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Executive Summary

This Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole Council (BCP Council) Playing Pitch Strategy (PPS) updates and supersedes the playing pitches element of sports strategies in the former Bournemouth Borough Council, Christchurch Borough Council and Borough of Poole areas and covers the period between 2018 and 2033 in alignment with the emerging new Local Plan. The strategy, which is compliant with Sport England guidance, focuses on football, rugby union, cricket and hockey pitches (both grass and artificial surfaces). Its development has been shaped and overseen by a steering group formed of officers from the Active Dorset (the County Sports Partnership), Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole Council, sports governing bodies, and Sport England, and consultation has been undertaken (with clubs and providers / owners of pitches for which the update has been undertaken) as part of the process.

The Strategy’s Vision

“This strategy centres on the provision of high-quality playing pitches which are as inviting as possible. It aims to meet the demand for participation in club based and informal / casual sports, provided in partnership and which:

✓ help to improve the health and wellbeing of the resident population;
✓ are attractive and welcoming to the community;
✓ increase accessibility, in particular, to the least active and under-represented residents;
✓ contribute to the overall economic and visitor ‘offer’ of the towns; and,
✓ are viable and financially sustainable into the future.”

The strategy was developed for the former local authorities, being commissioned prior to the transition to the new single authority, BCP Council.

The PPS plays a number of important roles in sport, leisure and planning terms, and also has a direct link into the health and wellbeing agenda both in relation to formal club based sport but also social, casual and informal sport aimed at getting people more active (with positive outcomes for mental as well as physical health). At its basic level, the PPS provides an audit of the quality, quantity and accessibility of playing pitches, establishes the current levels of demand (and therefore whether pitches are being over or under used) and projects forward demand likely to arise by the end of the strategy period so that the appropriate level of pitch provision can be planned for the future. The strategy:

• Can be used as robust evidence to protect existing playing pitches and playing fields;
• Can help to improve the quality of offer and provision by identifying and quantifying issues relating to the quality of pitches and ancillary facilities;
• Can be used by clubs and teams and pitch providers to support applications for funding for the improvement of the quality, quantity and accessibility of provision;
• Helps to defend against inappropriate development or loss of pitches;
• Informs planning policy development;
• Provides a strategic view and options for the provision of pitches during the strategy period; and,
 Forms an important part of the “package” of strategies, evidence and actions which can contribute towards improving the physical and mental health and wellbeing of those who live and work in the Borough.

What the strategy cannot do is provide a precise blueprint for change to 2033. Instead, it sets out a “direction of travel” with a number of detailed actions, recommendations and options for pitches which will need to be planned for, delivered, monitored and their impact on demand managed during the strategy period. The strategy cannot do the work necessary (for example, logistical, feasibility and viability work) required to confirm actions with 100% certainty and make things happen “on the ground”, which is the task of the many stakeholders (such as clubs, providers, owners and managers of pitches) and bodies (such as BCP Council, sports governing bodies and Sport England) which may be responsible for delivery of pitches and facilities following the strategy’s adoption.

**Figure EX1: The Study Area**

While there are numerous recommendations for each sport and pitch type, the strategy’s main headlines are set out below to provide a “snapshot” of the strategy’s findings for pitch provision in the Borough.

**Football**

- Demand is projected to increase by 2033. Assuming that unused capacity on existing secure sites can be used, moving teams away from unsecure to secure community use sites and taking into account future demand from an increase in the number of teams, an additional 5 full size grass pitches would be needed to accommodate additional match play in Bournemouth, 3 in Christchurch and 4 in Poole (if 3G pitches do not feature as part of the solution for future provision). Improvements to the quality and reliability of some pitches could help to reduce this number (by increasing carrying capacities). This demand for grass pitches would reduce by 2-3 grass pitches for every full size 3G floodlit pitch provided.

- Up to 5 additional full size floodlit 3G pitches with secure community use are needed across the Borough by 2033 if all clubs are to have an opportunity to train on a 3G surface. This is in addition to current 3G pitches “in the pipeline”. 1 x 3G pitch in the Bournemouth area and 1 x 3G pitch in the Poole area should be provided.
with a third only delivered in the Bournemouth / Poole area if demand is demonstrated “on the ground”. 2 x 3G pitches are needed in Christchurch. 3G provision will provide additional supply / capacity for matches at weekends which will, in turn, reduce the capacity required for additional grass pitches if 3G provision is delivered. This requirement reduces if unsecure 3G and sand-based pitches can feature as part of the future supply with certainty (i.e. making unsecure sites secure and acceptance that training can take place on non-3G artificial pitches and not negatively impact on secure use hockey supply).

**Hockey**

- **Demand is projected to increase by 2033.** Taking into account additional future demand, a total of 12 senior and 2 junior teams could be in place at Poole Hockey Club by 2033, a total of 10 senior teams from Bournemouth University and a total of 25 senior and 25 junior teams from Bournemouth Hockey Club. To accommodate projected growth, Poole Hockey Club could need up to 10 additional hours over weekends for matches and 7 additional hours for training during weekday evenings (full size pitch hours).
- **Dependency of Poole Hockey Club on the pitch at Ashdown Leisure Centre as the only secure community use pitch.** There are challenges to increasing the club’s use during their preferred times for training and have to compete with football use on the pitch (training and social play). Secure use at Ashdown Leisure Centre may provide sufficient capacity for the club in the short and medium term if priority time can be made for hockey over football.
- **If projected growth comes to fruition,** an additional hockey pitch will be needed to accommodate Poole Hockey Club’s demand if unsecure community sites cannot be relied upon with any certainty for additional capacity. Secure use at Ashdown Leisure Centre may provide sufficient capacity for the club in the short and medium term if priority time can be made for hockey over football.
- **There is currently a supply (carrying capacity) of 68 hours at the unsecure community use site at Chapel Gate in the peak period.** However, this is only notional capacity for hockey, given the poor condition of the second pitch and the amount of use by football, particularly on the second pitch. There is demand for 26 hours of use in the peak period on the first pitch at Chapel Gate, 23 hours of which is for hockey. The second pitch sees 18 hours of demand, with little of this taken by hockey due to its poor condition and poor floodlighting. Spare unused capacity on the second pitch is unusable for hockey. Projected demand suggests an increase by 2033 equating to a need for almost 4 full size floodlit AGPs by that time to accommodate both training and matches for the club and University teams. With the 2 pitches at Chapel Gate (assuming the second pitch is resurfaced) plus access to the pitch at Talbot Heath School, means an additional pitch could be required by 2033.
- **For the future long-term sustainability of hockey clubs** (with regard to financial viability and maximising the availability of volunteer / coaches’ time) a “one site model” is preferred by England Hockey, focusing club activity on one central site.

**Cricket**

- **Taking into account existing unused capacity, a desire to move use away from unsecure to secure sites and the demand for additional new capacity,** this translates into an equivalent need for additional capacity of around 71 good quality grass pitches (i.e. wickets / strips) in Bournemouth, 24 in Christchurch and 0 (zero) in Poole (having spare or “headroom” capacity of around 11 pitches), and 7 good quality artificial pitches in Bournemouth, 4 in Christchurch and 10 in Poole.
- **If current unsecure pitches can be transferred to secure community use, and spare capacity can be used,** these numbers reduce to 6 additional grass pitches in Bournemouth, 15 in Christchurch and 0 in Poole, and to 0 artificial pitches in Bournemouth, 2 in Christchurch and 2 in Poole.
- **However, it must be stressed that this does not equate to a need for pitch capacity to this total amount being provided at new grounds.** In reality, additional capacity to accommodate demand could be provided through a combination of: delivery of pitches or grounds “in the pipeline” improving the quality
of standard and poor quality pitches; securing community use on current unsecure sites; bringing “mothballed” pitches back into use where and when necessary; new additional pitches at existing grounds where capacity would be practically usable; additional artificial pitches to absorb projected demand on grass pitches; and / or, (if necessary) new additional grounds in sub-areas / locations where the demand is likely to occur. Scenarios for possible solutions which could accommodate the increase in demand suggest that there could be no need for additional grass pitches or artificial pitches in Bournemouth and no need for additional grass pitches in Poole, although there could still be demand for up to 2 additional artificial pitches in Poole and in Christchurch, there would be no need for additional grass or artificial pitches to 2033.

- Potential imported demand from teams (Parley CC) which may be forced to return to Christchurch if their home ground is not available next season equates to 9 grass pitches and up to 3 artificial pitches.
- Provision of new additional pitches will need to respond to demonstrable demand “on the ground”. A “plan, deliver, monitor, manage” approach should therefore be taken to the provision of additional capacity. The combination of provision between grass and artificial pitches will also need to be provided to fit with real demand (for example, to match increased participation in the junior and women’s game should it materialise as projected / targeted by the ECB / Dorset CB).

Rugby Union

- Demand is projected to increase by 2033. Taking into account overplay at existing sites, a desire to move away from or secure use of unsecure sites the need to accommodate a small amount of latent demand (in Christchurch) and the demand for additional new capacity, this translates into an equivalent need for additional capacity of 9.5 good quality full size pitches in Bournemouth, 3 good quality full size grass pitches in Christchurch and none in Poole. Additional pitch capacity could be provided through a combination of: improving the quality and / or maintenance regimes of existing pitches to improve quality from “poor” or “standard” to “good”; providing floodlighting to increase evening training capacity; securing community use on current unsecure sites; new additional pitches at existing club grounds where feasible; introduction of the new pipeline pitch at Slades Farm; consolidating rugby use and increasing pitch capacity on shared sports pitch sites and / or, a rugby focused 3G pitch.
- Oakmeadians RFC is a large club with potential to grow the number of teams in the future. However, it has limited capacity to do so on its current site (Meyrick Park) and pitches are overplayed. Pitch quality improvements are key to ensuring the club can sustain current levels of (and increase) play at the site. A new pitch in the pipeline at Slades Farm will provide some additional capacity but not a sufficient amount to not require quality improvements to be made at Meyrick Park (i.e. Slades Farm is not a solution to overcoming capacity issues).
- Poole RFC has capacity to grow at their ground at Turlin Moor, capacity which should be protected for future demand which could appear in the long-term.
- East Dorset RFC’s ground at Iford Playing Fields does not have security of use for the club. This is a key issue which needs resolving in order for the club to access funding from RFU to improve capacity through provision of floodlighting. The site should be protected for rugby union use and discussions need to continue on whether the football pitch on the site
can be utilised for rugby in the future if the club grows. There are other issues relating to the club’s use of the facilities that need resolving between the Council and the club.

- Bournemouth RFC is a large club, and which has expressed an intention to move away from Chapel Gate. However, the capacity at the site should be protected as current tenants moving away could provide an opportunity for other clubs (for example, Dockers RFC and East Dorset RFC have indicated a willingness to consolidate on a single site and move away from their current grounds at Barrack Road and Iford respectively.
- While Chapel Gate is considered a strategically important facility across a wider area than just Christchurch (including Bournemouth and southern Dorset), its location on the northern edge of the Borough means that it is not well-related (in terms of proximity) to much of Bournemouth’s and Christchurch’s main population along the coast.
- A rugby compliant 3G pitch could be explored to increase available capacity for rugby and also help deliver additional capacity for football training at Chapel Gate or Slades Farm (as a second 3G pitch alongside the football 3G in the pipeline) or another site.

Other Sports

- There is one American Football club operating in Bournemouth, Bournemouth Bobcats. They are a nomadic club, currently having no home ground as there base year after year. There have been discussions about shared use of East Dorset RFC’s rugby ground in the past if a second rugby pitch could be secured at the site, but this option use has proven challenging to secure at the site. There could be opportunities to accommodate the club at the new pitch site at Slades Farm and this is an option which should be considered moving forward. Bournemouth University has an American Football team which plays predominantly at Chapel Gate.
- Lacrosse in the study area has had a history of having sufficient numbers to form a club with teams in some years and not in others. Participation numbers ebb and flow and can change from year to year with a good proportion of players being students from the University meaning that club formation is often reliant on a fluctuating pool of players. However, the University does have teams in its own right most years, usually playing at Chapel Gate. England Lacrosse has been trying to establish a club with a more stable number of players to maintain teams every year. Clubs have used both Chapel Gate and Talbot Heath School in the past and provision should be made as this strategy is delivered for certainty of capacity to be established at a site suitable for a club’s demand within the Borough through ongoing discussion with England Lacrosse, the Club and pitch providers.

General

- The current supply of playing pitches should be protected from loss with any “mothballed” sites retained to accommodate future capacity for growth.
- The provision of any new grass or artificial pitch will need to demonstrate long-term cost viability prior to delivery and should made available for secure community use where possible.
- A “plan, deliver, monitor, manage” approach should be taken to the provision of new pitches and the management and any necessary “re-packaging” of existing supply. Provision of additional pitches / capacity should be made in response to demonstrable demand “on the ground”.
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1. Introduction
(What is a Playing Pitch Strategy and why has it been developed?)

1.1 In late 2017, we (Stuart Todd Associates Ltd.) were commissioned by Active Dorset, Bournemouth Borough Council and Borough of Poole to help refresh and update the playing pitch strategy produced in 2013/14 as part of the Joint Borough Sports Strategy. We were also commissioned, in autumn 2018, to produce a PPS for Christchurch Borough. This strategy brings together both draft strategies given the formation of the new Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole Council (BCP Council). The strategy process has focused on updating local knowledge on pitch sites with some quality audits undertaken where the Steering Group has felt it necessary to gather new information as a result of known changes to pitch provision in recent years or to fill gaps in knowledge or arising from survey responses from clubs and providers. The strategy is compliant with the most up-to-date Sport England Playing Pitch Strategy (PPS) guidance (issued in October 2013\(^1\)). Development of the strategy necessitates a lengthy process to gather and analyse data across different sports’ seasons, consult with key stakeholders and ensure agreement of the strategy’s content by sports governing bodies and Sport England. Where possible, the approach to the strategy’s development has sought to expedite this process, without compromising the need to meet the requirements of the guidance. The strategy covers the period between 2018 and 2033 to provide updated evidence to inform the Local Plan process.

1.2 A PPS plays a number of important roles in sport, leisure and planning terms, and also has a direct link into the health and wellbeing agenda both in relation to formal club based sport but also social, casual and informal sport aimed at getting people more active (with positive outcomes for mental as well as physical health). At its basic level, the PPS provides an audit of the quality, quantity and accessibility of playing pitches, establishes the current levels of demand (and therefore whether pitches are being over or under used) and projects forward demand likely to arise by the end of the strategy period so that the appropriate level of pitch provision can be planned for the future.

1.3 The PPS:

- Can be used as robust evidence to protect existing playing pitches and playing fields;
- Can help to improve the quality of offer and provision by identifying and quantifying issues relating to the quality of pitches and ancillary facilities;
- Can be used by clubs and teams and pitch providers to support applications for funding for the improvement of the quality, quantity and accessibility of provision;
- Helps to defend against inappropriate development or loss of pitches;
- Informs planning policy development; and,
- Provides a strategic view and options for the provision of pitches during the strategy period;
- Forms an important part of the “package” of strategies, evidence and actions which can contribute towards improving the physical and mental health and wellbeing of those who live and work in the Borough.

It is for these reasons, and to ensure that the Borough has an up-to-date PPS guidance compliant strategy, that it was commissioned.

1.4 What the strategy does not and cannot do is provide a blueprint for change to 2033. The strategy can present options based on evidence and assessment of it (and indeed recommendations) but cannot do the work necessary (for example, logistical, feasibility and viability work) required to confirm actions with 100% certainty and make things happen “on the ground”, which is the task of the many stakeholders (such as clubs, providers, owners and managers of pitches) and bodies (such as the Borough Council, sports governing bodies and Sport England) responsible for delivery of pitches and facilities following the strategy’s adoption.

---

2. The Study Area
(What is the extent of the study area?)

2.1 The study area for the PPS is the whole of the BCP Council area, as shown on the map below (Figure 1). The locations of all pitches identified in the study are shown in Appendix 1 to this strategy and details of each pitch and site are set out in the Assessment Reports which accompany this strategy document.

2.2 Much of the data on pitches is listed and broken down into sub-areas within the former Boroughs. This has been done to help provide more localised assessment than that which can be provided at a Borough-wide scale. The sub areas used, as shown in Figure 1, are consistent with those used in the Joint Borough Sports Strategy in 2013/14 and comprise aggregations of electoral wards. Use of these sub areas for this PPS was confirmed by the Steering Group overseeing the work.

2.3 The assessment and strategy were prepared in the knowledge that local government review was underway across Dorset, which has resulted in the newly formed BCP Council.

Figure 1: Study Area and Sub-Areas

Sub-area references

Bournemouth:
B1 Talbot & Branksome Woods, Central, Westbourne & West Cliff
B2 Boscombe East, Boscombe West, East Cliff & Springbourne
B3 Kinson North, Kinson South, Redhill & Northbourne
B4 Wallisdown & Winton West, Winton East, Queen’s Park
B5 Throop & Muscliff, Strouden Park
B6 West Southbourne, East Southbourne & Tuckton, Littledown & Iford

Christchurch – Composition of Sub Areas (Wards):
C1 Grange, Mudeford & Friars Cliff, Purewell & Stanpit
C2 Highcliffe, West Highcliffe, North Highcliffe & Walkford
C3 Portfield, Jumpers, Town Centre
C4 Burton & Winkton
C5 St Catherine’s & Hurn

Poole:
P1 Hamworthy East, Hamworthy West, Poole Town
P2 Parkstone, Penn Hill, Newtown
P3 Canford Cliffs, Branksome East, Branksome West, Alderney
P4 Oakdale, Canford Heath East, Canford Heath West
P5 Creekmoor, Broadstone, Merley & Bearwood
3. Typology
(What sports and types of pitches does the strategy cover?)

