUE MATRIX | 24 |
| APPENDIX TWO: CATCHMENT MAPS | 46 |
| APPENDIX THREE: POTENTIAL ALTERNATIVE TYPOLOGIES FOR LOW QUALITAND VALUE SITES | |

PART 1: INTRODUCTION

This is the Open Space Standards Paper prepared by Knight, Kavanagh & Page (KKP) for South Staffordshire District Council (SSDC). It follows on from the preceding Open Space Assessment Report. Together, the two documents provide an evidence base to help inform the future provision for open spaces in South Staffordshire.

This study is intended to assist in the Councils process of reviewing its Local Plan. Given the potential scale of growth in the area, and the implications such growth may have on existing provision, it is important for the Council to have clarity over existing levels of open space and what types of provision should be delivered.

This document helps identify the potential deficiencies and surpluses in existing and future open space provision. In addition, it should help inform an approach to securing open space facilities through new housing development and help form the basis for negotiation with developers for contributions towards the provision of open spaces.

Scope

The table below details the open space typologies included within the study:

| Туроlоду | Primary purpose | |
|--|--|--|
| Parks and gardens | Accessible, high quality opportunities for informal recreation and community events. | |
| Natural and semi- natural greenspaces | Wildlife conservation, biodiversity and environmental education and awareness. | |
| Amenity greenspace | Opportunities for informal activities close to home or work or enhancement of the appearance of residential or other areas. | |
| Provision for children and young people | Areas designed primarily for play and social interaction involving children and young people, such as equipped play areas, MUGAs, skateboard areas and teenage shelters. | |
| Allotments | Opportunities for those people who wish to do so to grow their own produce as part of the long term promotion of sustainability, health and social inclusion. | |
| Cemeteries and churchyards | Quiet contemplation and burial of the dead, often linked to the promotion of wildlife conservation and biodiversity. | |
| Green corridors | Areas or route which provide walking, cycling or horse riding, whether for leisure purposes or travel. May also offer opportunities for wildlife mitigation. | |
| Civic Space Including civic and market squares, and other hard surfaced a designed for pedestrians | | |

The Companion Guidance to PPG17 included the open space typology of formal outdoor sports. This is predominantly covered within the associated PPS. A PPS is undertaken in accordance with the methodology provided in Sport England's Guidance 'Developing a Playing Pitch Strategy' for assessing demand and supply for outdoor sports facilities (2013).

Any site previously categorised as outdoor sports provision but with a clear multifunctional role (i.e. available for wider community use) is included in this study as a type of open space. Pitch or sport sites purely for sporting use are solely included within a PPS. For sites with a multifunctional role, double counting between the two studies does not occur as the PPS looks at the number of pitch/sports facilities at a site and not hectares of land (as prescribed in Sport England Guidance).

Analysis areas


For mapping purposes and audit analysis, the South Staffordshire area is divided into five analysis areas (consistent with five localities used in other studies). These allow more localised examination of open space surpluses and deficiencies. Use of analysis areas also allows local circumstances and issues to be considered. The analysis areas and their populations are shown in the table below.

| Analysis area (Locality) | Composition | Population (2017) [*] | |
|-----------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|--|
| Central (Locality 4) | Includes Perton, Codsall, Bilbrook | 25,407 | |
| North (Locality 1 | | | |
| North East (Locality 3) | Great Wyrley, Cheslyn Hill, Shareshill, Featherstone | 32,245 | |
| North West (Locality 2) | Wheaton Aston, Lapley, Brewood | 11,037 | |
| South (Locality 5) | Kinver, Enville, Stourton, Swindon, Wombourne | 27,282 | |
| South Staffordshin | South Staffordshire | | |

Table 1.2: Population by analysis area

ONS Mid-Year Estimates

Figure 1: Analysis area map



PART 2: ASSESSMENT REPORT SUMMARY

A summary from the Assessment Report on a typology by typology basis is set out below.

2.1 Parks and gardens

- Two sites classified as traditional parks and gardens, the equivalent of over 305 hectares.
- All assessed parks and gardens are located in the South Analysis Area.
- FIT suggests a standard of 0.80 ha per 1,000 population. South Staffordshire is above this with 2.73 hectares per 1,000 population.
- There are potential catchment gaps in parks provision to the settlements of Essington and Great Wyrley. However, these are likely to be served by other types of open space provision including amenity greenspace and natural and semi natural greenspace.
- All assessed park and garden sites rate above the threshold for both quality and value. The quality of Baggeridge Country Park is noted as being particularly good. This is reflected in the site being the only park to achieve Green Flag Award status.
- Both assessed sites score highly for value, with the important social interaction, health benefits, ecological value and sense of place.

2.2 Natural and semi-natural greenspace

- In total, there are 42 natural and semi-natural greenspace sites covering over 965 hectares. This is an equivalent to 8.63 hectares per 1,000 population. This includes all sites including those considered as inaccessible.
- If inaccessible sites are omitted, there are 33 sites giving a total of over 568 hectares. This
 is an equivalent to 5.08 hectares per 1,000 population.
- FIT suggests a standard of 1.80 ha per 1,000 population. Using the 42 sites, there are 8.63 ha per 1,000 population across South Staffordshire. Only the North East Analysis Area (0.13 ha per 1,000 population) does not meet the FIT standard.
- Mapping shows there is a good distribution of natural and semi natural greenspace. Minor gaps are noted to settlements such as Great Wyrley and Wombourne.
- Of assessed natural sites, a total of 17 (50%) rate above the threshold set for quality. There are 17 assessed sites that rate below the quality threshold applied. Most low scoring sites lack ancillary provision with several appearing to have restricted access.
- All but seven sites rate above the threshold for value. This demonstrates the added benefit
 natural and semi-natural greenspaces can provide especially in terms of contributing to
 flora and fauna whilst also providing recreational opportunities.

2.3 Amenity greenspace

- There are 224 amenity greenspace sites equating to over 170 hectares of provision.
- Proportionally, more provision is located in the North East Analysis Area (2.24 ha per 1,000 population) compared to other areas.
- FIT suggests a standard of 0.60 ha per 1,000 population. Overall, South Staffordshire (1.52 ha per 1,000 population) meets the FIT standard.
- Mapping shows that all areas of greater population density are generally well served by amenity greenspace provision based on a 480m catchment.
- The majority of amenity greenspace sites (71%) in South Staffordshire rate above the threshold for quality.
- In addition to its multifunctional role, amenity greenspace makes a valuable contribution to visual aesthetics for communities – hence all sites rate above the value threshold.

2.4 Provision for children and young people

- There are 52 play sites identified; a total of over five hectares.
- All analysis areas have a level of provision below guideline quantity standard of 0.25 hectares per 1,000 population.
- The mapping highlights a good distribution of play provision. Only a slight catchment gap is potentially noted to the Wombourne settlement.
- A greater proportion of play sites (90%) rate above the threshold for quality. There are five sites rating below the threshold
- All play areas rate above the threshold for value; reflecting the social, healthy and developmental benefits provision can provide

2.5 Allotments

- There are 11 allotments sites, equating to more than 13 hectares
- Based on the current population of South Staffordshire (111,290) it does not currently meet the NSLAG standard, with 0.12 hectares per 1,000 population
- Some sites are known to having waiting lists. However, the numbers are relatively small and suggest supply can accommodate most demand.
- All allotments rate above the thresholds for quality and value. This reflects the associated social inclusion and health benefits, amenity value and the sense of place offered by such forms of provision.
- The value of allotments is widely recognised due to the associated social inclusion, health benefits and the sense of place they offer.

2.6 Cemeteries

- There are 36 cemeteries and churchyards, equating to over 34 hectares.
- The largest contributor to provision is North Walsall Cemetery, Bloxwich (7.20 hectares).
- Almost three quarters of cemeteries (72%) score above the threshold for quality.
- No standards are set for cemeteries. The need for additional cemetery provision should be driven by the requirement for burial demand and capacity.

2.7 Green corridors

- There are 40 main green corridors identified. The most significant contributor in terms of size is Staffordshire and Worcestershire Canal.
- The sites offer important recreational opportunities such as walking and cycling as well as attracting visitors to the area. They also provide important habitat and wildlife benefits.

2.8 Civic Space

- There are 28 sites classified as civic space.
- Most sites rate above the quality threshold. No specific quality issues are highlighted.
- All sites rate above the value threshold reflecting the social and cultural role of civic space.

PART 3: SETTING PROVISION STANDARDS

3.1 Developing and setting standards

The following section derives and details the proposed local standards recommended for SSDC. It details how current provision levels identified as part of the assessment compare to existing standards such as national benchmarks and whether any adjustments to the proposed standards are recommended.

It is important to recognise that there are no prescribed national standards for open space provision. In general, very little guidance is offered at a national level for quality with benchmarking of standards focusing on quantity and accessibility levels. Subsequently the following approach has been used to provide an informed reasoning to the setting and application of standards for SSDC.

An overview of the proposed standards in terms of quality, accessibility and quantity is set out below. Further information on the evidence used to inform these standards is provided in the associated Assessment Report. The proposed standards are then used to determine deficiencies and surpluses for open space in terms of quantity, quality and accessibility (as recommended by best practice).

3.2 Quality and value

To determine whether sites are high or low quality (as recommended by guidance); the results of the site assessments are colour-coded against a baseline threshold (high being green and low being red). The primary aim of applying a threshold is to identify sites where investment and/or improvements are required. It can also be used (if desired) to set an aspirational quality standard to be achieved at some point in the future and to inform decisions around the need to further protect sites from future development (particularly when applied with its respective value score in a matrix format).

The baseline threshold for assessing quality can be set on the pass rate for Green Flag criteria (66%) as the site audit criteria is based on Green Flag. This is the only national benchmark available for quality of parks and open spaces. However, the site audit criteria used for Green Flag is not appropriate for every open space typology as it is designed to represent a sufficiently high standard of site.