3.1 The strategy does not consider all sports which use pitches. The typology for the playing pitch assessment is as follows:

- Outdoor grass pitches used for football, rugby union and cricket;
- Outdoor full-size artificial grass pitches (AGPs) used predominantly for hockey and / or football (which can be partitioned to make a number of smaller pitches for smaller sided games or training); and,
- Outdoor smaller, dedicated or “formal” AGPs (where booking is required, i.e. not open multi-use games areas) used predominantly for small sided football (games e.g. 5, 6 or 7-a-side).

3.2 The strategy does not consider use of indoor sports halls, “kick-about” areas or, as indicated above multi-use games areas (MUGAs), although it is recognised that these play important roles in the provision of space for informal / casual play and many different sports.

3.3 While all pitches meeting the above criteria are identified for the purposes of establishing the quantity of pitches available, only those pitches with some “community use” during the “peak period” are taken forward in the assessment of provision. This is because the PPS is concerned with understanding and planning for public or wider use (for example by one or more clubs or teams) and accessibility, than that provided for a single user. Pitches without community use will tend to be used only by one group of users and will typically include mainly school sites. These are important to school pupils and students and will often not be available for wider community use to protect the quality of provision, for reasons of security and child safeguarding, or for logistical reasons such as not being able to open a school site up at a weekend or evening. However, an understanding of pitches not currently available for community use or access are noted to be able to understand the role they could potentially play in supporting provision in the future.

3.4 “Community use” does extend to those sites which are provided on a commercial basis and those which require a membership fee for use (where those fees are not exorbitant and where membership is not unduly restrictive).

3.5 Analysis of the supply of and demand for community use pitches is also split into developing an understanding of those pitches which have some security of community use (for example a long-term lease, covenant and / or community use agreement) and those which have unsecure community use (for example, where such agreements are absent and reliance is on a verbal or other form of informal arrangement). This distinction is important, as those pitches which are used by the community or clubs on unsecure sites are at risk of being taken away from supply (for example if the provided decides that they no longer wish to host clubs or other community use), sometimes at short notice, placing additional pressure on those sites with secure community use. During the assessment, consideration has been given to the degree of risk that reliance on use of unsecure sites is placing on supply overall.

4. Methodology
(How has the strategy been developed?)

4.1 It has been important that the development of the PPS has followed the guidance published by Sport England and which has been agreed by the national governing bodies (NGBs) for the sports considered by the strategy. Use of the guidance, and data verification and checks on the quality of the various outputs during the strategy’s development by these bodies ensures that the final strategy is robust, fits with their priorities and their own strategies and benefits from those bodies’ support as

---

2 The peak period is Monday – Thursday 5pm – 9pm, Friday 5pm – 7pm and Saturday and Sundays 9am – 5pm.
its options are explored and actions delivered. This check was particularly important as the budget for the work limited the amount of primary data that could be collected.

4.2 Sport England’s PPS guidance sets out a ten-step process to be followed to ensure that the PPS is robust. Discussion has been held and agreement made between Active Dorset, local authorities, NGBs and Sport England to ensure that the refresh approach captures all of the relevant information and data required by the PPS methodology without having to completely revise the strategy’s data (and go through the whole process for all pitches from the start). Data from steps 2 and 3 have been captured in a large MS Excel spreadsheet made available to the Steering Group and analysis of the data is presented in reports setting out summary tables of key data and issues (the “Assessment Reports”). Those reports sit alongside this strategy as the evidence for its overall “direction of travel” and specific actions for sports and pitches. It documents, step-by-step and in detail, the data and information which has been gathered and analysis of that done during steps 2 to 7 in the 10-step approach below.

Figure 3: the Ten-Step Approach

4.3 The logical steps that the report takes to address steps 2 to 7 are set out below. Put simply, for each of the sports (football, cricket, hockey and rugby union) and pitch types (grass and artificial) in the typology the report assesses current supply, demand, accessibility, availability, quality, quantity and issues with provision, to set out the position now; and then projects likely future need and demand forward to understand requirements for each sport and pitch type in the future and the changes necessary to ensure provision is adequate to meet these future needs.
4.4 The supply and demand information and data used in the assessment was collected over several months during 2013/14 for Bournemouth and Poole with updated and refreshed data on some sites collected in the summer and autumn of 2017. For the Christchurch part of the strategy, data was collected and verified in 2018/19.
5. Consultation and Management
(Who has been involved in the strategy’s development?)

Steering Group

5.1 PPS guidance requires the development of the strategy to be steered and managed by a “steering group”. This typically includes (at least) the commissioning local authority, Sport England and sports governing bodies (NGBs). The involvement of a steering group is particularly important given the importance of its members in the “grounding” and delivery of the strategy. The steering group plays a significant role by:

- considering (through “check and challenge”) information and data during the process;
- verifying and helping to localise data;
- providing a connection with local providers, clubs and teams;
- helping to put locally gathered information into a strategic context; and,
- commenting on and shaping the outputs of the study at each stage in the process and giving approval required by the PPS guidance prior to the process moving to the next stage.

5.2 NGBs have played a key role, in particular, and their role and commitment to the process is set out in the PPS guidance. The steering group has been chaired by an officer from Active Dorset.

Figure 5: Steering Group Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Named Representative(s) on Steering Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Active Dorset</td>
<td>Martin Kimberley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bournemouth Borough Council (and now BCP Council)</td>
<td>Paul Mitchell, Michael Rowland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borough of Poole (and now BCP Council)</td>
<td>Jan Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christchurch Borough Council (and now BCP Council)</td>
<td>Alan Ottaway, Maria Walton, Laura Bright</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christchurch Borough Council (input provided prior to the combined authority being formed)</td>
<td>Paul Rutter, Simon Trueick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rugby Football Union</td>
<td>Jon Bendle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football Association</td>
<td>Sacha Nicholas (Hampshire FA), Kathryn Purnell (Dorset FA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorset Cricket Board</td>
<td>Keith Brewer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England Cricket Board</td>
<td>Neil Higginson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England Hockey</td>
<td>Jo Hawley, Gaynor Toms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport England</td>
<td>Bob Sharples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stuart Todd Associates Ltd.</td>
<td>Stuart Todd, Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Colin Johnson (Associate Sports Consultant) (providing education sector expertise)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.3 Communication with the steering group has not simply been through meetings at key stages of the process. The project lead (Martin Kimberley) has kept an ongoing dialogue with members of the steering group throughout the process, and the consultant responsible for producing this strategy has also maintained ongoing dialogue with the steering group members as the work has progressed.

Consultation

5.4 Consultation is an integral and important part of the PPS’ development, as set out above. For the Bournemouth and Poole elements of the strategy, extensive consultation was undertaken for the playing pitches elements in the Joint Borough Sports Strategy in 2013/14. For these areas and for
Christchurch, for those pitches where updated data has been required for the strategy refresh, in addition to the role of the steering group members outlined above providing detailed information about specific sites and clubs where required, consultation has been undertaken, prior to the strategy being produced, in the following ways:

- online surveys early in the process sent to relevant clubs, pitch owners, pitch managers, pitch providers and schools (by the Active Dorset and sports governing bodies) to ascertain up-to-date baseline information about quality, accessibility, demand for pitches and ancillary facilities being reviewed and other important issues of concern;

- face-to-face on-site meetings with some of those managing and maintaining sites during the pitch audit process (undertaken by Active Dorset);

- face-to-face meetings with some clubs (undertaken by various members of the steering group); and,

- telephone and face-to-face interviews with schools, colleges and academies in the study area (undertaken by SASP in the Bournemouth and Poole areas) identified as priorities for engagement by the steering group.

5.5 This strategy is also now subject to wider consultation and views will help to inform and confirm the strategy’s direction of travel, identify any issues missed and supplement or update information since the data was gathered. Any changes in data identified through consultation will only be updated further at this stage if it would be likely to require a fundamental change to the conclusions overall for that sport or pitch type. The use of pitches and issues of concern can change from season to season and so some flexibility in the interpretation of results at the pitch specific level will be required, something which will need to be acknowledged as the strategy is delivered and as solutions are identified. This is one of the reasons why, as noted above, the strategy cannot provide a blueprint for change but instead focuses on key actions and options for change to improve the quality of provision and respond appropriately to changes in demand to 2033. In this context, the actions which arise from the process are considered to be “live”.
6. Responsibilities
(Who has ownership of the strategy and who will deliver its actions?)

6.1 While the development of the strategy was commissioned by Active Dorset, in partnership with the former Bournemouth Borough Council, Christchurch Borough Council and Borough of Poole, (and therefore ownership of the strategy rests with Active Dorset and the newly created BCP Council), this does not suggest that any additional pitches or facilities proposed to fill identified shortfalls or future provision must be funded and / or delivered and / or maintained by the local authority, or indeed Active Dorset. The nature of sports facility and pitch provision has been changing over the last decade or so nationally with the role of local authorities now moving away from that of a provider, maintainer and operator of facilities to that of a facilitator and enabler. However, the strategy has an important role in informing the current and future reviews of the Council’s Local Plan, Infrastructure Delivery Plan, Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) and approach to CIL and s106 planning obligations. It will also play an important role informing the decision-making process as the Council considers planning applications (as the local planning authority) which relate to the protection, enhancement and provision of pitches and facilities.

6.2 New pitches and facilities are most likely to be provided in partnership by the local authority, sports organisations, national sports governing bodies, the education sector / establishments, clubs, businesses and operators, or more commonly by a combination of one or more of these. The local authority is likely to play a key enabling and co-ordination role in planning for and the delivery of new pitches and facilities across the Borough. The same applies to the improvement of existing pitches and facilities, where management and / or ownership of existing facilities is no longer (or never has been) the responsibility of the Council. The current landscape of pitch provision therefore requires the steering group members each to (continue to) play an important role in helping to deliver the strategy’s recommendations and action framework.

7. Other Strategies & Plans and Funding Opportunities
(What key strategies & plans and funding opportunities are relevant to the PPS strategy?)

7.1 There are a number of important strategies and plans which are relevant to the PPS strategy, both on the sport and planning side which are briefly summarised below. It is important to note the context that they provide, both for the strategy to be produced and also for the recommendations and actions it presents. There are other strategies and plans with which this strategy has a connection. However, these cannot all be summarised here.

7.2 We acknowledge and recommend, however, that important links should continue to be made by appropriate bodies between this strategy for pitches and sport and those produced for issues such as health & wellbeing (including leisure and active lives), green infrastructure, transport, economic development and wider planning programmes (in addition to those strategies summarised below).
National Planning Policy Framework and National Planning Practice Guidance

7.3 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)\(^3\) sets out the Government’s planning policies which provide, alongside various legislation, the ‘rules’ of the planning system. It sets out a ‘golden thread’ for the planning system which should respond positively to help achieve the delivery of sustainable development. Paragraph 11 states that there is “a presumption in favour of sustainable development” and implies that there is a need for local authorities to react positively to other policies in the NPPF. In relation to playing pitches, there is particular importance to respond positively to section 8 of the NPPF “Promoting Healthy and Safe Communities” which states (in paragraph 92) that planning policies and decisions should “…plan positively for the provision and use of shared spaces, community facilities (such as…meeting places, sports venues, open space…) and other local services to enhance the sustainability of communities and residential environments” and “guard against the unnecessary loss of valued facilities and services”.

7.4 Paragraphs 96 and 97 (see box) go further in relation to sport specifically and provide the basis of and justification for an up-to-date assessment of playing pitch provision and an associated strategy. They include important reference to the role of facilities and pitches to health and wellbeing and provide the policy ‘hook’ on which planning policies, backed up by an up-to-date assessment of need, can be developed.

7.5 The Government’s Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) helps the policies in the NPPF to be interpreted and appropriately applied through a series of questions and answers for various topics. The guidance refers to Sport England guidance in relation to assessing needs for sport and offers advice on how open space should be taken into account in planning (Paragraph: 001, Reference ID: 37-001-20140306, Revision date 06-03-14 – see box).

7.6 Again, this ties in the importance of the consideration of pitches in a wider context including health, recreation and landscape.

---

Current Borough-wide Adopted Planning Policies

7.7 The most relevant planning policies relating to the protection and provision of playing fields and pitches are contained within the respective “development plans” for the Borough, namely, the Bournemouth Borough Council adopted Core Strategy 2012, Borough of Poole’s Local Plan 2013-33 adopted in November 2018 and adopted Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy 2014. The key (non-site-specific) policies relating to playing pitches for the former local authority areas, until superseded by a replacement Local Plan covering the new administrative area, are reproduced below.

---

**Policy CS30 Promoting Green Infrastructure**

The Council, through its own strategies and work programmes, and working with developers and other partners, will provide for a well connected and distributed multi-functional green infrastructure network, identifying the Borough as an urban green zone and the coastal strip as a coastal enhancement zone, that:

- Retains and enhances Bournemouth’s attractiveness as a tourist destination and its location for economic investment;
- Assists in the mitigation of and adaptation to, climate change;
- Assists with flood and surface water attenuation;
- Improves sustainable access through improved walking and cycling routes to key destinations, the coast and open spaces;
- Connects and enhances biodiversity and wildlife habitats;
- Promotes a healthy population through environmental enhancements, and increased access to open space, formal and informal recreation and sport opportunities;
- Enhances the townscape, landscape, historical and cultural identity of the Borough;
- Offers residents the opportunity to grow their own food through allotment and community garden provision;
- Enhances the coastal strip including the beach, chines, cliffs, cliff top and Christchurch Harbour; and
- Links to and complements sub-regional green infrastructure provision.

---

**Policy CS31 Recreation, Play and Sports**

The Local Planning Authority will refuse planning permission for development that results in the loss of public and private open spaces, including sports grounds and play grounds, which contribute to the recreational, visual, ecological or environmental value of an area or contribute to a network of green infrastructure, except where it is demonstrated to be underused and surplus to requirements and the benefits arising from development outweigh the loss of the space.

The Council, through its own strategies and work programmes, and working with developers and other partners will seek to ensure that the quality, quantity, type and location of open space, sports grounds and play grounds meet demand for recreation and sporting activities.

New residential development will be required to assist in the delivery of open space and recreational facilities.

---

**Policy PP26 Sports, recreation and community facilities**

1. New facilities

The Council supports proposals for new sports, recreation and community facilities or the enhancement/expansion of existing facilities if they are located in areas that are easily accessible by the local community through public transport and/or convenient walking and cycling routes.

2. Protecting existing sports and recreation facilities

Existing sports and recreation facilities, including school playing fields, will be protected from development unless:

a) replacement provision of an equivalent or greater quantity and quality is provided in a suitable location to meet the needs of the catchment population;

b) the development provides an alternative community benefit to outweigh the loss of the facility; or

c) it can be demonstrated that the facility is surplus to requirements through a robust and up to date assessment of need with specific consideration given to the Council’s Playing Pitch Assessment and/or Built Facilities Assessment.

3. Existing community facilities

The Council will seek to retain sites currently or last used for community facilities. Development that would lead to the loss of such premises will only be permitted where the proposals provide sufficient community benefit to outweigh the loss of the existing facility or service and it can be demonstrated that:

a) the loss would not result in a substantial decline in the range of facilities and services for local people; or

b) the facility is no longer needed and it is not feasible to support its continued existence.

---

7.8 Policies in adopted development plans have statutory (legal) weight in the planning system. It should be noted that policies within the plans should not be read or used in isolation from other policies in the plans which might be relevant to planning applications (i.e. development plans should be read as a whole).

7.9 This strategy and its recommendations can inform the review of these planning policies at the appropriate time and their interpretation and use while they remain adopted. The strategy can also inform the review of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) alongside the use of section 106 planning obligations. The PPS methodology does not recommend the use of provision standards for pitches and standards are therefore not recommended for inclusion in the emerging new Local Plan. However, should planning officers need to understand a snapshot of provision required in relation to specific development proposals to understand the demand arising from specific developments and the level of financial contributions to seek from development, Sport England has produced a playing pitch calculator to understand requirements for pitch numbers and costs. The latest version of the calculator can be obtained from Sport England but must not be used in isolation from this strategy’s recommendations.

7.10 BCP Council is developing a new Local Plan to replace the current adopted Plans for the former local authority areas. A first consultation on the Plan ran until 18th November 2019. It is the intention that a new BCP-wide Local Plan will be in place (adopted) within the next 4 years.

Neighbourhood Plans

7.11 Neighbourhood plans are statutory development plans which can be prepared by parish and town councils and neighbourhood plan forums in unparished areas. They provide a layer of local detailed

---

planning policy within the context of national and Borough planning policies. In BCP, the following parishes are developing or have an adopted (“made”) neighbourhood plan. The stage at which the plans have reached in October 2019 are stated in brackets.

**Bournemouth**
1. Boscombe and Pokesdown Neighbourhood Plan (Referendum held, awaiting adoption / being “made”)
2. Queen’s Park Ward Area Neighbourhood Plan (designated Neighbourhood Area and Forum)

**Christchurch**
3. Burton Parish (Area designated in December 2018 and plan development in progress)
4. Hurn Parish (Area designated in February 2019 and plan development in progress)

**Poole**
5. Broadstone Neighbourhood Plan (Made)
6. Poole Quays Neighbourhood Plan (Made)

These plans are important to take into account in terms of how the strategy deals with pitches in those areas relative to policies in the plans. There is also a connection between the priorities that a community identifies in terms of infrastructure provision (including pitches and facilities), the recommendations made for specific sites in this strategy and any Community Infrastructure Levy payments made to the local community which should be recognised by all of those organisations and providers with an interest and / or responsibility in maintaining and delivering high quality spaces, sports pitches and ancillary / associated facilities.

---

7 See [https://www.bournemouth.gov.uk/planningbuilding/PlanningPolicy/Other-Planning-Documents/queens-park-ward-area-neighbourhood-plan.aspx](https://www.bournemouth.gov.uk/planningbuilding/PlanningPolicy/Other-Planning-Documents/queens-park-ward-area-neighbourhood-plan.aspx)
8 See [https://burtonparishcouncil.gov.uk/neighbourhood-plan/](https://burtonparishcouncil.gov.uk/neighbourhood-plan/)
7.13 In 2016, Sport England published their latest strategy, “Towards an Active Nation”¹², which reflects a change from the principal focus of support in previous strategies being on support for competitive sport to the focus now being on people getting more active and growing participation, whether through competitive sport or informal / casual sport.

7.14 As the extract from the strategy (see box) shows, the key strands of the strategy are to tackle inactivity, investing more in children and young people, helping to reduce the costs of activity on public spending, helping the sports sector to be more welcoming and inclusive, helping to keep sport up-to-date with regard to digital expectations, encouraging stronger local collaboration, working with a wider range of partners and encouraging behaviour change.

7.15 The impact of this push towards increased informal participation in sport and for younger ages is likely manifest in slightly different ways for different sports in relation to pitch provision, but for grass pitches it may mean ensuring that there is a focus on good quality provision for younger age groups, ensuring that younger age groups are retained in sports as they move into adulthood by ensuring consistency of that good quality into adult sport and helping to ensure that there is sufficient capacity on artificial pitches to support casual formats of sports.

¹² See https://www.sportengland.org/media/10629/sport-england-towards-an-active-nation.pdf

7.16 The FA’s “Strategic Plan 2016-2020”\(^{13}\) is a high-level plan which sets out 7 priority aims for the FA. In relation to the amateur game, the focus on female football (to double the player base) and on participation (providing flexible, inclusive and accessible playing opportunities for everyone) are the most relevant to this PPS.

7.17 The FA also has a “National Game Strategy for Participation and Development 2018-2021”\(^{14}\) which sets out, in brief, how the FA will channel £260 million of investment to boost participation and the development of grassroots football in England (see extracts in boxes) with a focus on participation, player development, better training and playing facilities and improvements in the football workforce and improved technology to help run the game more efficiently. The FA is also working with Sport England, the Football Foundation, Premier League and local authorities through the “Parklife” programme\(^{15}\) to deliver £200 million of investment over 15 years to 2033 to provide 120 affordable and sustainable hub / cluster sites across England with artificial pitches and improved facilities at the grass roots level. The FA is also developing “Local Football Facility Plans”, short, well defined investment plan that captures current football facility assets and identifies investment priorities in local authority areas. Most priority projects identified for delivery will need to have been identified in Playing Pitch Strategies to feature in the plans.

7.18 The Football Association have engaged consultants to develop and produce, nation-wide, Local Football Facilities Plans (LFFPs). According to the FA, LFFPs are being produced for every local authority in England. They will set a 10-year vision to transform local football facilities, identify priority projects, act as an investment portfolio for projects that require funding and will be updated on a regular basis. They are particularly important as they will guide 90% of national football investment. It is the intent that the LFFPs will compliment and take forward actions identified in the Playing Pitch Strategy for each authority area. It is important to note that LFFPs are not a replacement or substitute for a PPS. The Poole LFFP has recently been completed, while in Bournemouth and Christchurch, the LFFP process has recently commenced.

---


\(^{15}\) See [https://www.sportengland.org/funding/parklife/](https://www.sportengland.org/funding/parklife/)
England Hockey “Facilities Strategy” 2017-2033

7.19 As is the case with a number of NGBs, EH’s new facilities strategy reflects the new Sport England strategy, “Towards an Active Nation”. The strategy is based on what it calls a “virtuous circle” which aims to use the success of hockey on the international stage to help create and maintain visibility of the sport and therefore increase participation, both through formal play at clubs and other formats and casual play through offers such as Quicksticks, In2Hockey, Flyerz and Back to Hockey and increasing the number of young players through increasing links with schools. The strategy has 3 key objectives: to protect pitches, improve facilities and develop facilities. These translate into the strategy’s focus: to retain current provision where appropriate to ensure that hockey is maintained across the country; with current facilities stock ageing, to see strategic investment into refurbishing pitches and ancillary facilities, and recognising that more support is required for clubs to obtain better agreements with facilities providers and to receive better education about owning and maintaining an asset; and, respond to identified demand for multi pitches in the right places to consolidate hockey and allow clubs to have all of their provision catered for at one site.

England and Wales Cricket Board “Inspiring Generations” 2020-2024

7.20 The ECB’s current 5-year plan, “Inspiring Generations” was published in 2019. It sets out six clear priorities for how the challenges cricket faces can be tackled and states that it is a plan that can adapt and flex to the fast pace of change being seen in the sport, while respecting and protecting the valued traditions of the game and setting out how the next generation of fans can be attracted to the game.

7.21 Amongst the many important actions set out for cricket across the game, specifically in relation to pitch provision and use, the strategy includes actions such as: invest in club facilities; install non-traditional playing facilities in urban areas; double cricket participation in primary schools; deliver a compelling and coordinated recreational playing offer from age five upwards; grow the base (in girls’ and women’s cricket) through participation and facilities investment; launch centres of excellence (for girls’ and women’s cricket) and a new elite domestic structure; deliver a girls’ secondary school programme; double the number of volunteers in the game; and, increase participation in disability cricket. The

---

16 See [https://www.englandhockey.co.uk/page.asp?section=2075&sectionTitle=Facilities+Strategy](https://www.englandhockey.co.uk/page.asp?section=2075&sectionTitle=Facilities+Strategy)
17 See [http://www.ecb.co.uk/](http://www.ecb.co.uk/)
strategy’s aim is that by 2024, there will be a generation which will be inspired to say that “cricket is a game for me”.

Rugby Football Union National Facilities Strategy

7.22 The RFU National Facilities Strategy\textsuperscript{18} is in the process of being revised to reflect the new Sport England strategy “Towards an Active Nation”. However, the focus seems likely to follow the direction of travel set by the Sport England strategy. The main areas of focus for the 2013-2017 strategy are reproduced for context (see box). The strategy’s ten priorities are:

1. Clarity of focus; 2. Overhaul strategy setting and business planning; 3. Develop the quality of leadership; 4. Improve the quality of experience; 5. Maximise the opportunity of RWC 2015; 6. Establish a robust approach to investing RFU money and resources in the sport; 7. Evolve style and effectiveness of communications; 8. Create a culture of collaboration and teamwork across the organisation; 9. Minimise bureaucracy and simplify governance; 10. Develop domestic and international relations.

The Strategy’s Relationship with Health and Wellbeing

7.23 The PPS has clear links to helping maintain and improve the physical and mental health and wellbeing of residents in the Borough through the use of pitches by both formal sports clubs and teams, informal and social use of facilities such as artificial grass pitches (AGPs) and also the use of grass pitch space where it is part of an area of open greenspace such as a park or recreation ground. The public health agenda and provision for sport is becoming more focused on provision for informal, casual and social play in addition to formal / competitive play, in order to help get people more active in their day to day lives. There is also a clear role for multi-purpose pavilion or clubhouse facilities in the promotion and use of pitch and facility space for sport and other wider health and recreation activities. It will be important, therefore, for the PPS to inform the Dorset and BCP Health and Wellbeing Boards’ review of the Health and Wellbeing Strategy and as they create a new Physical Activity Strategy in 2020. There are also close links between the provision of good quality pitches and facility infrastructure with the work of Active Dorset whose mission is “To establish Dorset as a place where people choose to enjoy an active lifestyle through participation in sport and physical activity”.

\textsuperscript{18} See http://www.englandrugby.com/mm/Document/Governance/ClubSupport/01/30/36/31/nationalfacilitiesstrategyversion_Neutral.pdf
7.24 The data which underpins the Health and Wellbeing Strategy is set out in the Joint Strategic Needs Assessment (JSNA) which, amongst other data, cites the link between levels of deprivation (identified by the Indices of Multiple Deprivation) across the Borough and impacts on health. Levels of deprivation will need to be considered alongside future programmes of improvement of existing pitches and facilities (where needed) in the Borough and how best to utilise greenspace for improvement in levels of activity, which may or may not involve playing pitches.

7.25 Many of the recommendations of the strategy link closely with some of the principles of “Active Design” supported by Sport England, and the appropriate provision of pitches and associated facilities (in terms of location and quality) can help contribute positively to achieving the delivery of active places “on the ground”.

Funding Opportunities

7.26 The nature of funding for sports pitches and facilities is constantly changing and evolving. This strategy, therefore, given that it covers an extensive period of time, does not seek to define what current funding opportunities are in detail due to changes which will undoubtedly occur over time. However, the list below provides a brief (but not exhaustive) summary of funding opportunities across sports. Readers should not rely on this list being either comprehensive or up-to-date and those with an interest in funding pitch maintenance, improvement or additional new provision should discuss funding opportunities available to them at the time of interest with the local authority, Sport England, Sports Governing Bodies and other relevant organisations such as the Football Foundation, Rugby Football Foundation and National Hockey Foundation.

Across-sports

- Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)
- Section 106 planning obligations
- Sport England Small Grants Programme
- Big Lottery Fund
- Public Work Loans Board (PWLB)

19 The JSNA report which includes data on the IMD is available to view here: https://www.bournemouth.gov.uk/councildemocratic/AboutYourCouncil/AboutYourCouncilDocs/BPHWB/JSNA20102015final.pdf
20 See https://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/active-design/ for Active Design, October 2015
22 a charge on new developments applied by the local authority to developments which meet certain criteria and is most often collected for housing schemes on a charge per square metre – see https://www.bournemouth.gov.uk/planningbuilding/PlanningPolicy/Other-Planning-Documents/community-infrastructure-levy.aspx and https://www.poole.gov.uk/planning-and-building-control/planning-policy-and-guidance/community-infrastructure-levy/ for more information
23 Section 106 planning obligations deliver infrastructure and site specific requirements related to a development that cannot be delivered through CIL but are necessary in order for planning permission to be granted. Contact your local authority for further information on the application of section 106 to sports facilities and pitches outside of CIL.
24 See http://www.lotterygoodcauses.org.uk/funding/small-grants
25 See https://www.biglotteryfund.org.uk/
Football

- Pitch Improvement Programme
- Shared Access (floodlights)
- Premier League and FA Facilities Fund
- Premier League and FA Facilities Fund Small Grants Fund
- Football Stadia Improvement Fund

Rugby Union

- Helping Hand Grant
- Groundmatch Grant Scheme

Hockey

- National Hockey Foundation Grants

Cricket

- Small Grants Scheme
- Interest Free Loan Scheme
- Jewson Privilege Account Scheme

7.27 In addition to accessing capital funding opportunities, those providing additional pitches and facilities must take into account the long-term revenue implications of running, managing, maintaining and replacing facilities and pitches as they plan for the future. Many funders providing capital grants and loans will likely require a sustainable viability test and / or business plan to be in place (particularly where large sums of money are involved).

25 See https://www.pwlb.gov.uk/responsibilities/local-authority-lending-pwlb/
27 See http://www.thefa.com/get-involved/player/facilities/the-fa-pitch-improvement-programme
28 See http://www.thefa.com/get-involved/player/clubs-leagues/shared-access
29 See https://www.footballfoundation.org.uk/funding-schemes/premier-league-the-fa-facilities-fund/
30 See https://www.footballfoundation.org.uk/funding-schemes/premier-league-the-fa-facilities-fund-small-grants-scheme/
31 See https://www.fsif.co.uk/about-fsif/
33 See http://www.rugbyfootballfoundation.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=19&catid=16&Itemid=121
34 See http://www.54408.mrsite.com/index.htm
35 See https://www.ecb.co.uk/be-involved/club-support/club-funding/england-wales-cricket-trust-small-grant
36 See https://www.ecb.co.uk/be-involved/club-support/club-funding/england-wales-cricket-trust-interest-free-loan
37 See https://www.ecb.co.uk/be-involved/club-support/club-funding/jewson-privilege-account-scheme
8. The Vision for Playing Pitches in Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole
(What should the strategy seek to achieve?)

8.1 At the start of the PPS process, the Steering Group overseeing the strategy’s development agreed a Vision for the strategy. The Vision, set out below, sets the tone for the treatment of playing pitches in the Borough during the strategy period to the year 2033 and in doing so will inform the review of the current Borough-wide Core Strategy / Local Plan documents.

**Vision**

“This strategy centres on the provision of high-quality playing pitches which are as inviting as possible. It aims to meet the demand for participation in club based and informal / casual sports, provided in partnership and which:

✓ help to improve the health and wellbeing of the resident population;
✓ are attractive and welcoming to the community;
✓ increase accessibility, in particular, to the least active and under-represented residents;
✓ contribute to the overall economic and visitor ‘offer’ of the towns; and,
✓ are viable and financially sustainable into the future.”
9. The Objectives of the Playing Pitch Strategy
(How will the strategy meet the aspirations set out in the Vision?)

9.1 Accompanying the strategy’s Vision, a set of objectives has also been developed which set out what the strategy is seeking to achieve. The objectives reflect the role of the strategy in contributing towards sport, activity, health and wellbeing; and, providing up-to-date evidence and strategy framework to help protect, enhance and provide pitches and demonstrate the demand and need for pitches, with the aim of provision in the right places and at the right time.

Objectives

- To provide a carefully quantified and documented assessment of current and future needs for playing pitches and pitch sports within the borough focusing on quantity and quality issues within the supply and demand equation
- To provide information to assist asset management planning of council owned playing fields and the associated buildings
- To provide information to assist in decisions associated with the provision of public playing pitches
- To provide information to underpin the protection, enhancement and quality improvement of the existing pitch stock and ancillary facilities
- To map out a process for improvements in community access to educational and non-local authority pitches to achieve an understanding on the nature of ownership of existing provision
- To consider the revenue implications of maintaining playing pitches and establish a benchmark on revenue and expenditure.
- To undertake an exercise to classify pitches and associated facilities as: pitches to be developed (new construction); pitches to be retained; pitches to be improved / renovated; or, pitches to be considered for alternative uses
- To develop specific action plans of sites. It will identify areas of search for new playing pitch provision associated with the sport and locality of the area of need.
- To review the current supply of AGPs for all sports and provide clear recommendations on where new pitches should be delivered in each sub area
- To review the quantity and quality of changing room and ancillary support facilities on pitch sites and make recommendations to ensure they are fit for purpose
- To establish and review ownership of playing pitch sites (e.g. potential for transfer of ownership and/or management to user groups/ community organisations)
- To review and identify lapsed/disused sites and assess what their future role should be (allocate for medium-long term future use; improve and bring back into use short term; dispose of for another use)
- The Steering Group will use a number of scenarios to test the adequacy of current secure pitch provision to meet existing and future demand
- Develop a process for regular updating and monitoring of the PPS
10. Assessment Findings and Recommendations

10.1 The Assessment Reports concluded with the findings for each sport and pitch type from the data and information gathered and analysed. These, together with the headlines and recommendations which result from analysis are set out below. The detail behind the following sections is set out in the Assessment Reports. The strategy recommendations for each sport and pitch type are responsive to the requirements set out in the PPS guidance, which suggest that recommendations are set out under the headings of “protect”, “enhance” and “provide”.

11. FOOTBALL

Summary

11.1 Football has traditionally been played on grass pitches and the majority of matches seem likely to continue to do so in the short to medium term of the strategy period at least. The presence of grass pitches which can be protected where their use is justified by demand also helps to protect open space. However, grass pitches carry an on-going maintenance cost and there are other pressures such as provision of posts and nets, lack of available storage, and ensuring their quality in public areas, for example, keeping them free of litter, ‘dog mess’ and vandalism. Particularly poor, wet weather in recent winters has also led to cancellation of many matches and as a result of this and improving technology, the Football Association (FA) supports competitive play for affiliated football leagues on compliant artificial surface 3G pitches which are on the FA 3G register, although these have their own pressures such as the capital investment needed to construct them, ongoing maintenance and the need for a sinking fund to set aside funding for future refurbishment, as well as the potential resistance to play certain types of game on them and the cost for their use for clubs/players. There remains a significant role for grass pitches in accommodating the large number of teams and age groups wanting to play and will likely remain the key supply for play for the foreseeable future. It is understood that Sport England, the Football Association and Football Foundation and Rugby Football Union are currently exploring the use of hybrid grass / artificial pitches.

11.2 Clubs need suitable training facilities. For youth and adult teams, as most grass pitches do not have or would not be suitable for floodlights, teams need to use artificial surfaces to train. Teams will use 3G rubber crumb pitches, but also train on sand based AGPs sometimes due to the lack of supply of 3G pitches or cost / affordability. This does, however, introduce pressures on use of sand-based full size AGPs as it is the main surface used by hockey clubs for training and matches. Clubs also supplement their outdoor training with use of indoor sports halls during winter where available and cost effective.