Consequently, not all the same criteria are used for scoring all types of open space; as some criteria is more relevant for some forms of open space than others. For example, parks and gardens are assessed against most criteria to reflect the range and quality of facilities/features a park can typically be expected to contain. In comparison, natural and semi-natural greenspace is not assessed in terms of lighting or gradient; as neither are considered critical or relevant for natural sites. Whereas for parks, both elements are used as part of scoring parks provision.

In effect, there is a maximum score a site can potentially receive for each type of open space. A sites quality percentage is its actual score / the potential maximum score it could achieve for that typology (e.g. if a site scores 80 and the maximum it could achieve is 100; it will have a quality percentage of 80%).

Quality thresholds are therefore adjusted to better reflect average scores for each typology. Consequently, the baseline threshold for certain typologies is amended to better reflect this.

Sites are also allocated a value score. Quality and value are fundamentally different and can be unrelated. For example, a high-quality space may be inaccessible and, thus, be of little value; while, a poor quality space may be the only one in an area and thus be immensely valuable. As a result, quality and value are also treated separately in terms of scoring.

For value there is no national guidance on the setting of thresholds. The 20% threshold applied is derived from our experience and knowledge in assessing the value of sites. Whilst 20% may initially seem low, it is a relative score - designed to reflect those sites that meet more than one aspect of the criteria used for assessing value.

| Туроlоду | Quality threshold | Value threshold |
|---|-------------------|-----------------|
| Parks and gardens | 60% | 20% |
| Natural and semi-natural greenspace | 40% | 20% |
| Amenity greenspace | 50% | 20% |
| Provision for children and young people | 55% | 20% |
| Allotments | 45% | 20% |
| Cemeteries/churchyards | 45% | 20% |
| Green corridors | 50% | 20% |
| Civic space | 45% | 20% |

3.3 Accessibility

Accessibility catchments for different types of provision are a tool to identify communities currently not served by existing facilities. It is recognised that factors that underpin catchment areas vary from person to person, day to day and hour to hour. For the purposes of this process this problem is overcome by accepting the concept of 'effective catchments', defined as the distance that would be travelled by most users.

Guidance on walking distance and times is published by Fields In Trust (FIT) in its document *Beyond the Six Acre Standard* (2015). These guidelines have been converted into an equivalent time period.

FIT also offer appropriate accessibility distances for children's play provision. These vary depending on the type of play provision (children's play or older age ranges).

No national benchmarking or accessibility standards are set for the typologies of cemeteries, green corridors or civic space. For cemeteries and allotments, it is better to determine need for provision based on demand (i.e. burial space demand and allotment waiting lists).

| Open space typ | be | FIT guideline | Time equivalent |
|---|-------|---------------|-----------------------|
| Parks & Gardens | | 710m | 9-minute walk time |
| Natural & Semi-natural Greenspace | | 720m | 9-minute walk time |
| Amenity Greens | pace | 480m | 6-minute walk time |
| | LAP | 100m | 1-minute walk time |
| Provision for children & young people | LEAP | 400m | 5-minute walk time |
| | NEAP | 1,000m | 12.5-minute walk time |
| | Youth | 700m | 9-minute walk time |
| Allotments | | n/a | n/a |
| Cemeteries/churchyards Green corridors | | n/a | n/a |
| | | n/a | n/a |

Table 3.3.1: FIT accessibility guidelines

As guidance on appropriate accessibility catchments is now provided by FIT, it is recommended that these are used to help identify potential access deficiencies in provision.

3.4 Quantity

Quantity standards can be used to identify areas of shortfalls and help with setting requirements for future developments.

No quantity standard is suggested for open space provision such as cemeteries or civic space. Cemetery provision should be determined by instances of demand such as burial capacity and local need. Civic space provision should be considered as a design requirement for any large-scale developments.

Many of the settlements in the District are importantly served by green corridors. Consequently, a quantitative provision level is set for green corridors to reflect the role and opportunity such forms of provision provide. As green corridors are linear in their nature, with most provision being located outside of settlements, the current provision levels consist of any green corridor land within a settlement boundary as well as any provision within 720m of a settlement boundary. The 720m catchment is based on the 9-minute walk time equivalent recommended by FIT for natural and semi-natural greenspace; as this is considered the most fitting catchment distance.

To set a quantity standard it is useful to compare existing levels of provision identified as part of the assessment against national benchmarks. The current provision levels are initially detailed in the Assessment Report.

Guidance on quantity levels is published by Fields In Trust (FIT) in its document *Beyond the Six Acre Standard* (2015). The guidance provides standards for three types of open space provision; parks and gardens, amenity greenspace and natural and semi-natural greenspace. FIT also suggests 0.25 hectares per 1,000 population of equipped/ designated playing space as a guideline quantity standard for play provision. The National Society of Allotment and Leisure Gardeners (NSALG) offers guidance on allotments.

Table 3.4.1 sets out the quantity figures for current provision levels identified and the national benchmarks.

| Туроlоду | | Hectares per 1,000 population | | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------|-------------------------------|---------------------|--|
| | | Current provision levels | National benchmarks | |
| Parks & gardens | | 2.73 | 0.80 | |
| Natural & semi- natural greenspace | All sites | 8.63 | 1.00 | |
| | Accessible only | 5.08 | 1.80 | |
| Amenity greenspace | | 1.52 | 0.60 | |
| Green corridors | | 0.60 | n/a | |
| Provision for children & young people | | 0.05 | 0.25 | |
| Allotment | | 0.12 | 0.25 | |

The national benchmark quantity standards are not deemed as appropriate for use as they do not take into consideration the local circumstances, distribution and historical trends of the area. An approach using locally derived quantity standards ensures more reflective standards are set as they are based on and take consideration to current local provision levels and views.

For natural and semi-natural greenspace, the initial current provision level is noticeably quite large (8.63 hectares per 1,000 population). This figure is based on all forms of provision, regardless of access, being used to calculate an initial current provision level. There are however several sites identified as having restricted access. If these sites are omitted a current provision level of 5.08 hectares per 1,000 population is calculated.

Furthermore, the community survey shows residents are content with existing levels of provision. The availability of provision is generally considered to be very (34%) or quite satisfactory (46%) by respondents to the community survey.

| Very satisfactory | Quite satisfactory | Neither satisfactory or unsatisfactory | Quite unsatisfactory | Very unsatisfactory |
|----------------------|-----------------------|--|-------------------------|------------------------|
| 33.7% | 45.7% | 11.1% | 5.5% | 4.0% |

Table 3.4.2: Survey respondent satisfaction to availability

On this basis, the recommendation is for the current provision levels to be used as the recommended quantity standards for South Staffordshire.

For natural provision, using the current provision level which omits the restricted access sites is still a very high figure (5.08 hectares per 1000 population). Addressing quality and access to such forms of provision is viewed as more of a priority in the area. Consequently, it is recommended that no quantity standard be set for natural greenspace.

Similarly, no quantity standard is recommended to be set for parks and gardens. The inclusion of parks and gardens would significantly increase the combined quantity standard; considered by SSDC to an unviable level. In addition, it is unlikely that a new housing development would warrant justification for parks and gardens provision to be required. Instead the focus is on more locally accessible and usable open space provision.

Despite being lower than the FIT/NSALG benchmarks, no changes in the setting of quantity standards for allotments or provision for children and young people is recommended.

Minor observations/comments regarding play provision is mentioned; however, overall play provision is not highlighted as having a shortfall. Therefore, there is not considered a requirement to increase the quantity standard but a need to ensure equipment caters for a wide range of age groups with any opportunities to expand play provision (either through new sites or additional equipment at existing sites) being encouraged.

For allotments, whilst waiting lists are present at some sites across the District. This is not considered significant enough to justify increasing the quantity standard; as supply and demand seems well balanced.

Based on the above, the recommended quantity standards for South Staffordshire are set out in Table 3.4.3. The recommended standard (hectares per 1,000 population) is also shown converted on a hectares per household basis^{*}.

| | Recommended quantity standard | |
|---------------------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------|
| Туроlоду | Hectares per 1,000 population | Hectares per household |
| Parks & gardens | n/a | n/a |
| Natural & semi-natural greenspace | n/a | n/a |
| Amenity greenspace | 1.52 | 0.004 |
| Green corridors | 0.60 | 0.002 |
| Allotment | 0.12 | 0.0003 |
| Provision for children & young people | 0.05 | 0.0001 |
| Combined | 2.29 | 0.006 |

Table 3.4.3: Recommended quantity standard

 $^{^{*}}$ Calculated by dividing the hectares per 1,000 population by 365 (based on SSDC average of 2.74 bedrooms per dwelling i.e. 1,000 / 2.74 = 365)

PART 4: APPLICATION OF PROVISION STANDARDS

The provision standards used to determine deficiencies and surpluses for open space are set in terms of quality, accessibility and quantity.

4.1: Quality and value

Each type of open space receives a separate quality and value score. This also allows for application of a high and low quality/value matrix to further help determine prioritisation of investment and to identify sites that may be surplus as a particular open space type.

Quality and value matrix

Assessing the quality and value of open spaces is used to identify those sites which should be given the highest level of protection, those which require enhancement and those which may no longer be needed for their present purpose. When analysing the quality/value of a site, it should be done in conjunction with regard to the quantity of provision in the area (i.e. whether there is a deficiency).

The high/low classification gives the following possible combinations of quality and value:

High quality/low value

The preferred policy approach to a space in this category should be to enhance its value in terms of its present primary function. If this is not possible, consideration to a change of primary function should be given (i.e. a change to another open space typology).

High quality/high value

All open spaces should have an aspiration to come into this category and the planning system should then seek to protect them. Sites of this category should be viewed as being key forms of open space provision.