Grass Pitches

11.3 In Bournemouth in the 2017/18 season there were a total of 173 teams of which 45 are adult teams, 80 are youth teams (U11-U18) and 48 are Mini-Soccer (U5-U10) teams. In Poole in the 2017/18 season there were a total of 186 teams of which 55 are adult teams, 68 are youth teams (U11-U18) and 63 are Mini-Soccer (U5-U10) teams. In Christchurch in the 2018/19 season there were a total of teams.  

---

38 See http://3g.thefa.me.uk/
39 The number of teams will change from year to year. For example, in the 2018/19 season, there were (according to FA data) a significant number of additional teams across all age groups in Poole. It is acknowledged that there is going to be variance from year to year and any
88 teams of which 25 are adult teams (3 of which are ladies’ teams), 40 are youth teams (U11-U18) and 23 are Mini-Soccer (U5-U10) teams.

11.4 There are 177 grass pitches in Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole with the split between secure, unsecure and no community use as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Secure community use</th>
<th>Unsecure community use</th>
<th>No community use***</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bournemouth</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christchurch</td>
<td>21*</td>
<td>16**</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poole</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>103</strong></td>
<td><strong>56</strong></td>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: * Part of these figures include the pitches at Chapel Gate. Bournemouth University has bought the Chapel Gate facility and, it is understood, has offered a 5-year security of tenure to clubs currently using the site as their home ground. ** Many of these are located on sites which may have this unsecure use changed to secure community use in the short-term of the strategy period. Wingfields has been transferred to Highcliffe & Walkford Neighbourhood Council and Christchurch Town Council is possibly taking on Barrack Road Recreation Ground. While their retention as open space is secured, a written agreement for their use as sports pitches is not currently in place at the time of writing this report. However, it is understood that there is no desire from the new Town and Parish Councils to discontinue use for sport on these sites and it seems very likely that they will be secure in all but name. *** Most unavailable pitches with no community use and those with unsecure use are on school sites.

11.5 In Bournemouth and Poole, pitches were assessed for quality based on 2013 audit results and club and steering group knowledge of their quality. Pitches in Christchurch were assessed for quality based on local knowledge from members of the steering group and from surveys returned by clubs. These quality ratings were verified by the steering group members to ensure that the audit matched season-long quality in broad terms. Of the pitches with secure and unsecure use which are available for community use, 10 pitches in Bournemouth, 3 in Poole and 1 in Christchurch were rated as “poor”, all others being “standard” or “good”. The location of poor-quality pitches are as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Secure community use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bournemouth</td>
<td>King’s Park 5v5 pitch 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fernheath Playing Field pitches 1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Littledown Park pitch 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christchurch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Winton Arts and Media College pitches 1 and 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bishop of Winchester Academy pitches 1 and 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poole</td>
<td>Branksome Rec pitch 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Learoyd Playing Field pitch 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carter Community School</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11.6 Using these quality ratings, a carrying capacity for each pitch has been assigned with (on an adult size pitch) a “poor” quality pitch usually capable of hosting 1 match per week, a “standard” pitch able to host 2 matches and a “good” pitch 3 matches per week.

11.7 The condition and overall quality of ancillary facilities is important not only in order to improve the quality of experience for all players and help to maintain and grow the number of players in the game, but it is of particular importance to support growth in the women’s game. These grounds with poor quality changing facilities are as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Secure community use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bournemouth</td>
<td>Muscliff Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>King’s Park 9v9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christchurch</td>
<td>Waterman’s Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poole</td>
<td>Rossmore LC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Barrack Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Burton Rec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Winkton Fields</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wingfield Rec</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

sustained change in the growth trajectory of teams over the strategy period should be monitored and actions should respond accordingly. Much of this growth has arisen from teams emerging at the University.
11.8 Spatially, there is a relatively good distribution of grass pitches across sub-areas although there are noticeable gaps in secure pitch supply in sub-areas P1, northern P2, southern P3, B1 and B2, while all pitches in sub area C4 and most in C5 are unsecure community use. Of particular note in the north-east of the Borough is the significant amount of supply at Chapel Gate.

11.9 There are 11 secure use pitches which have seen more than 5 cancellations in Bournemouth, 0 in Christchurch and 5 in Poole. These cancellations are most often due to bad weather causing flooding on the pitches and improved drainage could increase reliability. Sites such as Kinson Manor (pitch 1), Victoria Park, Bournemouth Electric (pitch 1), pitches at Strouden Playing Fields and King’s Park in Bournemouth, and Branksome Recreation Ground (pitch 3), the pitches at Wallisdown Playing Fields and the youth pitches at Learoyd Playing Fields in Poole, all fall into this category.

11.10 The vast majority of community use grass pitches have no floodlighting and the greatest amount of use is over the weekends for matches, with few being used for weekday evening training due to a lack of floodlighting (training only becomes viable on most grass pitches at the very start and end of the football season when evenings are lighter). However, the provision of floodlighting, while increasing the opportunity to use a grass pitch, can lead to the quality of the pitch being compromised and pitches with floodlighting, usually in place at higher tier football club grounds with teams playing a better standard than most teams, are commonly protected from over-use by clubs. The Football Foundation would be unlikely to support funding bids for floodlighting at grass pitches where teams are not at step 6 and above and so it is unlikely to be an option for most grass pitches to increase carrying capacities and use.

11.11 There is currently a supply (carrying capacity) on secure community use grass pitches in Bournemouth of 92 match equivalents per week on mini (5v5 and 7v7) pitches, 11 match equivalents on youth (9v9) pitches and 39 on youth and adult (11v11) pitches. In Christchurch, the figures are 10 match equivalents on youth (9v9) pitches, 37 on youth and adult (11v11) pitches, 12 on 5v5s and 12 on 7v7s. In Poole the figures are 90 match equivalents per week on mini (5v5 and 7v7) pitches, 24 match equivalents on youth (9v9) pitches and 44 on youth and adult (11v11) pitches. On unsecure community use pitches in Bournemouth there is a supply of 0 match equivalents per week on mini (5v5 and 7v7) pitches, 5 match equivalents on youth (9v9) pitches and 15 on youth and adult (11v11) pitches. On unsecure community use pitches in Christchurch there is a supply of 24 match equivalents per week on mini (5v5 and 7v7) pitches, 6 match equivalents on youth (9v9) pitches and 13 on youth and adult (11v11) pitches. In Poole, the figures on carrying capacity on unsecure use pitches are 30 match equivalents per week on mini (5v5 and 7v7) pitches, 20 match equivalents on youth (9v9) pitches and 30 on youth and adult (11v11) pitches.

11.12 Comparing the carrying capacity of grass pitches with actual use on pitches with secure community access, only 8 are considered as being over-used for the amount of play that their quality rating suggests is appropriate in Bournemouth, with pitches at Fernheath and Bournemouth Electric showing the greatest overplay for their quality.

11.13 In Poole, the 6 secure use pitches are overused with the greatest overplay at Wallisdown (very significantly so) and Plainfields Farm (pitch 2). 10 unsecure pitches are overplayed in Bournemouth and 8 in Poole, although most of these are on school sites where community use is supplementary to education use. The majority of pitches therefore are either in balance (between their carrying capacity and demand) or have some spare capacity for additional use, at the current time.
11.14 In Christchurch, comparing the carrying capacity of grass pitches with actual use on pitches with secure community access, no pitches are considered as being over-used for the amount of play that their quality rating suggests is appropriate, while 5 have some capacity for additional play and 1 is being played at the appropriate capacity that its quality can accommodate. 2 unsecure pitches are overplayed in Christchurch, at Wingfields Recreation Ground’s north pitch and Burton Recreation Ground. Only Wingfields’ east pitch is being used in balance with the capacity it can accommodate for its quality while the remaining pitches all have some capacity to accommodate additional matches.

11.15 For each sub area, when supply / demand balance is totalled and figures for smaller pitches are converted to full size equivalents, the following picture of balance is revealed (where green shading represents capacity available to fulfil additional demand, orange shading represents balance between supply and demand and red represents overplay on pitches).

### Supply / Demand Balance (comparing current supply with current demand)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Full Size Pitch equivalents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Secure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bournemouth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-total</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poole</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-total</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christchurch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-total</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCP TOTAL</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11.16 Current levels of use suggest there may be opportunities to rationalise or repurpose some current pitches to create either pitch space for other sports or return solely to leisure / recreation use where the capacity provided by the pitch is replaced at a better-quality site. However, projections of future demand suggest that spare or “headroom” capacity will be required to accommodate additional demand if additional 3G provision cannot play a part in accommodating additional demand (as explored later in the report).
11.17 There are also a number of pitches which are no longer used (i.e. “mothballed” or lapsed) but which could play a role in future supply, depending on the solution developed for accommodating demand in the strategy.

11.18 In summary, there are a number of reasons why any current notionally spare capacity should be retained, as “headroom capacity”, at least until the end of the strategy period in 2033:

i) Not all spare capacity is likely to be available capacity on the days and at the times that might be required for it to be used;

ii) Not all spare capacity is capacity available wholly on single sites – i.e. most spare capacity arises from pitches already in use and to lose the capacity on these pitches would mean that teams would have to be moved to alternative pitches or sites to play home matches which could be unacceptable in terms of proximity to the team’s core supply of players, club roots, etc.;

iii) There may be unforeseeable issues in delivering 3G provision identified which could lead to a delay in the provision of the capacity as anticipated;

iv) To allow for flexibility of when demand changes season to season both within football and between sports and for any growth in demand beyond that contained within the projected demand; and,

v) Should all teams calculated in the projections of demand for 3Gs not migrate to a 3G surface to play matches (for example, due to cost, distance away from a 3G pitch, favouring their current home pitch as a preferred ground, etc.).

11.19 Projections indicate that there could be an additional 73 teams across all age groups by 2033 across Bournemouth, an additional 38 teams across Christchurch and an additional 85 across Poole. (This figure does not include demand for small-sided 5, 6 and 7-a-side teams in informal, social or small-sided leagues, which are considered in the section below dealing with artificial grass pitches (AGPs)).

11.20 Translating future projected team numbers to demand for grass pitches for matches only (i.e. assuming that training would be held on an AGP) suggests that almost 5 full size adult pitches of additional capacity would be required in Bournemouth, 3 in Christchurch and also almost 4 in Poole to accommodate additional demand. This is without any of this additional demand being accommodated on 3G full size pitches at weekends for matches, and assumes “good” quality pitches are provided, that matches taking place on unsecure community use pitches move to secure use pitches (or unsecure use can be changed to secure use) and current “headroom” capacity is utilised. If these assumptions do not come to fruition, a higher number of additional new grass pitches would be required.
Artificial Grass Pitches

11.21 3G (third generation) artificial grass pitches (AGPs) can provide a secure and high-quality surface on which to play football (and rugby where they meet the World Cup 22 standard\(^{40}\)). Hockey is played on sand and water filled pitches with a 25mm pile.

11.22 For football, in recent years, the popularity of AGPs has increased with most informal play (5, 6 and 7-a-side in particular) and some training taking place on AGPs where cost is not prohibitive. There is a balance to be struck between affordability for users and ensuring sufficient funds are captured to properly run and maintain AGPs (in addition to a desire from commercial operators for any profit to be made). Some teams will train on sand based AGPs (often due to cost / affordability, proximity or availability). However, the preference for football use is for 3G pitches which meet the performance standard of FIFA Quality accreditation (which cannot be used for hockey but can be shared with rugby where the 3G is sufficiently sprung and meet the World Cup 22 standard). 3G pitches can host competitive football matches given advances in surface improvement and the obvious advantages in quality and reliability, and therefore playing capacity, over traditional grass pitches which require much more maintenance and where bad weather can result in high numbers of match cancellations (or postponements) leading to backlog and extra game pressure during a season and fixture congestion in the latter part of the season. However, compared to grass pitches, AGPs are higher cost in terms of maintenance and funds required (sink fund) for replacement in the long-term.

11.23 There are 17 secure use 3G pitches in Bournemouth, all of which are either small or half size and 2 secure full size 3G and 1 secure full-size sand pitch in Poole (which is currently the home ground for the Poole Hockey Club). There are also 4 small unsecure 3G pitches and 2 full size unsecure sand / water-based pitches in Poole. There are 2 secure use 3G pitches in Christchurch, both at Two Riversmeet Leisure Centre, and both of which are half size pitches. There is also 1 unsecure community use sand based AGP at Mudeford Community Centre, again, half size. There are also 2 unsecure full-size sand based AGPs at Chapel Gate and 1 half size sand based AGP at The Grange Academy (which the school finds difficult to let due to the hire costs it has to levy). Two pitches in Poole meet the standards required to be on the FA Football Turf Pitch Register (http://3g.thefa.me.uk/), Canford Park Sports and the County Ground as do the pitches at Two Riversmeet. The quality of all AGPs with community use was rated either as “standard” or “good”. The Chapel Gate facility has two sand based AGPs, the second of which is rated as “poor”, where the surface needs replacing (as does the floodlighting).

11.24 While there were few club surveys returned, we have experience elsewhere of clubs sometimes saying that the cost of hiring an AGP can dissuade teams, particularly within the younger age groups, from booking AGP time. This can be a bigger issue in the winter months when charges for floodlighting can be in addition to the cost of hiring the pitch. However, while cost can be an understandable concern for some clubs, it should be noted that AGPs are expensive to build, run (for example high energy costs for floodlighting) and maintain properly\(^{42}\) and so a balance has to be struck between providing good quality surfaces and the need to charge appropriately.

11.25 Between them, the secure 3G pitches in Bournemouth host the equivalent of 130 full-size pitch hours of capacity / supply during peak hours\(^{42}\) although it is likely that supply is slightly more in entirety as many pitches are likely to be open outside of peak hours. In Poole there are 68 full size equivalent hours of supply on secure 3G pitches, 34 on the sand-based pitch, 66 hours on unsecure 3G pitches and 32 hours on unsecure sand / water-based pitches. Between them, the secure 3G pitches in Christchurch host the equivalent of 34 full-size pitch hours of capacity / supply during peak hours\(^{43}\) although it is likely that supply is slightly more in entirety as many pitches are likely to be open outside of peak hours. The secure sand AGP at Mudeford Community Centre adds a further 17 hours full size equivalent. There is 9 hours of full size equivalent time / available capacity at The Grange

\(^{40}\) World Cup 22 relates to the standard required of artificial turf for rugby. See http://www.irb.com/mm/document/lawsregs/regulations/04/21/57/42157_pdf.pdf for the full regulation.

\(^{41}\) A 3G pitch for example can cost on average around £700,000 to build and a further £25,000 per annum contributions towards a “sinking fund” for eventual replacement.

\(^{42}\) Peak hours / peak period for AGPs is considered to be Mon-Thurs 5pm-9pm, Fri 5-7pm and Sat & Sun 9am-5pm

\(^{43}\) Peak hours / peak period for AGPs is considered to be Mon-Thurs 5pm-9pm, Fri 5-7pm and Sat & Sun 9am-5pm
School AGP and there are 68 hours of full size equivalent capacity at the sand AGPs at Chapel Gate, although this capacity is not available solely for football use with the Bournemouth Hockey Club and University Hockey Club both using the pitches (focused predominantly at the first pitch on the site at the current time due to the quality issues on the second pitch for hockey play). There is strong demand for AGP time across the Borough with an estimated: 126 hours of demand on secure 3G pitches in Bournemouth; 22 hours per week taken-up for football use at the secure community use Two Riversmeet 3G pitches in Christchurch with the remainder being used for other activities (an area of demand growing according to leisure centre management) or spare capacity (the latter amounting to c.12 hours full size equivalent); and, 80 hours on secure 3G and sand-based pitches in Poole and 50 hours demand on unsecure 3G pitches and 32 on unsecure use sand-based pitches in Poole. The only secure use sand based AGP at Mudeford Community Centre sees 30 hours of use (15 full size pitch equivalent) for football with the remainder being for tennis with bookings quieter on Friday evenings. With regard to informal and small-sized league matches, we have identified current demand for 11 hours full size pitch equivalent use in Bournemouth, 8.5 hours in Christchurch and 12.5 in Poole, with all demand catered for on secure 3G pitches in Bournemouth, 6 hours of demand on unsecure sand-based pitches and 2.5 hours on secure 3G pitches in Christchurch and 9 hours of demand on unsecured 3G pitches and 3.5 on secure sand-based pitch in Poole.

11.26 With regard to unsecure sand based AGPs, The Grange Academy pitch only sees around 2 hours of regular use, which the school has suggested is due to the cost of the hire putting most clubs off from using it. The pitches at Chapel Gate see shared use between football and hockey. Since the condition of the second pitch has deteriorated, Bournemouth Hockey Club has been forced to move most play to the first AGP on the site. The poor quality of the second pitch surface and poor floodlighting has meant that hockey matches cannot be played on the pitch and safety concerns and poor lighting have meant that the pitch is not used regularly for training with hockey use amounting to less than 4 hours per week. However, informal / social football and training for clubs has continued on the pitch (amounting to around 13 hours of use). The first AGP at Chapel Gate sees predominant use for hockey with only a few hours per week for football and lacrosse. Overall, where there are AGPs supporting football, there is some capacity available in sub-areas P1, P4 and P5 in Poole, in sub-areas C1 and C5 and B4 in Bournemouth. However, there is no spare capacity in sub-areas P3, B3 and B6.