Low quality/low value

The policy approach to these spaces or facilities in areas of identified shortfall should be to enhance their quality provided it is possible also to enhance their value.

For open spaces in areas of sufficiency a change of primary typology should be first considered. If no shortfall of other open space typologies is noted than the site may be redundant/ 'surplus to requirements'.

If there is a choice of sites of equal quality to declare surplus, and no need to use one or part of one to remedy a deficiency in some other form of open space or recreation provision, it would be best to consider the one of lowest value to be more disposable.

Low quality<mark>/high value</mark>

The policy approach to these spaces should be to enhance their quality to the applied standards. Therefore, the planning system should initially seek to protect them if they are not already so.

There is a need for flexibility to the enhancement of low-quality sites. In some instances, a better use of resources and investment may be to focus on more suitable sites for enhancement as opposed to trying to enhance sites where it is not appropriate or cost effective to do so. Please refer to the Appendix One for a breakdown of the matrix.

4.2: Accessibility

Accessibility catchments for different types of provision are a tool to identify communities currently not served by existing facilities. It is recognised that factors that underpin catchment areas vary from person to person, day to day and hour to hour. For the purposes of this process this problem is overcome by accepting the concept of 'effective catchments', defined as the distance that would be travelled by most users.

Guidance on walking distance and times is published by FIT in its document *Beyond the Six Acre Standard* (2015). These guidelines have been converted into an equivalent time period.

FIT also offer appropriate accessibility distances for children's play provision. These vary depending on the type of play provision (children's play or older age ranges).

| Open space type | | Recommended accessibility standards | |
|-----------------------------------|-------|-------------------------------------|--|
| Parks & Gardens | | 710m | |
| Natural & Semi-natural Greenspace | | 720m | |
| Amenity Greenspace | | 480m | |
| | LAP | 100m | |
| Provision for children | LEAP | 400m | |
| & young people | NEAP | 1,000m | |
| | Youth | 700m | |

No catchments are suggested for the typologies of allotments or cemeteries. For cemeteries, it is difficult to assess such provision against catchment mapping as it is better to determine need for provision based on demand for burial space. For allotments, it is more appropriate to determine need for allotment provision based on demand such as waiting lists.

If an area does not have access to the required level of provision (consistent with the catchments) it is deemed deficient. KKP has identified instances where new sites may be needed or potential opportunities could be explored in order to provide comprehensive access to this type of provision (i.e. a gap in one form of provision may exist but the area in question may be served by another form of open space).

The following sections summarise the deficiencies identified from the application of the accessibility standards together with the recommended actions. Please refer to Appendix Two to view the associated maps and the catchment gaps.

In determining the subsequent actions for any identified catchment gaps, the following key principles are adhered:

- Increase capacity/usage in order to meet increases in demand, or
- Enhance quality in order to meet increases in demand, or
- Commuted sum for ongoing maintenance/repairs to mitigate impact of new demand

These principles are intended to mitigate for the impact of increases in demand on existing provision. An increase in population will reduce the lifespan of certain sites and/or features (e.g. play equipment, maintenance regimes etc). This will lead to the increased requirement to refurbish and/or replace such forms of provision. Consequently, the recommended approach is to increase the capacity of and/or enhance the existing provision available.

Central

| Туроlоду | Identified catchment gap need | Action | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|
| Parks and gardens | Noticeable gap in 710m catchment to east of area | Gap is served by other sites such as Perton Lakeside and Perton Playing Fields | | |
| Amenity Greenspace | No significant gaps in 480m catchment | n/a | | |
| Natural and semi- natural greenspace | No gaps in 720m catchment | n/a | | |
| Provision for children and young people | No gaps in catchments | n/a | | |

North

Table 4.2.3: North Accessibility Summary

| Туроlоду | Identified catchment gap need Action | | | |
|---|---|-----|--|--|
| Parks and gardens | No significant gaps in 710m catchment | n/a | | |
| Amenity Greenspace | No significant gaps in 480m catchment | n/a | | |
| Natural and semi- natural greenspace | No gaps in 720m catchment | n/a | | |
| Provision for children and young people | No significant gaps against catchments. | n/a | | |

North East

Table 4.2.4: North East Accessibility Summary

| Туроlоду | Identified catchment gap need | Action |
|---|--|---|
| Parks and gardens | Gaps in 710m catchment to Essington and Great Wyrley | Gaps served by other sites such as Hazel Lane/Walsall Road Playing Fields and Sutherland Road |
| Amenity Greenspace | No significant gaps in 480m catchment | n/a |
| Natural and semi- natural greenspace | Gaps to Great Wyrley | Gap served by other sites such as Essington & Wyrley Canal, Hatherton Reservoir and Sutherland Road |
| Provision for children and young people | No significant gaps against catchments. | n/a |

North West

| Туроlоду | Identified catchment gap need | need Action | | |
|---|---|-------------|--|--|
| Parks and gardens | No gaps in 710m catchment identified | n/a | | |
| Amenity Greenspace | No significant gaps in 480m catchment | n/a | | |
| Natural and semi- natural greenspace | No gaps in 720m catchment | n/a | | |
| Provision for children and young people | No gaps in catchment mapping | n/a | | |

South

| Туроlоду | Identified catchment gap need | Action |
|---|---|---|
| Parks and gardens | No gaps in 710m catchment identified | n/a |
| Amenity Greenspace | No significant gaps in 480m catchment | n/a |
| Natural and semi- natural greenspace | Some minor gaps in Wombourne | Gap covered by amenity sites such as The Meadlands and Brickbridge Lane Playing Fields |
| Provision for children and young people | Some gaps in catchment mapping to Wombourne | Explore expansion of provision at existing sites such as Bratch Park or Brickbridge Lane Playing Fields |

4.3: Quantity

Quantity standards can be used to identify areas of shortfalls and help with setting requirements for future developments.

Shortfalls in quality and accessibility standards are identified across the District for different types of open space (as set out in Parts 4.1 and 4.2). Consequently, the Council should seek to ensure these shortfalls are not made worse through increases in demand as part of future development growth across the District.

The recommendation for open space is for the current provision levels to be used as the recommended quantity standard for South Staffordshire. This equates to 2.29 hectares per 1,000 population (an equivalent to 0.006 hectares per household).

| Туроlоду | Recommended quantity standard | | | |
|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------|--|--|
| | Hectares per 1,000 population | Hectares per household | | |
| Amenity greenspace | 1.52 | 0.004 | | |
| Green corridors | 0.60 | 0.002 | | |
| Allotment | 0.12 | 0.0003 | | |
| Provision for children & young people | 0.05 | 0.0001 | | |
| Combined | 2.29 | 0.006 | | |

Table 4.3.1: Recommended quantity standards

The current provision levels can be used to help identify where areas may have a shortfall against the recommended quantity standard for South Staffordshire. Table 4.3.2 and 4.3.3 shows the position for each sub-area as to whether it is sufficient or identified as having a shortfall against the recommended quantity standard (Table 4.3.3) and for each type of open space (Table 4.3.2).

Table 4.3.2: Current provision against recommended quantity standards

| Analysis area | Amenity greenspace | | | Green corridors Allotments | | | Provision for children and young people | | |
|---------------|--------------------------------|--------|-------------------|----------------------------|-------------------|--------|--|--------|--|
| | (Hectares per 1000 population) | | | | _ | | | | |
| | 1.52 | | 0.0 | 0.60 0 | | 12 | 0.0 | 0.05 | |
| | Current provision | +/- | Current provision | +/- | Current provision | +/- | Current provision | +/- | |
| Central | 1.58 | + 0.06 | 0.07 | - 0.53 | 0.18 | + 0.06 | 0.04 | - 0.01 | |
| North | 1.16 | - 0.36 | 0.90 | + 0.30 | 0.09 | - 0.03 | 0.13 | + 0.08 | |
| North East | 2.24 | + 0.72 | 0.25 | - 0.35 | 0.08 | - 0.04 | 0.02 | - 0.03 | |
| North West | 0.79 | - 0.73 | 1.27 | + 0.67 | 0.15 | + 0.03 | 0.10 | + 0.05 | |
| South | 1.13 | - 0.39 | 1.05 | + 0.45 | 0.11 | - 0.01 | 0.02 | - 0.03 | |

All analysis areas are observed as having shortfalls in some form of open space. The North East Analysis Area and the South Analysis Area are identified as having quantity shortfalls against three types of provision.

Combined provision

Table 4.3.3 shows the position for each sub-area as to whether it is sufficient or identified as having a shortfall against the recommended standard in terms of combined provision.

| Analysis area | Hectares per 1000 population | | | |
|---------------|------------------------------|--|--|--|
| | Current provision | Sufficiency/deficiency against 2.29 recommended standard | | |
| Central | 1.87 | - 0.42 | | |
| North | 2.28 | - 0.01 | | |
| North East | 2.59 | + 0.30 | | |
| North West | 2.31 | + 0.02 | | |
| South | 2.31 | + 0.02 | | |

Table 4.3.3: Current combined provision against recommended quantity standard

The Central and North analysis areas are both identified as having a shortfall against the recommended standard. The North East, North West and South analysis areas are above the recommended quantity standard.

Identifying priorities

The focus for areas identified as being sufficient against the existing quantity standards will be for priorities to ensure quality and accessibility standards are being met. Table 4.3.2 and 4.3.3 also highlights those areas of the District with shortfalls in open space provision.

The recommended quantity standard should also be used to determine the open space requirements as part of new housing developments. In the first instance, a combination of open space provision should look to be provided as part of new housing developments. This should incorporate and aim to achieve good quality design as part of housing scheme layouts.

The column signalling whether an analysis area is sufficient or has a shortfall against the recommended quantity standards may be used to help inform the priorities for each type of open space within each analysis area (i.e. the priorities may be where a shortfall has been identified). A key driving consideration is for whatever type of open space provision to be provided is meaningful and designed to maximise practical use.