11.27 There is always going to be a degree of spare capacity on smaller than full size pitches at weekends with their size meaning that they cannot accommodate teams playing most age group formats. The same is true of sand and water-based pitches unless hockey matches can fill supply with competitive football matches on artificial pitches not sanctioned unless on a 3G surface. Full size and smaller size artificial pitches also see a dip in use on Friday evenings when teams do not often wish to train, and informal and social play is less popular.

11.28 In Bournemouth, a key issue is lack of full size secure 3G capacity to accommodate matches with all supply on smaller than full size pitches. While there appears to be around 11 hours of spare capacity on full size secure 3G pitches in Poole, only 3 of these hours are certain (at the County Ground) with the other 8 hours an estimate of spare capacity at Canford Park Sports. The other secure use spare capacity in Poole is at the Ashdown Leisure Centre pitch which is sand-based and therefore not available for matches at the weekend. In Christchurch, a key issue is lack of full size secure 3G capacity to accommodate 11v11 matches with all supply on half size pitches at Two Riversmeet.

11.29 Considering catchment areas based on a 20-minute drive-time for ease of access to secure 3G provision of any size, there are gaps across most of sub-area P3 and in parts of B1, P2 and P4. However, if smaller than full size 3G pitches are discounted, most of Bournemouth does not have easy access to a secure 3G pitch. All of the Christchurch area is within reach of a 20-minute drive to Two Riversmeet and the catchment extends into the east of Bournemouth and extended area to the north and east of Christchurch. Within a 20-minute catchment of the two key sites with artificial pitches (Two Riversmeet 3Gs and Chapel Gate’s sand based AGPs) there are numerous other artificial pitches accessible across Bournemouth to the west and as far as Ringwood Health and Leisure Club and Potterne Park to the north and Shorefield Leisure Club to the east.

11.30 With regard to current known changes in supply, it is understood that the two small pitches at Bournemouth University (Poole) will be lost soon, although to maintain supply their capacity should logically be replaced in close proximity elsewhere. At the time of undertaking the assessment and initially drafting this strategy there were two additional 3G full size pitches in the pipeline, one at
Slades Farm (Bournemouth) and one other, with sites at the Rosmore Leisure Centre or Ashdown Leisure Centre being considered. The pitch at Slades Farm has now been delivered.

11.31 In Christchurch, it is understood that there are two half-sized proposed 3G pitches with floodlighting in the pipeline as part of a major development which has been granted outline planning consent at Roeshot Hill in Christchurch. The conclusions from the assessment and strategy should inform the final 3G size of pitch to be delivered at the site (for example, there is a noticeable lack of full size 3G pitches in Christchurch and an identified need / demand as considered below) subject to site feasibility.

11.32 Two scenarios (with sub tests) have been run to try to identify levels of demand for full size 3G pitches. We have used two calculators to estimate demand, the FA calculator and our own (“STA”) calculator which can be adapted to specific time slots on specific days for all age group teams. The scenarios are as follows:

1. All teams playing competitive football having access to a full size floodlit 3G AGP to train on once a week (for existing and projected teams to 2033). This scenario also provides capacity for teams to play some matches on a 3G at weekends. The scenario has been run for both existing teams playing in existing timeslots and for future projected teams using existing match timeslots. Adjusting timeslots could, in some cases, increase the number of matches which could be accommodated.

2. All teams playing competitive football having access to a full size floodlit 3G AGP to play matches on (for existing and future projected teams to 2033).

11.33 The scenario results are summarised as follows. All figures are for full size pitch equivalent capacity and are rounded to the nearest half pitch.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>3G Demand (full size pitch equivalent)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STA Calculator</td>
<td>FA Calculator</td>
<td>STA Calculator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. accommodating training</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. accommodating matches</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>3G Demand (full size pitch equivalent)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STA Calculator</td>
<td>FA Calculator</td>
<td>STA Calculator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. accommodating training</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. accommodating matches</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>29.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>3G Demand (full size pitch equivalent)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STA Calculator</td>
<td>FA Calculator</td>
<td>STA Calculator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. accommodating training</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. accommodating matches</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

44 the FA calculator does not distinguish between adult team play on Saturdays and Sundays (meaning that the pitch requirement can double-count for weekend slots) hence why our own calculator is also used to provide specificity if required.
11.34 Assuming that the number of pitches required to satisfy all match play would be unviable (scenario 2\textsuperscript{45}), the range of pitches required by 2033 to accommodate all training demand is between 5.5 and 6 pitches in Bournemouth between 3 and 3.5 in Christchurch and between 5.5 and 6 pitches in Poole.

11.35 Examining this estimated required capacity, in Bournemouth:

i) All current and pipeline artificial is or will be on secure community use 3G surface (not sand).

ii) There is almost sufficient supply to meet training demand of 5.5 - 6 full size equivalent 3G pitches with currently 5 in total including the additional recently delivered 1 x 3G pitch at Slades Farm.

iii) The additional 1 x full size 3G pitch in the pipeline will provide additional match day capacity at weekends. Based on weekend match capacity of 1 x full size 3G being 2.2 grass pitches this will mean that an equivalent of 2.2 grass pitches of match capacity will be added into supply (grass pitches which could be subtracted from the grass pitch additional need to 2033 if the 3G pitch is delivered).

iv) Informal and social play (pay and play and small-sided game leagues) will need to be accommodated in addition to enabling opportunity for all teams to train so that in the event of all teams using the supply available, social and informal teams are not displaced. While these sides may also have flexibility to play indoors, it is suggested that an additional 0.5 pitch equivalent could be provided to allow for social and informal demand to 2033. This may or may not be needed, depending on how much of the capacity provided for teams to train is actually taken-up (some will not due to cost, proximity, availability at preferred times, etc.) and so the need for this additional supply should be monitored to determine real need “on the ground” before additional provision over and above the 1 additional pitch is provided.

11.36 Examining this estimated required capacity, in Christchurch:

i) There is currently 1 full size equivalent 3G pitch in Christchurch.

ii) There is 1 full size equivalent 3G in the pipeline at Roeshot Hill (current proposal is for 2 x half size 3G pitches, but could be more appropriately a single full size pitch to better serve demand and enable flexibility of use for matches at the weekend as well as training during the week, across all age groups and formats of the game subject to on-site feasibility).

iii) The existing and pipeline pitches would leave a demand for 2 x full size floodlit 3G pitches which is likely also to accommodate additional social and informal demand.

iv) Potential sites for these additional 3G pitches could include The Grange Academy (where the Academy has suggested interest in a new 3G pitch on its site) and Chapel Gate given its role as a strategic facility and likely demand at the site for a 3G pitch (in addition to the existing sand based pitches).

v) Following this strategy would free-up supply at the Chapel Gate sand-based pitches for hockey being the predominant use and allowing the Bournemouth Hockey Club (and University teams sufficient supply to grow).

vi) Based on weekend match capacity of 1 x full size 3G being 2.2 grass pitches this will mean that an equivalent of around 6 grass pitches of match capacity will be added into supply (grass pitches which could be subtracted from the grass pitch additional need to 2033 if the 3G pitches are delivered).

vii) Securing use of unsecure pitches and accepting that some training will continue on non-3G sand-based pitches is also important as it is unrealistic to expect all demand migrating to or being accommodated solely on 3G surfaces.

viii) At the mid-point in the strategy period, demand “on the ground” should be reviewed to understand if there is sufficient justification for investment in a 5th full size 3G in the latter part of the strategy period.

11.37 Examining this estimated required capacity, in Poole:

i) With regard to the supply / demand balance:

---

\textsuperscript{45} Figures for the number of 3G pitches required to accommodate all matches are very high and result in unrealistic levels of provision in terms of site availability and cost. However, they do help to confirm the importance of grass pitch supply in the Borough as a key part of match-day supply.
a) There is sufficient supply (7.8) to meet training demand of 5.5 - 6 full size equivalent 3G pitches, when the pitch in the pipeline, sand based, and secure and unsecure pitches taken into account.
b) There is insufficient supply (4.8) to meet training demand of 5.5 - 6 full size equivalent 3G pitches if only 3G surfaces (secure and unsecure) and pitch in the pipeline taken into account.
c) There is insufficient supply (3.0) to meet training demand of 5.5 - 6 full size equivalent 3G pitches if only secure 3G surfaces and pitch in the pipeline taken into account.
d) There is insufficient supply (4.0) to meet training demand of 5.5 - 6 full size equivalent 3G pitches if only secure pitches (3G and sand) and the pitch in the pipeline taken into account.

ii) 3.8 full size pitch equivalents are on unsecure sites, introducing significant risk to supply with 1.8 of these on 3G surface and 2 on sand / water-based pitches.

iii) An important action will therefore be to secure community use on these unsecure sites, if possible.

iv) Given the shortfall in provision of 3G surfaces, loss of any 3G surface should be replaced with equivalent capacity (or more if feasible).
v) Match capacity is 3 x full size 3G pitches (or will be when pipeline pitch is delivered, although the pipeline pitch will be sited on a grass pitch and so net increase in match capacity will be slightly less).
vi) Based only on current and pipeline 3G secure provision of 3 pitches, 2.5 – 3.0 additional 3G full size secure pitches would be required in secure use to meet demand.

vii) The capacity needed on secure sites will probably also increase for football by the amount of time displaced by / needed for hockey at the Ashdown Leisure Centre sand-based pitch (see hockey section).

viii) Securing use of unsecure pitches and accepting that some training will continue on non-3G sand / water-based pitches would reduce this and the strategy may have to take a pragmatic line in terms of how many additional full size 3G pitches can be provided in terms of both cost / affordability and available locations. Security of use in the long-term is probably a more important factor in supply than replacement of sand-based pitches with 3G. Therefore, an approach which mitigates supply to respond to 31. i) d) above (providing between 1 and 2 additional 3G full size pitches (with floodlighting), subject to demand being demonstrable “on the ground”, is probably the most pragmatic / realistic to expect by 2033.

ix) Any growth occurring from an increase in informal and social play (pay and play and small-sided game leagues), which could generate up to 0.5 pitch additional capacity, should be monitored to understand the implications of this demand (currently focused on use of unsecure 3G pitches and Ashdown sand-based pitch) on the additional provision of 3G pitches.

x) Continued use of the pitch at Ashdown Leisure Centre for football training and social / small sided games could have implications for accommodating demand for hockey in the long-term (see hockey assessment) and the additional 3G pitch capacity should be able to replace lost capacity at the Leisure Centre pitch for football to additional hockey demand at the Leisure Centre pitch.

xi) The pipeline pitch will provide additional match day capacity at weekends. Based on weekend match capacity of 1 x full size 3G being 2.2 grass pitches and with an adjustment made to allow for grass capacity lost to the pipeline 3G pitch (being considered for location at Rossmore and if so to be built over a grass pitch), this reduces to a capacity of 1.2 pitches of additional capacity of supply introduced.

xii) For each other additional 3G pitch introduced, match capacity provided in grass pitch equivalents would be an equivalent of 2.2 grass added into supply per 3G pitch provided (grass pitches which could be subtracted from the grass pitch additional need to 2033 if the 3G pitches are built).

Therefore, when Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole figures are summed (and if it is assumed that training should be migrated to 3G secure pitches), around 5 additional full size floodlit 3G pitches will be needed by 2033 if all teams are to have the opportunity to train, which should also provide sufficient capacity for small sided leagues where they choose to play on 3G, although there will still be role for sand-based pitches, particularly if those pitches can become secure use and their use does not threaten supply for hockey (particularly in Poole).
11.39 Applying this approach for 3G provision (i.e. at least 1 additional 3G pitch in Bournemouth and Poole and 2 in Christchurch, with a third only required in the Bournemouth / Poole area if demand is demonstrable “on the ground”) to the demand for grass pitches by 2033, based on the current and pipeline supply to be available by that time and assuming that teams who do not currently play on the existing 3G supply at weekends do so:

- in Bournemouth (taking into account the size and format of 3G pitches in the Borough which limits capacity for adult matches to take place), we estimate that no additional grass pitches will be needed. If the assumptions made in this scenario do not come to fruition, there could be a requirement for additional grass pitch capacity, which could be provided by currently “mothballed” pitches and so these should be protected for future potential use;
- in Christchurch no additional grass pitches will be needed if grass pitches which have unsecure community use are secured and any poor pitches and / or facilities are improved to at least a “standard” quality; and,
- in Poole, we estimate that an additional 1 full size equivalent “good” quality grass pitch will be needed. If new sites do not become available for additional grass pitches and if quality improvements cannot be made to existing secure use pitches to provide practically usable additional capacity at weekends, it would be appropriate to bring back into use mothballed pitches and so these should be protected for future potential use.

11.40 A summary of requirements and assumptions is reproduced below from the assessment tables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grass pitches</td>
<td>Pipeline</td>
<td>Additional</td>
<td>Less</td>
<td>Pipeline</td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>If additional</td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>balance of supply</td>
<td>grass pitches</td>
<td>grass pitches</td>
<td>pipeline</td>
<td>3G pitches</td>
<td>grass pitches</td>
<td>3G pitches</td>
<td>grass pitches</td>
<td>grass pitches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>2033</td>
<td>required by 2033</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>provided at weekend</td>
<td>2033</td>
<td>provided at weekend</td>
<td>2033</td>
<td>provided at weekend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secure</td>
<td>Unsecure</td>
<td>Secure</td>
<td>(column D minus C)</td>
<td>(column E minus F)</td>
<td>(column E minus F)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B’mouth</td>
<td>+7</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>2 ^</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poole</td>
<td>+11</td>
<td>+4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C’church</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: All grass pitches are full size equivalent. Assumes no improvements to quality of existing supply of pitches. Improvements to quality of pitches, particularly those rated as “poor” could help to reduce the need for additional grass pitches by increasing carrying capacity (see tables below). Impact of returning displaced and / or exported demand from Chapel Gate not factored into figures. * Assumes “good” quality pitches, that unsecure pitches replaced with / moved to secure community use pitches and the “headroom” / spare capacity identified in 2017 (column A) is utilised. ** Slades Farm (Bournemouth), in the pipeline at the time of assessment but now delivered. Rossmore Leisure Centre (Poole) is currently being explored as a possible location for a new 3G pitch. Figures rounded down to nearest full pitch. Rossmore fewer pitches capacity net as 3G would be built on an existing grass pitch if it proceeds in this location. ^ At Slades Farm. *** Delivered to accommodate training demand to meet 3G requirement by 2033 in Bournemouth (1 x 3G) and Christchurch (2 x 3G) and 1 X 3G delivered to increase security of supply in Poole. ^^ If 3Gs delivered. Figures could increase if “headroom” / spare capacity identified in 2017 (column A) cannot practically be used during the strategy period at the times when pitches are available. # Netted to zero (no additional grass pitches required) from -1.

11.41 Levels of actual and short-term demand will need to be closely monitored to understand how real demand increases during the lifetime of the strategy, particularly after the initial 5 years of the strategy period. As projections of demand and need are based on assumptions around increasing growth and participation, which may or may not come to fruition, additional provision after the first few years of the strategy period should be responsive to demonstrable levels of demand. The movement of demand away from sand-based surfaces to any new full size 3G provision should also be monitored (with regard to potential impact on other sports such as hockey – with use by other sports often being important to maintain viability of full-sized sand based pitches in the long term).
Importantly, the transition of demand to 3G pitches, both for training and for match play, must be well managed. The impact (or not) of transfer of pitches from being unsecure to secure community use should also be monitored to understand any resultant needs to provide additional grass pitches alongside 3G delivery.

11.42 The provision of the 3G pitches will also secure the residual supply on unsecure and secure sites to help enable comfortable play for teams and age groups at the appropriate time for league matches. However, the strategy cannot guarantee with any certainty that all unsecure sites can be made secure and so the delivery phase should plan, monitor manage the balance between supply and demand and ensure a good understanding of the migration of teams from using grass pitches to 3G for both training and matches.

11.43 If the assumptions made in this scenario do not come to fruition, there would be a requirement to maximise use of any headroom capacity on current grass pitches used, particularly those with secure community use, protect mothballed sites should demand require them to be brought back into use towards the latter end of the strategy period.

Key Issues Snapshot

11.44 The assessment data and discussion with members of the steering group suggest the following key issues are most prominent at the time of writing:

- Demand and viability of pitches (grass and 3G) at Canford Park Sports (Arena), Poole, particularly once AFC Bournemouth lease expires on use of grass pitches.
- Impact of AFC Bournemouth plans for stadium in King’s Park and associated training facilities on former Canford Golf Course opposite Canford Park Sports (Arena), including on AFC Bournemouth dedicated training pitches in the park.
- How best to respond to housing proposals at Turlin Moor, Poole, which could have an impact on football pitches at the site.
- Known loss of Bournemouth University small 3G pitches (2) and the need to replace capacity.
- While Chapel Gate is considered a strategically important facility across the Borough (including southern Dorset), it’s location on the northern edge of the Borough means that it is not well-related (in terms of proximity) to much of Christchurch’s and Bournemouth’s population along the coast.
- The Winkton Fields site sees a significant amount of demand and is an important site to junior and youth football. Retention of the site and improvement to the (lack of) facilities (or replacement if developed) is essential.
- The quality of ancillary facilities at Wingfields, Barrack Road and Burton Recreation Ground are also in need of improvement.
- There appear to be opportunities (potential sites) to accommodate the additional 3G pitches required to satisfy demand to 2033.