For example, in the South Analysis Area, shortfalls are highlighted across most forms of open space provision with the exception of green corridors (see Table 4.3.2). On this basis, these forms of provision should be a priority for the area as part of new housing developments. If not feasible, then ensuring contributions to enhancing the quality and accessibility of existing open space provision will be necessary. Enhancement of access to a site might include improved signage, entrances, pathways or other connective linkages.

PART 5: POLICY ADVICE AND STRATEGIC RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Strategic recommendations

The following section provides a summary on the key findings through the application of the quantity, quality and accessibility standards. It incorporates and recommends what the Council should be seeking to achieve in order to address the issues highlighted.

Recommendation 1

• Explore low quality sites and their potential for enhancement

The policy approach to these sites should be to enhance their quality to the applied standards (i.e. high quality) where possible. This is especially the case if the site is deemed to be of high value to the local community. Therefore, they should initially be protected, if they are not already so, in order for their quality to be improved.

The summary of low quality/value sites (Appendix One) identifies those sites that should be given consideration for enhancement if possible. Priority sites should be those highlighted as helping or with the potential to serve gaps in provision (see Recommendation 2)

Recommendation 2

 Sites helping or with the potential to serve areas identified as having gaps in catchment mapping should be recognised through opportunities for enhancement

The implications summary for the accessibility catchment mapping (Part 4.2) highlights those sites that help or have the potential to serve gaps in provision (Appendix Two sets out the catchment maps). Furthermore, there are several sites across South Staffordshire with a multi-functional role which may serve (to some extent) the wider areas of the District.

The Council should seek to safeguard the role and quality of these multi-functional sites through providing a greater number of and a more diverse range of features suitable for the typology of open space. This is to ensure it fulfils a secondary typology and also provides opportunities associated with other open space types. This may also help to minimise the need for new forms of provision in order to address gaps in catchments or to accommodate additional demand from housing growth. This may be particularly relevant in areas where there is not space to create new forms of provision.

Recommendation 3

 Sites in areas with sufficient provision of open space may be able to meet the need for other types of open space or could potentially be considered surplus

If no improvements can be made to sites identified as lower quality and value (Appendix One), then a change of primary typology should be considered (i.e. a change of role).

If no shortfall in other open space types is noted (Part 4.3), or it is not feasible to change the primary typology of the site, then the site may be redundant/ 'surplus to requirements'.

The following steps should be followed when considering if a site may be surplus:

| Step 1 | Identify site of low quality and low value and consider whether there is scope to improve the site's quality/value |
|--------|---|
| Step 2 | If no improvement can be made, check if the site is within an area identified as having a surplus of provision for that typology (Table 4.3.2) and is within the catchment area for a similar type of open space (final column in Appendix Three) |
| Step 3 | If there is sufficient provision (i.e. both conditions in Step 2 are satisfied), see if it is possible to change the primary typology of the site to another typology where a deficit is identified |
| Step 4 | If it is not feasible to change the site to an alternative typology, then the site may be surplus to requirements |

To assist this process, an initial high-level review of potential alternative typologies for sites rating low for quality and value has been undertaken. This is set out in Appendix Three.

Recommendation 4

• The need for additional cemetery provision should be led by demand

No standards have been set for the provision of cemeteries. Instead provision should be determined by demand for burial space.

5.2 Implications

The following section sets out the policy implications in terms of the planning process in South Staffordshire. This is intended to help steer the Council in seeking contributions to the improvement and/or provision of any new forms of open space.

How is provision to be made?

The requirements for on-site or off-site provision will vary according to the type of open space to be provided. Collecting contributions from developers can be undertaken through the following two processes.

Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) and Planning Obligations are the two main mechanisms available to the Council to ensure future development addresses any adverse impacts it creates. If required, Planning Conditions can be used to ensure that key requirements are met.

Planning obligations

Planning Conditions and Obligations (often known as Section 106 Agreements) require individual developments to provide or pay for the provision of development specific infrastructure requirements. They are flexible and deliver a wide range of site and community infrastructure benefits.

A development should make appropriate provision of services, facilities and infrastructure to meet the needs arising from that development.

Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

The CIL is a method of requiring developers to fund infrastructure facilities including open spaces. Charges are based on the size and type of new development. It will generate funding to deliver a range of local authority wide and local infrastructure projects that support residential and economic growth.

CILs are levied on the gross internal floor space of the net additional liable development. The rate at which to charge such developments is set out within a council's Charging Schedule. This is expressed in \pounds per m².

Seeking developer contributions

This document can inform policies and emerging planning documents by assisting in the Council's approach to securing open spaces through new housing development. The evidence should form the basis for negotiation with developers to secure contributions for the provision of appropriate facilities and their long term maintenance.

The wider benefits of open space and associated features regardless of size should be recognised as a key design principle for any new development. These features and elements can help to contribute to the perception of open space provision in an area, at the same time as also ensuring an aesthetically pleasing landscape providing wider social, environmental and health benefits. Sport England's Active Design^{*} looks at the opportunities to encourage sport and physical activity through the built environment in order to support healthier and more active lifestyles. It is therefore important for planning to consider the principles of Active Design.

Where open space provision within the catchment/settlement is identified as being sufficient in terms of quantity and can accommodate additional demand, provision of new open space is unlikely (subject to local plan policy requirements such as a landscape led approach to design). In some instances, where the open space requirement from the development is too small to provide meaningful open space provision, it may be more suitable to seek contributions for quality improvements and/or new off-site provision in order to address any demand arising from the development. Smaller infill development areas may not be expected to meet its own needs. This should be made clear through local plan policies, supported by the recommended minimum area thresholds for on-site provision shown in Table 5.3.2.

Off-site contributions

If new provision cannot be provided on-site it may be more appropriate to seek to enhance the quality of existing provision and/or improve access and linkages to existing sites. In some instances, a development may be located within proximity to an existing site. In such cases, it may be more beneficial for an off-site contribution to avoid the creation of small incremental spaces close to existing sites.

The expectation is for the cost of a financial contribution to be the equivalent to the cost of delivery for an open space on-site.

^{* &}lt;u>https://www.sportengland.org/facilities-and-planning/active-design/</u>

The SSDC Open Space Strategy (2014-2028) requires £93,698 per 1,000 bed spaces to deliver off-site greenspace provision (with one bed space equivalent to one person).

This equates to £93.70 per person (or £257.73 per dwelling^{*})

Standard costs for the enhancement of existing open space and provision of new open spaces should be reviewed and revised on a regular basis.

Maintenance contributions

There will be a requirement on developers to demonstrate that where on-site provision is to be provided it will be managed and maintained accordingly. In some instances, the site may be adopted by the Council, which will require the developer to submit a sum of money in order to pay the costs of the site's future maintenance. Often the procedure for councils adopting new sites includes:

- The developer being responsible for maintenance of the site for an initial agreed establishment period (typically 12 months).
- Sums to cover the maintenance costs of a site (once transferred to the Council) should be intended to cover an agreed set period (typically a minimum of 15 years).

The SSDC Open Space Strategy (2014-2028) details a cost of £65,190 per hectare for maintenance of open space provision (covering a 15-year period).

Calculations to determine the amount of maintenance contributions required should be reviewed and revised on a regular basis.

5.3 Approach to developer contributions

KKP advocates the requirement for open space should be based upon the increased demand generated from the net increase in dwellings in a proposed scheme. We also promote the use of quantity provision standards in calculating the open space requirements of new housing development. SSDC use a hectares per household to assist in the calculating of provision requirements. This has been cited throughout the report in order to assist the Council in its approach.


Flexible approach

A focus of this study has been to recognise the role quality and accessibility has in terms of open space provision. Future need should not just centre on quantity requirements of new residential developments. For instance, a new residential development may not warrant on-site provision but instead could contribute towards an existing site in close proximity.

The flowchart (Figure 5.3.1) sets out the process that should be considered when determining contributions in terms of quantity, quality and accessibility. For developments, the provision standards should be used to help determine the requirements for open space provision as part of a development.

^{* £93.70} x 2.74 (average bedrooms per dwelling delivered on policy compliant schemes in SSDC)

Figure 5.3.1: Determining developer contributions



If at Step 2, it is determined that provision should be on-site then the recommended quantity standards should be used to calculate the requirements for open space. This should be in accordance with the recommended minimum size thresholds in Table 5.3.2.

Determining on-site or off-site contributions

The requirement for on or off-site provision should be undertaken in conjunction with the accessibility and quality of existing open space provision. For instance, if an existing form of open space is located within access to the development there may not be a requirement to provide on-site provision.

It is recognised that open spaces of a particularly small size hold less recreational use and value. The presence of additional smaller sites will also add to the existing pressures of maintenance regimes and safety inspections. It is therefore suggested that a minimum area threshold is used to determine if provision should be provided on or off-site and in order to ensure meaningful forms of provision are provided.

New open space provision should look to be provided as off-site contributions if the calculated open space requirement for the proposed development falls below the size threshold. If the requirement is above the threshold, it should look to be provided on-site as part of the development.

FIT offers some guidance to the potential minimum threshold area of play sites (Table 5.3.1). SSDC currently uses a minimum area threshold of 0.29 hectares (incorporating play) to determine on or off-site provision requirements.

| Classification | | Minimum area of site |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|----------------------|
| | Equipped | 0.04 ha |
| Play areas* | Informal/casual (including MUGAs etc) | 0.10 ha |
| Current SSDC minimum area threshold | | 0.29 ha |

The existing SSDC minimum area threshold of 0.29 hectares is based on a quantity standard of 0.01 hectares per dwelling (i.e. a development of 29 dwellings would require on-site provision)^{\dagger}.