Demand Summary

11.45 The demand summary for the strategy and the “direction of travel” it should take for football provision is as follows. However, it is important to note that figures **should not be read or relied upon in isolation** outside of the context provided by the strategy recommendations.

a) Taking current demand into account and comparing to supply, there is an equivalent to around 7 full size grass pitches of potential capacity on secure community use sites in Bournemouth which is currently unused and 11 in Poole. In Christchurch, there is an equivalent to around 9.5 full size grass pitches of potential capacity on secure community use sites in Christchurch which is currently unused. Almost all of this unused capacity is on pitches which are used for matches already. Therefore, while this capacity is unused, most of it is not surplus which can be lost or removed from supply but is “capacity headroom” to accommodate future demand to 2033 and
beyond. Spare capacity is not applicable to all sub-areas with P3 in Poole and B4 having overplay on secure pitches, for example.

b) In Bournemouth, demand outstrips supply on unsecure sites with an equivalent of 4 full pitches of overplay. If overplay on unsecure sites was to be moved to spare secure site capacity, this would leave spare headroom capacity at 3 pitches. There is an equivalent of 5.5 full size pitches of unused capacity at unsecure sites in Christchurch, with most of these sites seeing use on them, meaning that they are not surplus to supply. There is an equivalent of 4 full size pitches of unused capacity at unsecure sites in Poole, with most of these sites having an alternative primary user such as a school, meaning that they are not surplus to supply. Despite this unused capacity at unsecure sites, it cannot be relied upon for club use given that it has no long-term security of tenure and it is desirable to accommodate teams currently using unsecure sites on secure sites.

c) Demand is projected to increase by 2033. Assuming that unused capacity on existing secure sites can be used, moving teams away from unsecure to secure community use sites and taking into account future demand from an increase in the number of teams, an additional 5 full size grass pitches would be needed to accommodate additional match play in Bournemouth, 3 in Christchurch and 4 in Poole (if 3G pitches do not feature as part of the solution for future provision). Improvements to the quality and reliability of some pitches could help to reduce this number (by increasing carrying capacities). This demand for grass pitches would reduce by 2-3 grass pitches for every full size 3G floodlit pitch provided.

d) Up to 5 additional full size floodlit 3G pitches with secure community use are needed across the Borough by 2033 if all clubs are to have an opportunity to train on a 3G surface. This is in addition to current 3G pitches “in the pipeline”. 1 x 3G pitch in the Bournemouth area and 1 x 3G pitch in the Poole area should be provided with a third only delivered in the Bournemouth / Poole area if demand is demonstrated “on the ground”. 2 x 3G pitches are needed in Christchurch. 3G provision will provide additional supply / capacity for matches at weekends which will, in turn, reduce the capacity required for additional grass pitches if 3G provision is delivered. This requirement reduces if unsecure 3G and sand-based pitches can feature as part of the future supply with certainty (i.e. making unsecure sites secure and acceptance that training can take place on non-3G artificial pitches and not negatively impact on secure use hockey supply).

e) Provision of new additional pitches will need to respond to demonstrable demand “on the ground”. A “plan, deliver, monitor, manage” approach should therefore be taken to the provision of additional capacity particularly in relation to the balance of supply to accommodate demand for match play between 3G and grass surfaces.

Recommendations

11.46 The above assessment conclusions suggest that the strategy should be as follows.

Grass Pitches

**PROTECT**

FR1) “Mothballed” pitches previously used for football and pitches rested or reserved on multi-pitch sites should be retained as green / open space to protect potential future short and long-term demand and capacity for football or other sports and informal sports and leisure activities should demand suggest a need. Such sites include:

- Slades Farm pitches (B4)\(^{37}\);
- Iford Playing Fields (pitch 3) (B6);
- Redhill Park (B3);

\(^{36}\) It should be noted that reinstatement of pitches could require investment to ensure that they are available to a “good” standard of quality. Re-opening pitches could also have implications for ancillary facilities and the suitability or age-group of teams using the pitches.

\(^{37}\) Due to be brought back into use during 2019/20.
• Branksome Rec 9v9 (pitch 5) (P3);
• Haskell's Rec (P5);
• Bearwood Playing Fields (P5);
• Riverway Recreation Ground (potential for 1 x junior and 1 x adult grass pitch subject to available space) (C5);
• Additional pitch at Wingfields Recreation Ground (1 x junior pitch) (C2).

FR2) The identified notional spare grass pitch capacity at pitches already used for matches should be retained during the strategy period to allow for “capacity headroom” and flexibility of provision to help accommodate growth to 2033.

FR3) The supply / capacity provided by existing grass pitches within a 20-minute drive-time catchment of a new 3G pitch should not be considered for loss from formal use / supply until their capacity is replaced and utilised by operational secure community use 3G capacity and they are deemed surplus over and above the identified “capacity headroom”. No team should be left without its usual home grass pitch just because a 3G has been provided and transition from grass to 3G use must be well-managed.

ENHANCE

FR4) Enhance capacity on existing pitches by improving quality and improve maintenance to ensure that the better quality is sustained in the long-term. There should be a focus on improving the following pitches rated as “poor” or “standard”, where feasible:
• Fernheath 11v11 (pitch 1) (B4);
• Fernheath 11v11 (pitch 2) (B4);
• Fernheath 9v9 (pitch 3) (B4);
• Fernheath 7v7 (pitch 4) (B4);
• King’s Park 5v5 (pitch 2) (B6);
• Littledown Park 7v7 (pitch 7) (B6);
• Whitecliff Recreation Ground (P2);
• Branksome Rec 11v11 (pitch 3) (P3);
• Learoyd Playing Field 11v11 (pitch 5) (P4);
• Waterman’s Park (C1);
• Highcliffe Recreation Ground (C2);
• Mudeford Wood Community Centre (C2).

FR5) Enhance the quality of changing and other ancillary facilities where necessary and possible to help ensure the quality of the experience for the sport is enhanced (with a focus on those of “poor” quality) in the first instance:
• Fernheath (B4);
• Muscliff Park (B5);
• King’s Park (youth 9v9 pitches) (B6);
• Branksome Rec 11v11 (P3);
• Whitecliff Recreation Ground (P2);
• Waterman’s Park (F43) (C1);
• Highcliffe Recreation Ground (F20) (C2);
• Mudeford Wood Community Centre (F30) (C2).
• Rossmore Leisure Centre (P3) (dependent on implications of a possible provision of new 3G pitch in this location if preferred to Ashdown Leisure Centre).

Such improvements are particularly important to help grow participation in the women’s game.

FR6) Support for enhancements to pitch quality and continuity of maintenance where a club has taken-on responsibility from a local authority can be sought through the FA’s Pitch Improvement Programme (PIP) which provides a range of support services to grassroots clubs, club volunteers and groundsmen including on-site evaluations with practical advice and recommendations.

FR7) Gain written reassurances from the Neighbourhood and Town Councils where they control transferred pitches that the security of use of the recreation grounds as public open green space extends to continued certainty of use as sports pitches:
• Barrack Road Recreation Ground (C3); and,
• Wingfields Recreation Ground (C2).
FR8) Gain the secure use of pitch sites which currently have unsecure use through clubs and relevant authorities working with pitch providers / owners to seek a long-term secure use agreement to provide certainty of supply and reduce the need for additional new pitches (where desirable by the club and provider). The priority should be those of strategic importance and those where there is a significant amount of use by teams, including, but not limited to, Winkton Fields (C4).

FR9) Enhance capacity on existing pitches at unsecure use sites by improving quality and improve maintenance to ensure that the better quality is sustained in the long-term. There should be a focus on improving the following pitches once secured for community use and where rated as “poor”, where feasible such as Burton Recreation Ground (C4).

FR10) Enhance the quality of changing and other ancillary facilities at unsecure use sites where necessary and possible to help ensure the quality of the experience for the sport is enhanced. There should be a focus on improving the following facilities once secured for community use and where rated as “poor”, where feasible:
- Barrack Road Recreation Ground (C3);
- Burton Recreation Ground (C4);
- Wingfields Recreation Ground (C2);
- Winkton Fields (C4) (once secured for community use).
Such improvements are particularly important to help grow participation in the women’s game.

PROVIDE

FR11) Ensure that the supply of grass pitches can accommodate existing and future demand for matches in sync with the provision of additional 3G capacity. At no time should the total supply of grass pitches not be able to accommodate demand for play out-with 3G capacity and “on the ground” demand for match play by each age group within the structure of the game. The role of grass pitches is particularly important should the additional 3G capacity not be delivered.

FR12) Enable opportunity in the Borough for club progression up the FA pyramid by ensuring that one or more pitches can meet FA requirements for progression.

FR13) Where needed, increased capacity of grass pitches could come from a combination of:
   a) Increasing reliability of pitches through improved quality, drainage and maintenance;
   b) Considering better grouping of age groups (and therefore pitch types and sizes) on multi-pitch sites; and,
   c) Provision of additional pitches in appropriate locations as demand requires during the strategy period subject to the timing of delivery of 3G capacity to:
      i. respond to growth in demand (as a result in club growth, growth in social / informal and non-club participation, increased population and spatial gaps in provision) where this cannot be catered for on existing pitches; and / or,
      ii. replace and increase the capacity of existing pitches of poor or standard quality; or, which prove uneconomical to manage and maintain; or, are unattractive to club use due to quality and / or cost.

3G Pitches

PROTECT

FR14) Protect the existing supply of secure 3G pitches identified in the assessment and their capacity. Any 3G pitch(es) lost to supply should be replaced by pitch(es) of equal or greater capacity and standard of quality, and in a location which serves a similar catchment to the pitches being replaced.

FR15) Seek agreement between hockey (EH) and football (FA), and with providers and clubs, about which sport should have sole or priority use of sand based full size AGPs as new 3G pitches proposed are introduced.

ENHANCE

FR16) Gain the secure community use of unsecure 3G pitches, particularly where they are currently in use for football training and social / small-sided games.
FR17) Where necessary, explore how best to make better use of existing supply to help ensure viability and capacity is retained in the long-term to help meet projected demand. This is particularly important as new additional 3G pitches are delivered.

FR18) Enhance the quality of changing and other ancillary facilities where necessary and possible to help ensure the quality of the experience for the sport is enhanced.

FR19) Gain the secure community use of unsecure sand-based pitches where they are currently in use for football training and social / small-sided games to maintain security of supply until additional 3G pitches are delivered to accommodate training and informal / small sided game demand.

PROVIDE

FR20) Deliver the 3G pitches in the pipeline:
   a) Rossmore Leisure Centre (Poole) (or alternative location in the Borough, such as Ashdown Leisure Centre, should Rossmore not emerge as the preferred location)
   b) Slades Farm (Bournemouth) (in the pipeline at the time of assessment and initial drafting of the strategy and now delivered)

FR21) Deliver the 3G pitch capacity proposed at Roeshot Hill (outline application 8/16/2932 approved March 2019). The preference on the site, as a result of the findings of the assessment would be for 1 x full size floodlit 3G pitch rather than 2 x half size 3G floodlit pitches given the flexibility of the space provided by a full size pitch to accommodate a wider variety of match formats including 9v9 and 11v11 matches if feasible on the site.

FR22) Provide 4 additional floodlit full size 3G pitches across the Borough (1 in Bournemouth, 2 in Christchurch and 1 in Poole) during the strategy period to ensure that all teams have access to evening and reliable surface training and to provide match capacity at weekends to complement grass pitch capacity. Provision could be explored in the following locations or sub-areas:
   a) Slades Farm, Bournemouth (explore opportunity for second 3G surface, with rugby compliance)
   b) The Grange Academy (sub-area C1);
   c) Chapel Gate (sub area C5); and,
   d) Other sites which come forward in spatially appropriate locations and where secure community use for the peak period can be assured

An additional 3G pitch may be required in Poole (or at an appropriate location close to Poole but within Bournemouth) should demand for additional 3G capacity be demonstrated “on the ground” during the strategy period.

FR23) 3G pitches should only be located in locations outside areas of flood risk unless the risk can be mitigated.

FR24) Ensure that 3G provision is introduced in a phased and managed way to ensure that provision is made to reflect actual need and demand “on the ground”. A “plan, deliver, monitor, manage” approach should therefore be taken to the provision of additional capacity.

FR25) Ensure that delivery of additional 3G pitch capacity takes into account use of non 3G based pitches by teams for training and is introduced in-step with demand required by hockey teams for additional sand-based pitches.

FR26) Ensure that delivery of 3G capacity does not compromise the continued use of existing grass pitches for matches unless provision is intended to replace capacity on one or more grass pitches with the replaced pitches being re-purposed for other sport or recreational use.

FR27) Ensure that any proposed new 3G pitches have certainty of users (clubs / teams) committed to them and that commitments to the management and maintenance of the ground are in place prior to delivery.

FR28) Ensure that all new 3G pitches and facilities have a secure community use agreement in place for the long-term (preferably in perpetuity) for community access for a 34-hour peak period48 where feasible and that the appropriate body is identified to monitor and enforce such agreements. Providers should ensure that provision is made for different user groups during the peak period including clubs, pay and play, informal use and casual leagues.

FR29) The provision of additional 3G pitches should be based on the above recommendations and also spatial gaps, opportunities for hub sites such as redevelopment of existing multi-pitch sites and / or

---

48 The peak period is Mon-Thurs 5pm-9pm, Fri 5pm-7pm and Sat and Sun 9am-5pm.
strategic development allocations demand and need in relation to existing provision and demand from sub areas.

FR30) The costs of hiring 3G pitch time and space will need to be competitive to help ensure future viability but it is important that, to help enable transition from use of grass for matches to maximise use of capacity on 3Gs at weekends, match play charges reflect those paid for grass pitch use.

FR31) The deliverability of new 3Gs in a timely manner on secure and managed sites hosted by providers which will adhere to the recommendations for 3Gs above and in line with the other recommendations in this strategy are critical to the successful delivery and community use of pitches in the long-term.

FR32) Proposals for full size 3Gs which take supply beyond that needed within the Borough to 2033 and propose secure community use, unless there is demonstrable demand for additional capacity, may be appropriate if it can be demonstrated that they are viable in the long-term and will not place at risk the viability of agreed peak time use or capacity at existing secure community use 3Gs. In such cases, reduced peak time community use hours may be appropriate to help ensure that the viability of other sites is not put at risk.

FR33) New full size 3G pitches should be capable of being sub-divided sufficiently and practically to cater for 7v7 and 5v5 matches.

FR34) Demand for any additional 3G capacity required over and above a total of 4 full size equivalent pitches should be demonstrated “on the ground” during the strategy period prior to delivery where they introduce an element of secure or unsecure community use.

**Advisory Standards**

**11.47** With regard to provision of new, additional and / or improved facilities and pitches, the following advisory guidelines are provided for grass pitches:

i) Quality: Pitches and facilities should conform to the most up-to-date NGB guidance. New pitches should be provided to good quality able to accommodate 3 match equivalent sessions per week with an appropriate maintenance regime to maintain this quality.

ii) Accessibility: Pitches and facilities should conform to the most up-to-date Building Regulations and NGB guidance; be easily and safely accessible by cycle, foot and public transport; have secure cycle storage / parking; and, have sufficient car parking spaces to accommodate demand for the use of the facility and any associated shared uses and comply with the most up-to-date Highways Authority, Local Planning Authority and Sport England requirements / guidance. Ancillary facilities should be secure. Clubs and teams should be able to access a grass pitch for home matches within a reasonable distance / travel time of where the core of a squad reside, subject to the balance of provision with 3G pitches provided in accordance with the distance / catchment standard set for 3G pitches. However, provision of new grass pitches should not be made in locations where the cost of ensuring quality, viability in the long-term or security of a facility is in doubt. Residents of new strategic development should have access to a mini or youth grass pitch within 600 metres (or 15 minute) walking distance subject to demonstrable demand “on the ground” (and within the context of adult pitch and 3G provision) as part of open space provision (which is subject to separate standards).

iii) Quantity: The Sport England Playing Pitch Calculator should be used by the local authority to generate baseline figures for grass pitch requirements relating to new development sites (usually at the pre-application stage of the planning process). Such figures must be used only as a starting point and not used in isolation without reference to area requirements for need and demand set out in the assessment report and strategy.

**11.48** With regard to provision of new, additional and / or improved facilities and pitches, the following guidelines are provided for 3G pitches:

i) Quality: Pitches and facilities should conform to the most up-to-date NGB guidance. Pitches should have a “sinking fund” for certainty of future refurbishment / replacement of the surface and an appropriate maintenance regime in place to maintain good quality.

ii) Accessibility: Pitches and facilities should conform to the most up-to-date Building Regulations and NGB guidance; be secure; be easily and safely accessible by cycle, foot and public transport; have secure cycle storage / parking; and, have sufficient car parking spaces to accommodate
demand for the use of the facility and any associated shared uses and comply with the most up-to-date Highways Authority, Local Planning Authority and Sport England requirements/guidance. Pitches should be available for 34 peak period hours (Mon–Thurs 5pm-9pm, Fri 5pm-7pm and Sat–Sun 9am-5pm), be floodlit and have secure community use, with some hours made available for informal and pay and play use (subject to demand). Residents should be able to access at least 1 full size 3G pitch within a 20-minute drive (not a radius/as the crow flies) (approximately\textsuperscript{49} 5 miles based on an average urban area driving speed of 15 mph). Where demand is addressed through the provision of small or half size pitches, residents should be able to access at least 1 within a 10-minute drive (not a radius/as the crow flies) (approximately\textsuperscript{50} 2.5 miles based on an average urban area driving speed of 15 mph). These standards apply where demonstrable demand exists on the ground and where a facility is feasible and viable in the long-term.

iii) Quantity: see recommendations above. Alongside this assessment’s recommendations and the strategy for pitches, the Sport England Playing Pitch Calculator should be used by the local authority to generate baseline figures for pitch requirements relating to new development sites (usually at the pre-application stage of the planning process). Such figures must be used only as a starting point and not used in isolation without reference to area requirements for need and demand set out in the assessment report and strategy. It is important that users of the calculator obtain the latest version from Sport England as it is periodically updated.