As part of this study, the recommendation is for the quantity standard to be 0.006 hectares per dwelling. To reach the existing minimum size threshold of 0.29 hectares, a development of 48 dwellings would be required. This would be a significant increase to the existing approach. It is therefore necessary to set an updated minimum area threshold.

The audits of most open space studies exclude sites below 0.2 hectares. As sites below this size are often considered as providing less recreational use and/or value. Utilising a 0.2 hectare minimum area threshold with the recommended quantity standard of 0.006 hectares per dwelling, results in an equivalent development consisting of 33 dwellings requiring on-site provision.

There is a presumption that a required space of 0.2 hectares (i.e. meeting the minimum area of site) should seek to include equipped play provision as a default.

On this basis, it is recommended that a minimum area threshold of 0.2 hectares is used by SSDC to help inform decisions regarding on and off-site requirements for provision.

Table 5.3.2: Recommended minimum area threshold for contributions:

| Classification | Minimum area of site |
|-----------------------|----------------------|
| Provision requirement | 0.20 ha |

In order to provide meaningful recreational provision, as cited earlier, new on-site provision should look to be well designed as part of the layout for developments (e.g. centrally located, accessible, recreational in use).

^{*} Minimum recommended size for play areas by Fields In Trust

[†] Minimum size threshold / quantity standard = number of dwellings to warrant on-site provision

APPENDIX ONE: QUALITY AND VALUE MATRIX

The following tables are part of the application of the quality and value matrix as set out earlier in the report (Section 4.1).

Sites that are colour coded green represent scoring above the thresholds for quality and value. Conversely, red scoring sites are those which rate below the quality and value thresholds.

A1.1: Central Analysis Area Summary

A1.1a: Allotments

| | | Quality | |
|-------|------|--|-----|
| | | High | Low |
| Value | High | Watery Lane Allotments (ID 408) Newgate Allotments (ID 235) Pendleford Mill Lane Allotments (ID 261) Sandy Lane Allotments (ID 289) | |
| | Low | | |

A1.1b: Amenity greenspace

| | | Quality | |
|-------|------|---------------------------------------|--------------------|
| | | High | Low |
| | | Athelstan Gardens/Harald Close (ID 8) | Dunster Grove (ID) |
| e | | Avon Close (ID 9) | |
| Value | High | Barley Croft/Cornhill Grove (ID 15) | |
| > | | Bilbrook Rd (ID 20) | |
| | | Chillington Drive (ID 73) | |

| Qu | Quality | |
|---|---------|--|
| High | Low | |
| Codsall House (ID 79) | | |
| Coulter Grove/Leasowes Drive (ID 84) | | |
| Elm Grove (ID 108) | | |
| Ennerdale Drive/Rydal Drive (ID 111) | | |
| Gainsborough Drive (ID 132) | | |
| Gainsborough Drive/Yew Tree Lane (ID 133) | | |
| Hudson Grove/Scampton Close (ID 167) | | |
| Joeys Lane Playing Field (2) (ID 172) | | |
| Joeys Lane Playing Field/Bilbrook Village Hall (ID 174) | | |
| Kingswear Avenue/Richmond Drive (ID 184) | | |
| Lime Tree Road (ID 196) | | |
| Lytham Road/The Parkway (ID 204) | | |
| Mercia Drive/Athelstan Gardens (ID 219) | | |
| Moatbrook Lane (ID 225) | | |
| Moor Park/Gleneagles Road (ID 229) | | |
| Nash Avenue (ID 232) | | |
| Oakleigh Drive (ID 244) | | |
| off Richmond Drive (ID 249) | | |
| Offa's Drive (ID 250) | | |
| Pattingham Playing Field (ID 256) | | |
| Perton Pavillion and Playing Fields (ID 266) | | |
| Repton Avenue/Hawksmoor Drive (ID 280) | | |
| Roundway Down/Winceby Road (ID 286) | | |
| Sandown Drive/The Parkway, Perton (ID 288) | | |
| Shackleton Drive (ID 296) | | |
| Shackleton Drive/Gaydon Close (ID 297) | | |

| | Quality | |
|-----|-------------------------------------|---|
| | High | Low |
| | Tangmere Close/The Parkway (ID 265) | |
| | The Cartway (ID 372) | |
| | The Parkway 2 (ID 380) | |
| | Vaughan Gardens (ID 392) | |
| | Village Green, Bilbrook (ID 394) | |
| | Village Hall Playing Field (ID 399) | |
| | Walton Gardens (ID 402) | |
| | Wheel Field (ID 415) | |
| | Wood Rd/Bakers Way (ID 428) | |
| | Wren Avenue/Pugin Close (ID 431) | |
| | Church Rd. Codsall (ID 77) | Benson Close (ID 19) |
| | Duck Lane (ID 96) | Cheshire Grove/Cunningham Road (ID 68) |
| | Hoylake Road (ID 166) | Crowland Avenue/Jedburgh Avenue (ID 88) |
| | Idonia Rd (ID 171) | Dippons Lane (ID 94) |
| Low | Milton Court (ID 223) | Edgehill Drive (ID 106) |
| | Penda Grove/Dippons Lane (ID 259) | Edgehill Drive/The Parkway (ID 107) |
| | Richmond Drive (ID 281) | Mercia Drive (ID 218) Naseby Road/Adwalton Road (ID 231) |
| | Severn Drive/The Parkway (ID 295) | Naseby Noau/Auwalton Noau (10 251) |
| | The Parkway 1 (ID 379) | |

A1.1c: Cemeteries

| | | Quality | |
|------|------|--|--|
| | | High | Low |
| alue | High | St Nicholas's Church Cemetery (ID 312) St. Chad's Church, Pattingham (ID 314) | St Nicholas's Church, Codsall (ID 313) |
| > | Low | | |

A1.1d: Civic Space

| | | Quality | |
|-------|------|--|---------------------------------------|
| | | High | Low |
| | | Memorial Garden (The Lone Singer) (ID 215) | Seating Area, Burnhill Green (ID 292) |
| | | Memorial Gardens, Codsall (ID 217) | |
| e | High | Pattingham Village Hall (ID 258) | |
| Value | | Seating area, Pendeford Mill Lane (ID 293) | |
| > | | War Memorial, Perton (ID 405) | |
| | Low | | |

A1.1e: Natural and semi-natural greenspace

| | Quality | |
|---------------|--|---|
| | High | Low |
| Value High | Perton Lakeside (ID 263) Jubilee Wood (ID 221) Pendeford Mill Nature Reserve (ID 260) Corser's/Smith's Rough (ID 83) Lower Lake (ID 203) Oaken Lanes Playing Fields (ID 243) Kingswood Common (ID 185) | Bluebell Walk (ID 25) Field, Dippons Lane, Perton (ID 120) Strawmoor Lane, Codsall (ID 357) |
| Low | | Westbeech Road (ID 410) The Parkway/St. Andrews Drive (ID 381) |

A1.1g: Provision for children and young people

| | | Quality | |
|-------|------|---|-----|
| | | High | Low |
| Value | High | Perton Lakeside play area (ID 263.1) Joeys Lane Playing Field play area (ID 174.1) Perton Lakeside play area (older children) (ID 263.2) Village Green play area, Bilbrook (ID 393) Village Hall Play Equipment, Codsall (ID 399.1) Pattingham Playing Field Play Equipment (ID 256.1) Joeys Lane Playing Field skatepark (ID 172.1 Joeys Lane Playing Field MUGA (ID 174.2) Burnhill Green Playing Field (ID 58) Golden Jubilee Skate Park (ID 256.2) | |

A1.2: North Analysis Area Summary

A1.2a: Allotments

| | Quality | | lity |
|-------|---------|--|------|
| | | High | Low |
| | Lliah | Francis Green Lane Allotments (ID 130) | |
| Value | High | Wolgarston Way Allotments (ID 421) | |
| Val | Low | | |

A1.2b: Amenity greenspace

| | | Quality | |
|-------|------|---|---|
| | _ | High | Low |
| Value | High | Haling Dene Centre (ID 140) Colliers Way, Huntington (ID 80) Huntington Recreation Ground (ID 169) Princefield, off Templars Way (ID 275) Stafford Road 2 (ID 341) Sycamore Way, Huntington (ID 363) Church Close, Dunston (ID 75) Former Vale Gardens Play Area (ID 123) Silver Birch Rd/Oak Ave (ID 302) Cherrybrook Drive (ID 67) Stafford Road Playing Field (ID 271) Woodland Court, Huntington (ID 430) Oak Avenue 1 (ID 239) | Stafford Rd (ID 339) Manorfield Close, Penkridge (ID 205) Four Crosses Lane/Catsbridge Lane Heron Drive (ID 125) St. Modwena Way (ID 334) |

| | Quality | | |
|-----|---------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|
| _ | High | Low | |
| | Stafford Road/Huntsmans Rise (ID 342) | Nagington Drive (ID 311) | |
| | Vale Gardens, Penkridge (ID 390) | Wolgarston Way (ID 420) | |
| | Maple Drive (ID 206) | Oak Avenue 2 (ID 240) | |
| | Pillaton Dv/Stag Dv (ID 267) | Gravel Lane 1 (ID 136) | |
| Low | Lime Road (ID 195) | Foxfields Way (ID 128) | |
| | Stafford Road 1 (ID 340) | Druids Way (ID 95) | |
| | Ling Road (ID 197) | Highland Road/Chase Walk (ID 155) | |
| | | Rockhouse (ID 282) | |
| | | Tildesley Close (ID 384) | |