\textsuperscript{49} this is an approximate figure as average traffic speeds vary from location to location and route to route and will change during the strategy period. Up to date GIS based traffic times should be used to estimate how far a catchment will extend based on the times given.

\textsuperscript{50} this is an approximate figure as average traffic speeds vary from location to location and route to route and will change during the strategy period. Up to date GIS based traffic times should be used to estimate how far a catchment will extend based on the times given.
12. HOCKEY

Summary

12.1 Since 2012, hockey has seen an 85% increase of U16 players taking up the sport and an overall 41% increase in players within the club environment. This is increase across all age groups expected to continue especially with the success of Rio Olympics and a home Women’s world cup in 2018.\(^{31}\)

12.2 Artificial Grass Pitches (AGPs) provide a secure and high-quality surface on which to play hockey used for both matches and training (and also football (for training and social games), and rugby where they meet the World Cup 22 standard\(^{52}\)). England Hockey categorises AGPs into four types\(^{53}\) with sand dressed and sand based the most commonly available and water-based surfaces found largely at elite centres. Hockey matches are typically played over a weekend with adult teams playing on Saturdays and junior teams on Sundays. Training usually takes place on weekday evenings although some junior training is held on Sundays.

12.3 For football, in recent years, the popularity of AGPs has increased; while 3G is the preferred surface, training and social play still takes place on sand pitches which can have an impact on availability of pitches for hockey clubs. This is the case in Poole, where football teams are using some time on sand based AGPs to train and for small sided informal play. This places some pressure on supply available for hockey club training on weekday evenings, in particular. In areas like Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole, where there is a limited supply of secure community use AGPs available (with a Category 1, 2 or 3 surface) for hockey use, there is particular risk to certainty and security of long-term use for hockey when a surface needs replacing, with commercial decisions sometimes leading to replacement with a 3G surface. The potential for change of surface can also be the case at school sites, sometimes compounded by a lack of sink fund in place to replace the surface (or carpet) within 10 years of installation. This position, particularly in relation to “home” grounds of hockey clubs, will need monitoring and hockey capacity used (and projected to be used) by clubs protected\(^{54}\).

12.4 There are currently 5 floodlit pitches with capability of hosting hockey matches and / or training across the Borough (Ashdown Leisure Centre, 2 at Chapel Gate, and 2 pitches at Canford School). 2 other pitches have no community use, no floodlighting and are too small to host matches (Bournemouth Collegiate School and Poole Grammar). One other full-size pitch, at Talbot Heath

\(^{31}\) Based on data supplied by England Hockey
\(^{52}\) World Cup 22 relates to the standard required of artificial turf for rugby. See http://www.irb.com/mm/document/lawsregs/regulations/04/21/57/42157_pdf.pdf for the full regulation.
\(^{53}\) England Hockey category 1 water surface essential for international hockey, category 2 sand dressed surfaces essential for domestic national premier competition and higher levels of player pathway, category 3 sand-based surfaces essential for all adult and junior club training and league hockey, EH provided competitions for clubs and schools and intermediate or advanced school hockey, and category 4 all long pile 3G surfaces only desirable for play where categories 1 – 3 are absent. Further details are available in the following documents: http://www.englandhockey.co.uk/core/core_picker/download.asp?id=17206&filetitle=EH+ArtificialGrass+Policy+2018&log_stat=true and section 6 of the following document regarding length of fibres - http://www.englandhockey.co.uk/core/core_picker/download.asp?id=17290&filetitle=EH+AGP+Guidance&log_stat=true
\(^{54}\) England Hockey has suggested that due to the loss of hockey compliant surfaces to 3G replacement, in some areas in England, hockey players are travelling over 30 minutes to get to a suitable AGP (in some cases this is doubling the travel time). Additionally, because of the conversion to 3G surfaces some local authority areas no longer have hockey teams playing within their boundary and they have been displaced to different areas or had to disband altogether.
School, will soon have a community use agreement in place and floodlighting (subject to planning approval) but it is understood will be principally for use by Bournemouth Hockey Club. The other sand based AGPs in the Borough are a secure community use at Mudeford Community Centre (half size), unsecure community half size pitch at The Grange Academy and a small size AGP at The Priory Church of England School which has no community use.

12.5 Chapel Gate, having recently been bought by Bournemouth University, is considered as a secure community use facility, in the short-term at least with a 5-year security of use having been offered to clubs using the facility as their home ground. The site is the home ground for Bournemouth Hockey Club which has 21 teams, 10 of which are U8 to U16 boys' and girls' teams, 5 of which are adult ladies, 5 adult men and 1 which is a veteran's team. The site also hosts University hockey for 2 ladies and 2 men's teams. The second pitch at the site is in poor condition and the surface needs to be replaced (rather than refurbished) and the club has stopped playing matches due to safety and quality concerns. The floodlighting on the pitch is also sub-standard with insufficient lux to play hockey. It is understood that the University has committed to improve the second AGP pitch on the site.

12.6 Of the 25.5 hours of current use on the first hockey pitch at Chapel Gate, 22.5 hours sees use by the hockey club with the remainder seeing use by school hockey, lacrosse and occasionally football. On the second pitch, most use is for football given the quality concerns for hockey use. With all use taken into account, there is around 16 hours of unused capacity per week.

12.7 Only one other pitch in the Borough has secure community use (Ashdown Leisure Centre in sub-area P4). It has a “standard” quality surface and is available for all 34 hours during the peak period. A recent report (undertaken for the former Borough of Poole local authority) suggests that the surface is likely to last for another 10 years. However, Poole Hockey Club, which uses the site as its home ground, has suggested that the surface is deteriorating and is not reliable for playing on late in the evening in winter due to potential for the pitch to freeze. The club has also suggested that floodlighting needs improving or replacing. Supply meets demand with Poole Hockey Club having 1 junior and 5 adult teams) all playing at Ashdown Leisure Centre. It is understood that the club has priority for booking on Saturdays and Tuesday evenings. However, available capacity at other times is shared with football at the moment and continued use by football teams may already be having an impact on the ability of the hockey club to grow. Current demand from hockey use is around 7.5 hours per week, 4 of which are for matches at weekends and 3.5 of which are for weekday evening training. The pitch is used for football for a further 15 hours per week, most of which will be during weekday evenings. If current levels of use for football remain into the future, or grow, there could be a risk to the supply of appropriate times for hockey, particularly for training, and particularly the unsecure use (with no formal community use agreement in place) of other pitches in the Borough.

12.8 Following England Hockey’s (EH) target for doubling participation rates between 2016 and 2026 and projecting this trend forward by half within the following years to 2033 suggests that by that time, a total of 12 senior and 2 junior teams could be in place at Poole Hockey Club, a total of 10 senior teams from Bournemouth University and a total of 25 senior and 25 junior teams from Bournemouth Hockey Club.

12.9 Projecting a year-on-year increase of 7% across all age groups at the hockey club and adding aspirational growth by the University of an additional 2 teams in the short-term suggests a need for up to 4 full size AGPs by 2033 to accommodate training and match demand. This means an increase of up to 2 additional pitches in addition to existing supply of 2 pitches at Chapel Gate (assuming that the second pitch is resurfaced/replaced). If the pitch at Talbot Heath School (in Bournemouth) comes forward for use by the club, this reduces the number to 1 additional pitch to serve demand in Christchurch is projected demand materialises “on the ground”.

12.10 Working through the required number of hours for training on weekday evenings and matches at weekends for the total number of anticipated teams by 2033, Poole Hockey Club could need up to an additional 10 hours over weekends for matches and 7 hours for training during weekday evenings (full size pitch hours) (or a total to accommodate current and future demand of 14 hours at weekends and 10 for training). This would suggest that by 2033 the club could need an additional 2 – 3 evenings to accommodate training. Bournemouth Hockey Club could require up to an additional 34 hours at weekends and 15 hours for training and Bournemouth University could require up to an additional 6 hours at weekends and 0 (zero) (during term time) if England Hockey assumptions for use are applied,
meaning that better use could be made of the time the teams use before additional time is necessary for additional members. Some additional capacity for Bournemouth Hockey Club will be provided at Talbot Heath School.

12.11 There may be other opportunities to secure community use for hockey on pitches not currently used at other sites such as Canford School’s pitches. The possibility of accessing the site for hockey should be explored during the strategy period as demand grows and if demand looks to be outstripping available supply. However, given the current status as unsecure school sites, they cannot be relied upon at the present time to provide long-term additional capacity for clubs. Additional capacity also seems unlikely to be made available at the unsecure pitches without community use at Poole Grammar and Bournemouth Collegiate School. Even if they could be brought into community use, they have no floodlighting, and both are half size pitches.

12.12 When setting required hours alongside match and training time slots, it is estimated that up to 2 full size floodlit pitches (i.e. 1 additional to the current supply in Poole) will be needed by 2033 to accommodate Poole Hockey Club’s growth, if projected growth appears “on the ground”, mainly to accommodate match day requirements (with training likely to be accommodated at the Ashdown pitch if priority can be made for hockey use). Secure use at Ashdown Leisure Centre may provide sufficient capacity for the club if priority time can be made for hockey over football and if demand as projected does not come to fruition. Therefore, demand “on the ground” should be monitored closely to understand the real need for an additional pitch for hockey use, which may materialise in the latter part of the strategy period.

12.13 Spatially, the catchment area (based on a 20-minute peak midweek drive-time) of the secure community use pitches in the Borough extends across most of the Borough.

12.14 Levels of actual and short and medium-term demand will need to be closely monitored to understand how real demand increases during the lifetime of the strategy. Provision for hockey beyond 2026 will need to be reconsidered during the lifetime of the strategy to understand the level of real demand compared to England Hockey’s targets and also in light of new targets established by that point for the period to 2033.

**Key Issues Snapshot**

12.15 The assessment data and discussion with members of the steering group suggest the following key issues are most prominent:

- Dependency of Poole Hockey Club on the pitch at Ashdown Leisure Centre as the only secure community use pitch. There are challenges to increasing the club’s use during their preferred times for training and have to compete with football use on the pitch (training and social play).
- If projected growth comes to fruition, an additional hockey pitch will be needed in Poole if unsecure community sites cannot be relied upon with any certainty for additional capacity. An additional hockey pitch will also be needed at Chapel Gate where the pitch at Talbot Heath School in Bournemouth can be utilised in full by Bournemouth Hockey Club.
- The resurfacing of the second pitch and replacement of the floodlights at Chapel Gate is a priority so that hockey use can return. However, when this occurs it will be important to ensure that the use of the pitch to accommodate hockey demand is prioritised first for hockey use, then football.
- There is some concern about the quality of changing / ancillary facilities at Chapel Gate. England Hockey has suggested that there is a need for improvements so that facilities serve more than just one sport.
- While Chapel Gate is considered a strategically important facility across a wider area than just Christchurch (including Bournemouth and southern Dorset), its location on the northern edge of Christchurch and Bournemouth means that it is not well-related (in terms of proximity) to much of Christchurch’s and Bournemouth’s main population along the coast.
• For the future long-term sustainability of hockey clubs (with regard to financial viability and maximising the availability of volunteer / coaches’ time) a “one site model” is preferred by England Hockey, focusing club activity on one central site.

Demand Summary

12.16 The demand summary for the strategy and the “direction of travel” it should take for hockey is as follows. However, it is important to note that figures for supply, demand and standards should not be read or relied upon in isolation outside of the context provided by the strategy recommendations.

a) There are no secure use sand-based pitches in Bournemouth.

b) There is currently a supply (carrying capacity) of 34 hours at secure community use sites in the peak period in Poole. However, this capacity is shared with football teams using Ashdown Leisure Centre for training or for social / informal / small sided football. Current demand from hockey use is around 7.5 hours per week. Figures suggest that current demand is met by supply and availability during the peak period for matches and training (although anecdotally, there are insufficient evening slots available to accommodate additional training demands on the days and times that Poole Hockey Club requires it, given football use on the pitch).

c) Demand is projected to increase by 2033. Taking into account additional future demand, a total of 12 senior and 2 junior teams could be in place at Poole Hockey Club by 2033, a total of 10 senior teams from Bournemouth University and a total of 25 senior and 25 junior teams from Bournemouth Hockey Club. To accommodate projected growth, Poole Hockey Club could need up to 10 additional hours over weekends for matches and 7 additional hours for training during weekday evenings (full size pitch hours).

d) It is estimated that up to 2 full size floodlit pitches will be needed by 2033 (i.e. Ashdown Leisure Centre + 1) to accommodate Poole Hockey Club’s growth if projected demand comes to fruition. Secure use at Ashdown Leisure Centre may provide sufficient capacity for the club in the short and medium term if priority time can be made for hockey over football.

e) There is currently a supply (carrying capacity) of 68 hours at the unsecure community use site at Chapel Gate in the peak period. However, this is only notional capacity for hockey, given the poor condition of the second pitch and the amount of use by football, particularly on the second pitch.

f) There is demand for 26 hours of use in the peak period on the first pitch at Chapel Gate, 23 hours of which is for hockey. The second pitch sees 18 hours of demand, with little of this taken by hockey due to its poor condition and poor floodlighting. Spare unused capacity on the second pitch is unusable for hockey.

g) Projected demand suggests an increase by 2033 equating to a need for almost 4 full size floodlit AGPs by that time to accommodate both training and matches for the club and University teams.

h) Additional new pitch provision, if required, should be provided only in response to demonstrable demand “on the ground”. A “plan, deliver, monitor, manage” approach should therefore be taken to the provision of additional capacity.

Recommendations

12.17 The above assessment conclusions suggest that the strategy should be as follows:

PROTECT

HR1) Protect the capacity available for hockey use on England Hockey Category 1, 2 and 3 surfaces. Consultation should take place between providers, clubs, England Hockey, Football Association and the Football Foundation prior to any change in surface type is introduced (for example, from sand to 3G). A change of surface type (or carpet) will require planning application and applicants will have to show that there is sufficient AGP provision available for hockey within the demand catchment if the surface is changed. Advice from Sport England and England Hockey should be sought prior to any planning application being submitted.
HR2) There is sufficient demand projected during the strategy period to 2033 to warrant protection of the sand-based pitch at Ashdown Leisure Centre for Poole Hockey Club use and of the two sand-based surfaces at Chapel Gate for hockey use by the Bournemouth Hockey Club and University teams. Consideration of 3G provision in addition to the two existing sand based AGPs at Chapel Gate (see Football Conclusions) would help to ensure that, as hockey demand on-site grows, football use on artificial pitches at Chapel Gate is catered for on-site and not displaced elsewhere.

HR3) For the future long-term sustainability of hockey clubs (with regard to financial viability and maximising the availability of volunteer / coaches’ time) a “one site model” for focusing club activity on one central site should be followed.

HR4) Protect the current number of hours used by hockey in the peak period as a minimum (i.e. seek to prevent use by additional football training on pitches used for hockey).

HR5) Seek agreement between hockey (England Hockey) and football (Football Association), and with providers and clubs, about timely sole or priority use of sand based full size secure use AGPs within the context of the football assessment conclusions and recommendations.

HR6) Maintain AGP surfaces and lighting to a “good” quality standard.

**ENHANCE**

HR7) Seek to gain formal agreement or security of use of unsecure pitches to provide additional supply for hockey, particularly if Poole Hockey Club’s projected growth comes to fruition.

HR8) Resolve sharing issues at Ashdown Leisure Centre between hockey and football use to increase the time available to the hockey club to train on weekday evenings, given that the pitch is the only secure community use hockey surface available in Poole (a covering much of Bournemouth).

HR9) Seek improvements to quality of secure use pitches and ancillary facilities where necessary to help provide consistency of supply and quality and sustain and help grow club membership, for example at Ashdown Leisure Centre (AGP1) (home of Poole Hockey Club).

HR10) Seek improvements to the quality of the second pitch at Chapel Gate by replacing the surface and floodlighting to acceptable standards for hockey match play and training.

HR11) Resolve sharing issues between hockey and football use at Chapel Gate and ensure a managed transition as hockey demand grows on-site and as solutions for football 3G surfaces are delivered either on or off site to accommodate demand for football training.

HR12) Enhance ancillary facilities at Chapel Gate to ensure that they support the needs of the hockey club.

**PROVIDE**

HR13) Provide 1 new additional full size floodlit AGP with a hockey compliant surface in a location appropriate to cater for the catchment of demand (and if possible to meet a “one site model” for the club) should projected growth of Poole Hockey Club come to fruition and community use cannot be secured on unsecure community use pitches to help accommodate demand.

HR14) With improvements to the second pitch at Chapel Gate, together with the pitch at Talbot Heath School in Bournemouth catering for community use principally by Bournemouth Hockey Club (assuming planning permission is granted for floodlights on the site), projected demand by 2033, if it appears “on the ground” is for 1 additional full size floodlit AGP for hockey use. Towards the end of the strategy period, a site should be identified if demand emerges in a location appropriate to cater for the catchment of demand.