A1.2c: Cemeteries

| | | Quality | |
|---|------|---|--|
| | | High | Low |
| | | St. Michael's & All Angels, Penkridge (ID 333) | All Saints' Church, Bednall (ID 4) |
| | | St. Michael's and All Angels Burial Ground (ID 322) | St. Lawrence's Church, Coppenhall (ID 320) |
| ¢ | High | St. Leonard's Church, Dunston (ID 321) | |
| | Hign | Church of St. Saviour, Hatherton (ID 76) | |
| | | St. James' Church, Acton Trussell (ID 315) | |
| | Low | | |

A1.2d: Civic space

| | | Quality | |
|-----|------|---|---------------------------------|
| | | High | Low |
| | High | Festival Gardens, Penkridge (ID 119) Market Street, Penkridge (ID 207) | Hatherton Parish Rooms (ID 143) |
| Ine | High | Market Street, Penkridge (ID 207) | |
| Va | Low | | |

A1.1e: Green Corridors

| | | Quality | |
|-------|------|---|---|
| | _ | High | Low |
| | | Brook footpath 2 (ID 47) | Princefield Bridge/Templars Way (ID 274) |
| | | Boscomoor Lane/Vale Gardens 2 (ID 29) | Staffordshire and Worcestershire Canal 6 (ID 348) |
| | | Francis Close/Princefield Bridge (ID 129) | |
| | | Staffordshire and Worcestershire Canal 4 (ID 346) | |
| e | High | Boscomoor Lane/Vale Gardens 1 (ID 28) | |
| Value | | Gravel Lane 2 (ID 137) | |
| | | Lyne Hill Railway Walk, Penkridge (ID 439) | |
| | | Staffordshire and Worcestershire Canal 5 (ID 347) | |
| | | | |
| | Low | | |

A1.2f: Natural and semi-natural greenspace

| | | Quality | | |
|-------|------|--------------------------------------|----------------------------------|--|
| | | High | Low | |
| | | Littleton Leisure Park (ID 198) | Cavan's Wood, Huntington (ID 63) | |
| | | Canal Wharf/Wolgarston Way (ID 59) | Bedingstone Drive (ID 17) | |
| e | High | Fishing Pools, Four Crosses (ID 121) | | |
| Value | | Shoal Hill Common 1 (ID 298) | | |
| > | | Shoal Hill Common 2 (ID 299) | | |
| | Low | | King Cup Drive (ID 183) | |

A1.2g: Provision for children and young people

| | Quality | |
|----------------|--|------------------------------------|
| | High | Low |
| Allue Value | Horse Fair Play Area (ID 165) Kempson Road Play Area (ID 179) Wolverhampton Road Play Area (ID 422) Village Green, Huntington (ID 395) Huntington Recreation Ground skate park (ID 169.1) Heron Drive Play Area 1 (ID 148.1) Monkton Recreation Centre Skate Park (ID 226) | Heron Drive Play Area 2 (ID 148.2) |
| Low | | |

A3.3: North East Analysis Area Summary

A3.3a: Allotments

| | | Quality | |
|-------|------|----------------------------------|-----|
| | | High | Low |
| Value | High | Pinfold Lane Allotments (ID 270) | |
| Va | Low | | |

A3.3b: Amenity greenspace

| | | | Quality |
|-------|------|--|---|
| | | High | Low |
| | | Quinton Park Recreation Ground (ID 277 | Off Hilton Road (ID 248 |
| | | Sutherland Road (ID 360) | Mitre Road, Cheslyn Hay (ID 444) |
| | | Featherstone Community Centre (ID 115) | Norfolk Grove 2 (ID 237) |
| | | Health Centre, Landywood Lane (ID 147) | Cannock Road/Park Road (ID 62) |
| | | New Road/East Road 1 (ID 233) | Baneberry Drive (ID 12) |
| | | Low Street/Rosemary Road Playing Fields (ID 200) | Baneberry Drive/Speedwell Gardens 1 (ID 13) |
| Value | High | Moons' Lane/Upper Landywood Road (ID 228) | Oaks Drive Playing Field (ID 247) |
| Va | High | Hall Lane/Quinton Avenue (ID 141) | Dundalk Lane (ID 97) |
| | | Oaks Drive 2 (ID 246) | Hatherton Reservoir (ID 144) |
| | | Dundalk Lane/Landywood Lane (ID 98) | Pinfold Lane 1 (ID 268) |
| | | Jones Lane Playing Field (ID 175) | High Hill/Kitchen Lane (ID 152) |
| | | Oaks Drive 1 (ID 245) | |
| | | Rowan Drive (ID 287) | |
| | | Gorsemoor Way (ID 135) | |

| | Quality |
|---|---------|
| High | Low |
| Larchmere Drive/Gorsemoor Way (ID 191) | |
| Woodcock Gardens (ID 429) | |
| Burnet Grove, Featherstone (ID 57) | |
| Station Street Recreation Ground (ID 355) | |
| Teford Avenue (ID 368) | |
| Tudor Close (ID 389) | |
| Cannock Road/Hilton Road (ID 61) | |
| Long Lane, Springhill (ID 199) | |
| Hazel Lane/Walsall Road Playing Fields (ID 146) | |
| Hilton Road/Olde Hall Road (ID 158) | |
| Parks Crescent (ID 254) | |
| Cannock Road Playing Field (ID 60) | |
| Norfolk Grove 1 (ID 236) | |
| Rosewood Park (ID 284) | |
| Tower View Road (ID 387) | |
| Weston Drive 3 (ID 413) | |
| Bramwell Drive (ID 31) | |
| Brook Lane (ID 48) | |
| Hill Street, Essington (ID 156) | |
| East Road (2) (ID 103) | |
| Broadmeadow Lane 1 (ID 43) | |
| High Street/Pinfold Lane (ID 153) | |
| Brownshore Lane (ID 53) | |
| St. Mary's Close/School Lane (ID 329) | |
| Brook Lane/John's Lane (Library) (ID 50) | |
| Dunston Close (ID 100) | |

| | | | Quality |
|-------|------|---|---|
| | | High | Low |
| | | Broadmeadow Lane 3 (ID 44) | |
| | | Mitre Road (ID 224) | |
| | | School Lane/Manor Drive (ID 290) | |
| | High | Weston Drive 2 (ID 412) | |
| | | East Road (1) (ID 102) | |
| | | Pendrel Close (ID 262) | |
| | | Walsall Road / Hilton Lane (ID 401) | |
| | | Alpha Way (ID 7) | Windsor Road (ID 419) |
| | | Baneberry Drive/Speedwell Gardens 2 (ID 14) | Brooklands Avenue (ID 51) |
| | | New Road/East Road 2 (ID 234) | Old Lane and Baneberry Drive (ID 251) |
| | | Whilmot Close/Pendrell Close (ID 416) | Rosemary Road (ID 283) |
| e | | Brooklime Gardens (ID 52) | The Crescent (ID 375) |
| Value | | Teasel Grove/Turnstone Drive (ID 366) | High Hill/Backhalve Lane (ID 151) |
| > | | Leander Close (ID 193) | Kestrel Way 2 (ID 181) |
| | | Ajax Close (1), Anson Road Estate (ID 1) | Broadmeadow Lane 2 (ID 42) |
| | Low | Yemscroft (ID 437) | Mary Rose Close/Essington Canal Walk (ID 212) |
| | LOW | Kestrel Way 1 (ID 180) | East Road/Oaks Drive (ID 105) |
| | | Chillington Close/Weston Drive (ID 72) | Lapwing Close (ID 190) |
| | | Oxley Close, Anson Road Estate (ID 252) | Swynnerton Drive/Hawthorne Road (ID 362) |
| | | Park Road, Hilton (ID 253) | Moon's Lane (ID 227) |
| | | | Weston Drive 1 (ID 411) |
| | | | Bridge Avenue (ID 39) |
| | | | Ajax Close (2), Anson Road Estate (ID 2) |
| | | | Broad Lane/Bursnips Road (ID 40) |
| | | | Pinfold Lane 2 (ID 269) |

| Quality | |
|---------|----------------------------------|
| High | Low |
| | Hilton Rd, Featherstone (ID 157) |

A3.3c: Cemeteries

| | | Quality | |
|-------|------|---|-----|
| | | High | Low |
| | | North Walsall Cemetery, Bloxwich (ID 238) | |
| | | Strawberry Lane Cemetery (ID 438) | |
| | | Great Wyrley Cemetery (ID 138) | |
| е | High | St. John the Evangelist, Essington (ID 317) | |
| Value | | St. Mary's Church, Shareshill (ID 327) | |
| > | | Cheslyn Hay Cemetery (ID 69) | |
| | | St. Mark's Church, Great Wyrley (ID 322) | |
| | | | |
| | Low | | |

A3.3f: Civic Space

| | | | Quality | |
|-------|-----|------|-------------------------------|-----|
| | | | High | Low |
| Value | | | Memorial Garden, Great Wyrley | |
| | e | High | Millennium feature, Essington | |
| | alu | | War Memorial, Cheslyn Hay | |
| | > | Low | | |

A3.3g: Green corridors

| | | Quality | |
|-------|------|--|-----|
| _ | | High | Low |
| | | Wyrley and Essington Canal 1 (ID 434) | |
| | | Wyrley and Essington Canal 3 (ID 436) | |
| ue | High | Wyrley and Essington Canal 2 (ID 435) | |
| Value | | Essington and Wyrley Canal Walk South (ID 114) | |
| | | Essington and Wyrley Canal Walk North (ID 113) | |
| | Low | | |

A3.3h: Natural and semi-natural greenspace

| | | Quality | |
|------|------|---------|---|
| | | High | Low |
| alue | High | | Brownshore Lane Woodland, Essington (ID 54) |
| Val | Low | | Lower Belt, Cannock Road (ID 201) |

A3.3e: Provision for children and young people

| | | | Quality |
|-------|------|--|--|
| | | High | Low |
| Value | High | Brook Lane Play Area (ID 50.1) East Road Play area (ID 234.1) Quinton Park Play Area (ID 277.1) Quinton Park skate park (ID 277.4) Cheslyn Hay Recreation Ground Play Area (ID 355.1) Featherstone Community Centre LAP (ID 115.1) Quinton Park BMX Track (ID 277.2) Cheslyn Hay Teen Shelter (ID 355.2) Featherstone Community Centre MUGA (ID 115.2) Leander Close Play Area (ID 194) Featherstone Community Centre Shelter (ID 115.3) | Quinton Park Teen Shelter (ID 277.5) Jones Lane Playing Fields Play Area (ID 175.1) Quinton Park basketball net (ID 277.3) |
| | Low | | |

A3.4: North West Analysis Area Summary

A3.4a: Allotments

| | | Quality | |
|------|------|---|-----|
| | | High | Low |
| | High | Ball Lane Allotments (ID 11) | |
| alue | | Ball Lane Allotments (ID 11) Chambley Green Allotments (ID 64) | |
| > | Low | | |

A3.4b: Amenity greenspace

| | | Quality | |
|-------|------|--|--|
| | | High | Low |
| Value | High | Marston Road Playing Field (ID 210) Chambley Green, Coven (ID 65) Coven Playing Field (ID 87) Lower Green (ID 202 Kiddemore Green Road (ID 182) Deansfield Close (ID 91) Deansfield Road (ID 92) Engleton Lane Playing Field (ID 110) Bishops Wood Public Footpath (ID 23) Oak Road, Brewood (ID 242) Oak Court (ID 241) Blymhill Playing Field (ID 27) Sports Ground, Station Drive (ID 309) The Orchard, Brewood (ID 443) | Bishops Wood Playing Field (ID 21) Timber Grove/Stonebridge Road (ID 385) |
| | Low | | Jubilee Grove, Blymhill (ID 178) |

A3.4c: Cemeteries

| | | Quality | |
|-------|------|---|---|
| | | High | Low |
| | | St. Paul's Church, Coven (ID 335) | All Saints' Church Graveyard, Lapley (ID 3) |
| | | St. Mary's RC Church, Brewood (ID) 330 | St. Paul's Churchyard Extension (ID 336) |
| - | Hiah | St. Mary's & St. Chad's Church (ID 323) | St. Mary's Church Graveyard (ID 324) |
| Value | High | All Saints' Church, Lapley (ID 5) | St. John's Church, Stretton (ID 318) |
| Š | | St. John the Evangelist Church (ID 316) | |
| | | St. Mary's Church, Blymhill (ID 325) | |
| | Low | | |

A3.4d: Civic space

| | | Quality | |
|-------|------|--|--|
| | | High | Low |
| | | Coven Memorial Hall (ID 85) | Seating area, Stafford Street (ID 294) |
| a | High | Village Square, Wheaton Aston (ID 400) | Seating area, Brewood (ID 291) |
| Value | High | Church Road, Brewood (ID 78) | War Memorial, Stretton (ID 406) |
| | • | Village Green, Lapley (ID 396) | |
| | Low | | |

A3.4e: Green corridors

| | Quality | |
|---------|----------------------------------|-----|
| | High | Low |
| 鸟 High | Brewood Visitor Moorings (ID 36) | |
| Vol Sal | | |

A3.4e: Natural and semi-natural greenspace

| | | Qua | ality |
|--------|---------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| | | High | Low |
| Welene | Llink | Barnfield Sandbeds, Brewood (ID 16) | |
| | High Jaine | The Bront, Coven (ID 371) | |
| | > . | | White Sitch and Blymhill Common (ID 417) |
| | Low | | The Church 'on the common', Coven Heath (ID 373) |

A3.4f: Provision for children and young people

| | | Quality | | |
|-------|------|--|-----------------------------------|--|
| | | High | Low | |
| Value | High | Coven Playing Field skate park (ID 87.3) Coven Playing Field play area (ID 87.1) Engleton Lane Playing Field play areas (ID 110.1) Bishops Wood Skate Park (ID 24) Marston Road Playing Field Teen Shelter (ID 210.2) Primrose Close Play Area (ID 273) Blymhill Playing Field play area (ID 27.1) Bishops Wood Playing Field play area (ID 21.1) Coven Playing Field MUGA (ID 87.2) | Marston Road Play Area (ID 210.1) | |

A3.5: South Analysis Area Summary

A3.5a: Allotments

| | | Qua | lity |
|------|-------|--|------|
| | | High | Low |
| C) | Lliah | Boundary Way Allotments (ID 30) | |
| alue | High | Boundary Way Allotments (ID 30) Swindon Road Allotments, Swindon (ID 361) | |
| Š | Low | | |

A3.5b: Amenity greenspace

| | | | Quality | |
|-------|------|---|---|--|
| | | High | Low | |
| | | Daneford Gardens (ID 89) | The Meadlands (ID 377) | |
| | | Fox Rd/Ebstree Rd (ID 126) | Dark Lane, Kinver (ID 90) | |
| | | The Close, Swindon (ID 374) | Meadow Lane (ID 214) | |
| | | Brickbridge Lane Playing Fields (ID 38) | Dimmingsdale Road Playing Field (ID 93) | |
| | | Bratch Locks Picnic Area (ID 33) | Tollhouse Way (ID 386) | |
| | | Whites Wood (ID 418) | Recreation Ground Lower Penn (ID 279) | |
| е | High | Forge Valley Way (ID 122) | | |
| Value | | Hazel Grove (ID 145) | | |
| > | | Kinver Edge Fort and Rock Houses (ID 187) | | |
| | | Bull Lane, Wombourne 2 (ID 56) | | |
| | | Bratch Park (ID 34) | | |
| | | Bull Lane, Wombourne 1 (ID 55) | | |
| | | Brockley's Walk, Kinver (ID 45) | | |
| | Low | Himley Playing Field (ID 161) | Fox Road Playing Field (ID 127) | |
| | Low | | Van Diemans Rd (ID 391) | |

A3.5c: Cemeteries

| | | Quality | |
|-------|------|--|--|
| | | High | Low |
| Value | High | St. Michael and All Angels Church (ID 331) St Benedicts Biscop Church, Wombourne (ID 310) St. John's Church, Swindon (ID 319) All Saints' Church, Trysull (ID 6) Comber Ridge Burial Ground (ID 81) St. Mary's Church, Enville (ID 326) Holy Cross Church, Bobbington (ID 164) | Sytch Lane Cemetery (ID 364) St. Peter's Church, Kinver (ID 338) St. Peter's Church Graveyard, Kinver (ID 337) |
| | Low | | |

A3.5d: Civic Space

| | | Qu | ality |
|-------|------|--|--|
| | | High | Low |
| Value | High | Maypole, Wombourne (ID 213) Jubilee Gardens (ID) Village Green, Lower Penn (ID 397) Kinver Shelter (ID) | Halfpenny Green (ID 139) War Memorial/Village Green Enville (ID 407) The Green, School Lane (ID 376) Commemorative Stone, Trysull (ID 82) |
| | Low | | |

A3.5e: Green corridors

| | | Quality | |
|-------|------|--|--|
| | | High | Low |
| Value | High | Wom Brook Walk, Gravel Hill (ID 424) Wom Brook Walk, Millfields Way (ID 425) Wom Brook Road, Rookery Road (ID 426) Wom Brook Walk, Brook Road (ID 423) Staffordshire & Worcestershire Canal 1,3 (ID) Kingswinford Railway Walk (ID) Hyde Bridge Dunsley (ID 170) | Bells Mill, Kinver (ID 18) Staffordshire & Worcestershire Canal 2,7,9 & 12 (ID) |
| | Low | | |

A3.5d: Natural and semi-natural greenspace

| | | Qua | ality |
|-------|------|----------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| | | High | Low |
| | | Kinver Edge (ID 186) | Ridgehill Wood (ID 440) |
| | | Highgate Common (ID 154) | Enville Common (ID 112) |
| e | High | Himley Plantation (ID 160) | Friars Gorse, Kinver (ID 131) |
| Value | | | The Million (ID 378) |
| - | | | |
| | Low | | Sterrymere Gardens, Kinver (ID 356) |
| | | | |


A3.5e: Parks and gardens


| | | Qua | ality |
|-------|------|---|-------|
| | | High | Low |
| /alue | High | Himley Hall Landscape Park (ID 159 Baggeridge Country Park (ID 10) | |
| | Low | | |

A3.5f: Provision for children and young people

| | | Quali | ity |
|-------|------|--|-----|
| | | High | Low |
| Value | High | Trysull Playing Field (ID 388) Marsh Playing Fields Playground (ID 208) Millfields Way Play Area (ID 425.1) Bratch Park Play Area (ID 34.1) Baggeridge Country Park play area (ID 10.1) Kinver Skate Park (ID 441) Hinksford Lane Play Area (ID 163) Himley Playing Field Play Area (ID 161.1) Kinver Pump Track (ID 442) Brickbridge Lane Playing Fields play area (ID 38.1) | |

APPENDIX TWO: CATCHMENT MAPS









Figure A2.2: Natural and semi-natural greenspace with 720m catchment









Figure A2.4a: Provision for children and young people with FIT catchments (north)

Figure A2.4b: Provision for children and young people with FIT catchments (south)



APPENDIX THREE: POTENTIAL ALTERNATIVE TYPOLOGIES FOR LOW QUALITY AND VALUE SITES

Table A3 is intended to assist in the process of exploring alternative uses for sites rated as low quality and value. Recommendation 3 of Part 5 sets out a step-by-step approach (provided below) which should be followed in determining if a site is surplus to requirements:

| Step 1 | Identify site of low quality and low value and consider whether there is scope to improve the site's quality/value | |
|--------|---|--|
| Step 2 | If no improvement can be made, check if the site is within an area identified as having a surplus of provision for that typology (Table 4.3.2) and is within the catchment area for a similar type of open space (final column in Appendix Three) | |
| Step 3 | If there is sufficient provision (i.e. both conditions in Step 2 are satisfied), see if it is possible to change the primary typology of the site to another typology where a deficit is identified | |
| Step 4 | If it is not feasible to change the site to an alternative typology, then the site may be surplus to requirements | |

Biodiversity net gain is outside the scope of this study. However, it is important to consider that sites potentially surplus to open space requirements may still offer opportunities for semi natural greenspace as an alternative typology in order to assist the Council in providing biodiversity net gains within the District.

Table A3: Potential alternative typologies for low quality and value sites

| ID | Site name | Typology | Typologies in sub- area with quantity shortfall | Potential alternative typology for site | Site covered by catchment of other open space |
|----|--------------------------------------|--------------------|---|---|---|
| 2 | Ajax Close (2), Anson Road Estate | Amenity greenspace | Green corridors, Allotments, Play | Play | Site ID: 147, 277, 193, 252, 1, 237, 238 |
| 19 | Benson Close | Amenity greenspace | Green corridors, Play | Play | Site ID: 250, 365, 167, 296, 297, 8, 223, 219, 218, 380, 171, 203, 381, 263 |
| 39 | Bridge Avenue | Amenity greenspace | Green corridors, Allotments, Play | Play | Site ID: 144, 419 |
| 40 | Broad Lane/ Bursnips Road | Amenity greenspace | Green corridors, Allotments, Play | Green corridor | None |

| ID | Site name | Туроlоду | Typologies in sub- area with quantity shortfall | Potential alternative typology for site | Site covered by catchment of other open space |
|-----|-------------------------------------|--------------------|---|---|---|
| 42 | Broadmeadow Lane 2 | Amenity greenspace | Green corridors, Allotments, Play | Play | Site ID: 375, 44, 147, 175, 43, 401, 146, 50, 48, 368 |
| 51 | Brooklands Avenue | Amenity greenspace | Green corridors, Allotments, Play | Green corridor, Play | Site ID: 39, 419, 141 |
| 68 | Cheshire Grove/ Cunningham Road | Amenity greenspace | Green corridors, Play | Play | Site ID: 88, 263, 204, 84, 372, 15, 280, 232, 106, 295, 107, 405, 233 |
| 88 | Crowland Avenue/ Jedburgh Avenue | Amenity greenspace | Green corridors, Play | Play | Site ID: 68, 263, 381, 229, 204, 84, 372, 15, 280, 232, 106, 295, 107, 405, 233 |
| 94 | Dippons Lane | Amenity greenspace | Green corridors, Play | Green corridor | Site ID: 120, 218, 380, 365, 167, 296, 297, 223, 8, 219, 171, 132, 259 |
| 95 | Druids Way | Amenity greenspace | Amenity greenspace, Allotments | Allotments | Site ID: 420, 129, 59, 274, 275, 369, 311, 350, 334. |
| 105 | East Road/Oaks Drive | Amenity greenspace | Green corridors, Allotments, Play | Green corridor, Play | Site ID: 246, 245, 103, 102, 234, 233, 247 |
| 106 | Edgehill Drive | Amenity greenspace | Green corridors, Play | Allotments, Play | Site ID: 280, 232, 68, 88, 107, 295, 231, 286 |
| 107 | Edgehill Drive/The Parkway | Amenity greenspace | Green corridors, Play | Green corridors | Site ID: 280, 232, 68, 88, 106, 295, 231, 286, 405, 288, 9 |
| 127 | Fox Road Playing Field | Amenity greenspace | Amenity greenspace, Allotments, Play | Allotments | Site ID: 126 |
| 128 | Foxfields Way | Amenity greenspace | Amenity greenspace, Allotments | None | Site ID: 169, 339, 342, 341, 206, 239 |
| 136 | Gravel Lane 1 | Amenity greenspace | Amenity greenspace, Allotments | Green corridors | Site ID: 137, 80, 267, 197, 340 |
| 151 | High Hill/ Backhalve Lane | Amenity greenspace | Green corridors, Allotments, Play | Play | Site ID: 152, 53, 339, 156, 389, 254 |

| ID | Site name | Туроlоду | Typologies in sub- area with quantity shortfall | Potential alternative typology for site | Site covered by catchment of other open space |
|-----|---|--------------------|---|---|---|
| 155 | Highland Road/ Chase Walk | Amenity greenspace | Amenity, Allotments | None | Site ID: 430, 340, 197, 136 |
| 157 | Hilton Rd, Featherstone | Amenity greenspace | Green corridors, Allotments, Play | None | Site ID 61, 158, 248, 429, 115, 251, 14, 366, 13, 12 |
| 178 | Jubilee Grove, Blymhill | Amenity greenspace | Amenity greenspace | None | Site ID 27 |
| 181 | Kestrel Way 2 | Amenity greenspace | Green corridors, Allotments, Play | Play | Site ID 269, 268, 180, 190, 97, 153, 98, 284, 228, 227, 31, 224 |
| 190 | Lapwing Close | Amenity greenspace | Green corridors, Allotments, Play | Green corridor, Play | Site ID: 181, 269, 268, 180, 97, 284, 228. 212, 98, 227, 31 |
| 212 | Mary Rose Close/ Essington Canal Walk | Amenity greenspace | Green corridors, Allotments, Play | Green corridors | Site ID 190, 181, 269, 268, 180, 98, 284, 228, 360 |
| 218 | Mercia Drive | Amenity greenspace | Green corridors, Play | Play | Site ID: 94, 380, 365, 167, 296, 297, 250, 171, 259, 219, 8, 223 |
| 227 | Moon's Lane | Amenity greenspace | Green corridors, Allotments, Play | None | Site ID 31, 212, 190, 181, 180, 97, 98, 284, 228, 360 |
| 231 | Naseby Road/ Adwalton Road | Amenity greenspace | Green corridors, Play | Play | Site ID: 286, 106, 232, 107, 295, 68, 405, 288, 111, 223, 9, 281, 266 |
| 240 | Oak Avenue 2 | Amenity greenspace | Amenity, greenspace, Allotments | None | Site ID: 363, 302, 206, 195, 239, 341, 271, 342 |
| 251 | Old Lane and Baneberry Drive | Amenity greenspace | Green corridors, Allotments, Play | Green corridors | Site ID: 14, 13, 12, 57, 115, 366, 52, 429, 248, 158, 61, 157 |
| 269 | Pinfold Lane 2 | Amenity greenspace | Green corridors, Allotments, Play | Green corridor, Allotments | Site ID: 181, 268, 190, 212, 228,180, 153 |
| 282 | Rockhouse | Amenity greenspace | Amenity greenspace, Allotments | Allotments | Site ID 123, 384, 390, 275, 95, 140 |

| ID | Site name | Туроlоду | Typologies in sub- area with quantity shortfall | Potential alternative typology for site | Site covered by catchment of other open space |
|-----|-------------------------------------|----------------------------------|---|---|---|
| 283 | Rosemary Road | Amenity greenspace | Green corridors, Allotments, Play | Green corridors | Site ID: 200, 355, 144, 419 |
| 311 | Nagington Drive | Amenity greenspace | Amenity, Allotments | None | Site ID: 95, 334, 148, 275, 420 |
| 362 | Swynnerton Drive/ Hawthorne Road | Amenity greenspace | Green corridors, Allotments, Play | Green corridor, Play | Site ID: 389, 254, 156, 53 |
| 375 | The Crescent | Amenity greenspace | Green corridors, Allotments, Play | Play | Site ID: 42, 44, 175, 147, 277, 43, 50, 401, 146 |
| 384 | Tildesley Close | Amenity greenspace | Amenity greenspace, Play | Play | Site ID: 123, 282, 205, 390, 275, 140 |
| 391 | Van Diemans Rd | Amenity greenspace | Amenity greenspace, Allotments, Play | Play | Site ID: 38, |
| 411 | Weston Drive 1 | Amenity greenspace | Green corridors, Allotments, Play | Play | Site ID: 412, 72, 413, 100, 237, 236, 252, 2, 1, 387, 7, 193, 277 |
| 419 | Windsor Road | Amenity greenspace | Green corridors, Allotments, Play | None | Site ID: 355, 51, 39, 283, 200 |
| 420 | Wolgarston Way | Amenity greenspace | Amenity greenspace, Allotments | Allotments | Site ID: 95, 334, 311, 148, 140, 67 |
| 183 | King Cup Drive | Natural/semi natural greenspace | Amenity greenspace, Allotments | Amenity greenspace | Site ID 136, 267, 80, 169, 128, 339 |
| 201 | Lower Belt, Cannock Road | Natural/semi natural greenspace | Green corridors, Allotments, Play | Green corridors | Site ID: 429, 248, 158, 61, 157, 253 |
| 356 | Sterrymere Gardens, Kinver | Natural/ semi natural greenspace | Amenity greenspace, Allotments, Play | Amenity greenspace | Site ID: 89 |

| ID | Site name | Typology | Typologies in sub- area with quantity shortfall | Potential alternative typology for site | Site covered by catchment of other open space |
|-----|---|---------------------------------|---|---|--|
| 373 | The Church 'on the common', Coven Heath | Natural/semi natural greenspace | Amenity greenspace | Amenity greenspace | None |
| 381 | The Parkway/ St. Andrews Drive | Natural/semi natural greenspace | Green corridors, Play | Green corridors | Site ID: 229, 166, 167, 296, 297, 365, 19, 166, 380, 250, 218, 223, 204, 84, 372, 88, 68 |
| 410 | Westbeech Road | Natural/semi natural greenspace | Green corridors, Play | Play | Site ID: 256 |
| 417 | White Sitch and Blymhill Common | Natural/semi natural greenspace | Amenity greenspace | Amenity greenspace | None |