HR15) Monitor closely the change in demand to map against projected demand and understand the real demand “on the ground” for additional match and training time. The delivery of additional pitches should be made in a timely fashion, i.e. co-ordinated in alignment with demand, availability of supply and risk of loss of existing supply on unsecure sites. A “plan, deliver, monitor, manage” approach should therefore be taken to the provision of additional capacity.

HR16) New AGP pitches should only be located in locations outside areas of flood risk or suitable mitigation put in place.

HR17) New AGPs should be located on a managed site hosted by a provider which will: adhere to the recommendations for pitches above; and, not rely on third party management of the pitch and ancillary facilities.
Advisory Standards

12.18 With regard to provision of new, additional and/or improved facilities and pitches, the following guidelines are provided:

i) Quality: Pitches and facilities should conform to the most up-to-date NGB guidance. Pitches should have a “sinking fund” for certainty of future refurbishment/replacement of the surface and an appropriate maintenance regime in place to maintain good quality.

ii) Accessibility: Pitches and facilities should conform to the most up-to-date Building Regulations and NGB guidance; be secure; be easily and safely accessible by cycle, foot and public transport; have secure cycle storage/parking; and, have sufficient car parking spaces to accommodate demand for the use of the facility and any associated shared uses and comply with the most up-to-date Highways Authority, Local Planning Authority and Sport England requirements/guidance. Pitches should be floodlit to a minimum of 350 lux. Pitches should be available for 34 peak period hours (Mon – Thurs 5pm-9pm, Fri 5pm-7pm and Sat – Sun 9am-5pm), be floodlit and have secure community use, with some hours made available for informal and pay and play use (subject to demand). Residents should be able to access at least 1 full size sand based AGP within a 20-minute drive (not a radius/as the crow flies) (approximately 55 miles based on an average urban area driving speed of 15 mph). These standards apply where demonstrable demand exists on the ground and where a facility is feasible and viable in the long-term.

iii) Quantity: see recommendations above. Alongside this assessment’s recommendations and the strategy for pitches, the Sport England Playing Pitch Calculator should be used by the local authority to generate baseline figures for pitch requirements relating to new development sites (usually at the pre-application stage of the planning process). Such figures must be used only as a starting point and not used in isolation without reference to area requirements for need and demand set out in the assessment report and strategy. It is important that users of the calculator obtain the latest version from Sport England as it is periodically updated.

---

55 this is an approximate figure as average traffic speeds vary from location to location and route to route and will change during the strategy period. Up to date GIS based traffic times should be used to estimate how far a catchment will extend based on the times given.
13. CRICKET

Summary

13.1 There are 7 cricket grounds with secure community use grass pitches (i.e. wickets / strips) in Poole, all with artificial pitches, 4 secure grounds in Bournemouth, 2 of which have an artificial pitch and 4 cricket grounds with secure community use grass pitches in Christchurch (1 at Hurn Bridge Sports Club56, which also has an artificial pitch, and 3 at Chapel Gate). The well-used Hurn Indoor Cricket Centre is adjacent to the Sports Club pitches. There are 4 unsecure community use grounds in Poole, 3 with grass pitches and 2 with artificial pitches with the figures in Bournemouth being 5 and 1 respectively. There are 4 unsecure community use grounds in Christchurch with 1 each at Mudeford Recreation Ground, Wingfields Recreation Ground57 and Winkton Fields (although while there is a single pitch, it has not been used recently), and 1 at East Christchurch Sports and Social Club (although at the time of writing this site may lose its cricket ground to alternative sports use). There are 2 grounds with no community use in Bournemouth and 3 in Poole, all of which are on school sites.

13.2 The main spatial gaps where there are no pitches with secure community use are B1, B2 and much of southern B3, northern B4 and B6. In Poole, the main gaps are in P1, P4, P5 and southern P3 and in Christchurch, sub-area C3.

13.3 In Bournemouth in the 2018 season there were 8 clubs, with a total of 23 teams of which 14 are adult teams and 9 are junior teams. In Poole in the 2018 season there were 5 clubs, with a total of 33 teams of which 15 are adult teams and 18 are junior teams. There is 1 women’s team in Bournemouth. There are 5 evening league teams across Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole. In Christchurch in the 2018 season there were 4 clubs (Bournemouth CC, Christchurch CC, Mudeford CC and Bournemouth University), with 38 teams playing for these clubs and in the BECL league and last man stands competition. Of this number, 12 are boys’ teams, 1 is a girls’ team, 5 are ladies’ teams, 19 are adult men’s teams and 1 last man stands. Junior and women’s teams have been identified as opportunities for growth in Bournemouth and Poole. This is a particular gap in the Borough and the ECB is looking to address this through its current strategy. Growing junior play in the Borough will help to ensure succession into adult teams in the medium and long term.

13.4 The majority of club sites / grounds have secure community use. Most grounds are in the ownership of the local authority, with management and maintenance mostly a mix of local authority and club responsibility.

13.5 Most pitches are either of a standard or good quality, as is the case with artificial pitches. The only secure community use pitch rated as “poor” is Branksome Recreation Ground (Poole). When set alongside pitches’ carrying capacity and the amount of play they accommodate during a season, the secure pitches at Kinson Manor Playing Field (Bournemouth) were considered as being overplayed. Of the secure pitches, 6 grass squares were being played at the level appropriate for their quality at

56 The current lease on the ground ends in July 2024 but the lease is protected by legal agreement. Clubs are offered hire terms on an annual basis by the tenant (Christchurch FC Ltd.).
57 However, the sites at Mudeford and Wingfields have been transferred to Christchurch Town Council and Highcliffe & Walkford Neighbourhood Council respectively and, although there is no formal agreement in place for the continued use of the sites for sport (and are therefore, strictly speaking and in sports terms, pitches with unsecured community use), given the long tradition of sports use and with a formal community use agreement in place for the use of the sites as public green spaces, it is understood to be very likely that the sites will continue to be used for sport moving forward.
(King’s Park (Bournemouth), Hurn Bridge Sports Club (Christchurch), Chapel Gate (Christchurch) and Whitecliff Recreation Ground (Poole), as is the artificial pitch at Broadstone Recreation Ground with no overplay or spare capacity. Figures suggest overplay on the artificial pitch at Hurn Bridge Sports Club. There is no evidence to suggest this is having a degrading impact on the surface as the quality assessment indicated that it is of “good” quality, but it is an indicator that an additional artificial pitch could be necessary to accommodate the demand. All other secure use pitches have some potential capacity to accommodate an increase in demand. The ground at Winkton (in Christchurch) has capacity on the square to accommodate additional grass pitches with only 1 currently laid for play and no record of use in 2018. Recommendations for individual pitches (and others) will be made in the strategy and action plan.

Ancillary facilities such as changing rooms and pavilions seem to be in good condition apart from those at Winton Recreation Ground (Bournemouth), Winkton Fields (Christchurch) and Wingfields Recreation Ground (Christchurch) which have been rated as poor quality (Winkton Fields in particular has very limited facilities).

In Bournemouth, there is currently a supply (carrying capacity) of 313 match equivalents per season on grass squares (135 of which are on secure community use sites) and 180 match equivalents on artificial pitches (of which 120 are on secure use sites). In Poole, there is currently a supply (carrying capacity) of 420 match equivalents per season on grass squares (325 of which are on secure community use sites) and 270 match equivalents on artificial pitches (of which 210 are on secure use sites). In Christchurch there is currently a supply (carrying capacity) of 185 match equivalents per season on grass squares (150 of which are on secure use sites) and 210 match equivalents per season on artificial pitches (of which 150 are on secure sites).

The following tables set out the supply and demand balance on grass and artificial pitches (where green shading represents spare or unused capacity, orange represents supply and demand in balance and red represent overplay).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-area</th>
<th>Pitch equivalents*</th>
<th>Secure</th>
<th>Unsecure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bournemouth</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B3</strong></td>
<td>-3.4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B6</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Area</strong></td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Poole</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P5</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Area</strong></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Christchurch</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Area</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BCP Total</strong></td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-area</td>
<td>Pitch equivalents*</td>
<td>Secure</td>
<td>Unsecure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bournemouth</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Area</strong></td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Poole</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P5</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Area</strong></td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Christchurch</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C5</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Area</strong></td>
<td>-0.8</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Borough</strong></td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes. Figures may not sum due to rounding. Positive score = capacity / underplay, negative score = no capacity / overplay.
* based on a good quality pitch accommodating 60 matches per season and good quality grass pitches hosting 5 per season.

13.9 No quantifiable unmet or latent demand was identified by clubs for grass or artificial pitches in Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole.

13.10 Figures for potential imported demand (from Parley CC if it fails to secure use of its current ground just outside the Borough boundary) suggest a potential demand for up to 3 artificial pitches and around 9 grass pitches (if adult teams play matches on grass and train on artificial pitches and junior teams play and train on artificial pitches) which could equate to 1-2 grounds. No displaced demand (i.e. teams playing outside the Borough who wish to return to play within the Borough) have been identified during the assessments.

13.11 If additional demand arising from population growth and an increase in participation is added to the amount of capacity required to accommodate use currently on unsecure community use pitches, a significant number of grass and artificial pitches would be needed across Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole.\(^{58}\)

---

\(^{58}\) Up to 71 grass pitches (i.e. wickets / strips) could be required in Bournemouth, 24 in Christchurch and none in Poole to accommodate the total number of teams likely to be generated by 2033 and if clubs are to move away from, or secure use at, unsecure sites. The figure for artificial pitches is an additional 7 in Bournemouth, 4 in Christchurch and 10 in Poole, again, assuming that play at unsecure sites moves to secure sites or those unsecure sites can be made secure for community use. In Christchurch, there is no available ‘spare’ capacity on existing grass or artificial secure community use pitches and so existing secure sites cannot absorb any of this new demand. The growth in demand for artificial pitches is largely a result of participation rate targets generated by the All Stars programme and desire to see a greater number of women’s teams. It is assumed that around 90% of junior team demand will occur on artificial surfaces. The tables at paragraph 13.18 (entitled “calculating the residual demand required if various solutions can be maximised”) set out the options which can be utilised to reduce these figures to a realistic scale of new additional provision.
13.12 However, the preferred solution should always be to secure community use on clubs’ home grounds rather than move them and fund provision of a new ground. If unsecure grass pitches can be transferred to secure use (and “spare” capacity on existing pitches can be utilised) additional grass pitch capacity required is 6 in Bournemouth and 15 in Christchurch, and 2 artificial pitches in Christchurch and 2 in Poole.

13.13 Figures for Bournemouth are relatively high as play from growth in sub-area B6 is assumed to take place on grass pitches as there are no artificial grass pitches serving teams in the area. Up to 7 artificial pitches could be needed across Bournemouth and up to 10 across Poole to cater for additional demand if that demand emerges “on the ground”.

13.14 Figures should be treated with caution and as a “top end” figure and the demand for and provision of additional pitches will need to be monitored to understand realistic demand on the ground to ensure supply accurately reflects demand prior to any new pitches being provided (particularly on new grounds). The combination of provision between grass and artificial pitches will also need to be provided to fit with real demand.

13.15 The aggregate figures for individual sub areas, for each former Borough and whole area combined and, in some cases, can mask specific needs at individual sites and the recommendations below seek to ensure that these issues are addressed within the context of the overall strategy approach.

13.16 Additional capacity seems unlikely to be required in full on additional new grounds. Opportunities exist to add pitches at existing sites, including at the sites where there is little or no use (such as Winkton) although supply of additional pitches should, of course, follow demand. Some or all of the additional capacity required could be accommodated on existing grounds where there is the opportunity to set a new pitch at an existing square, but only where time slots are available to accommodate new teams playing matches on Saturdays and Sundays depending on the age group and format of the game played (and subject to the ability of the club or other body responsible for maintenance to maintain the additional pitch). It is understood, for example, that in Christchurch there is insufficient supply at existing grounds used by teams on Saturdays although there is some capacity available on Sundays. The site at Winkton should therefore be considered as buffer or headroom capacity should it not be appropriate to locate additional demand at existing well-used sites, particularly in relation to the provision of additional grass pitches. Spatially, Winkton is further to travel away from the main conurbation and club home grounds and could explain why it sees no demand. Another factor in the need to retain these locations for potential increased use is the changing nature of cricket where some grounds are now too small to accommodate comfortably adult men’s team matches. Adult teams to whom this position applies may need to move home matches to alternative grounds with smaller sites being a focus more for the junior game in the future.

13.17 The ability to cater for the projected level of increase may be beyond the volunteer capacity of many clubs and this may constrain “on the ground” emergence of teams. Specific recommendations in terms of actions to accommodate this level of growth in the long term will be made in the strategy and action plan and it is likely that it will not simply require physical provision of the number of pitches indicated. Part of the solution to providing sufficient capacity for growing teams could be to seek to secure current unsecure sites used, bringing “mothballed” pitches back into use where and when necessary and providing more artificial pitches to accommodate a greater amount of demand.

59 While projections have made assumptions about use, should these assumptions not fit actual demand needs “on the ground”, the balance between grass pitch and artificial pitch provision may need to change to reflect the preferred or available surface for matches.
particularly to accommodate junior growth (with 1 artificial pitch being able to accommodate the equivalent of 12-20 junior grass pitches), minimise risk to quality on shared sites and ensure that clubs which grow have the playing and training capacity to do so, on second grounds if this is not achievable on their current home ground.

13.18 Measures which could be taken on specific sites to reduce the number of new additional pitches required and the resultant capacity it could introduce to the supply of secure sites could look as follows. The following tables also calculate the resulting residual demand needing to be accommodated by 2033.

| Bournemouth: calculating the residual demand required if various solutions can be maximised |
|--------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Increased capacity from: | Potential Additional Capacity Provided (Pitches) |
| | Grass | Artificial |
| a) Increasing capacity of poor and standard rated secure quality pitches (notional figure to be tested against whether improvements will achieve real time availability of pitch time) | 0 | 0 |
| b) Using notionally spare capacity on secure pitches (subject to testing to determine if practical to do so given match days and timeslots required) | 6 | 1.5 |
| c) Securing formal community use agreements for club play taking place on unsecure sites | 1<sup>60</sup> | 0 |
| d) Securing formal secure community use agreements for junior demand on unsecure education sites | 10<sup>61</sup> | 2<sup>62</sup> |
| e) Securing community use on sites where no community access is not currently permitted | 4<sup>63</sup> | 1<sup>64</sup> |
| f) New pitches in the pipeline being delivered | 9<sup>65</sup> | 1<sup>66</sup> |
| g) Bringing “mothballed” pitches back into use where and when necessary (i.e. providing additional capacity on sites where grass pitches are not currently in use but where there have been pitches before) | 32<sup>67</sup> | 2<sup>68</sup> |
| h) Introducing additional artificial pitches to absorb projected demand on grass pitches, particularly for junior matches and in locations where no artificial pitches exist | - | 1<sup>69</sup> |
| i) Provision of new additional grass pitches on existing grounds where feasible to do so (estimate) | 3 | - |
| Total Additional Demand by 2033 | 71 | 8 |
| Less total a) – i) | 65 | 8.5 |
| Residual demand to be provided for: | 6 | -0.5 |

Commentary: The minus figure indicates spare capacity, in this case there is some capacity to accommodate half an artificial pitch worth of demand, which equals 30 match equivalents on a good quality artificial pitch. Subject to where and on which surface type demand manifests, this has potential to absorb demand for the additional residual grass pitches required, with 1 good quality grass pitch providing 5 match equivalents (i.e. 6 grass pitches of demand equating to 30 match equivalents).

---

60 At Bournemouth Boys Grammar School (B5)
61 At Leaf Academy (B3) and Winton Arts and Media College (B4)
62 At Bournemouth Boys Grammar School (B5) and Winton Arts and Media College (B4)
63 At Talbot Heath School (B1)
64 At Talbot Heath School (B1)
65 At Slades Farm (B4) (suggested number of pitches)
66 At Slades Farm (B4) (suggested number of pitches)
67 At Meyrick Park (B1), King’s Park (K2) (B6) and Strouden (B5) (assumes 8 pitches at each)
68 At Littledown (B6) and Muscliff (B5)
69 At King’s Park (B6)
### Poole: calculating the residual demand required if various solutions can be maximised

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Increased capacity from:</th>
<th>Potential Additional Capacity Provided (Pitches)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grass</td>
<td>Artificial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Increasing capacity of poor and standard rated secure quality pitches (notional figure to be tested against whether improvements will achieve real time availability of pitch time)</td>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;70&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2.5&lt;sup&gt;71&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Using notionally spare capacity on secure pitches (subject to testing to determine if practical to do so given match days and timeslots required)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Securing formal community use agreements for club play taking place on unsecure sites</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;72&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Securing formal secure community use agreements for junior demand on unsecure education sites</td>
<td>16&lt;sup&gt;73&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;74&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Securing community use on sites where no community access / is not currently permitted</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) New pitches in the pipeline being delivered</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Brining “mothballed” pitches back into use where and when necessary (i.e. providing additional capacity on sites where grass pitches are not currently in use but where there have been pitches before)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) Introducing additional artificial pitches to absorb projected demand on grass pitches, particularly for junior matches and in locations where no artificial pitches exist</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Provision of new additional grass pitches on existing grounds where feasible to do so (estimate)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Additional Demand by 2033</strong></td>
<td><strong>22</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Less total a) – i)</strong></td>
<td><strong>54</strong></td>
<td><strong>7.5</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Residual demand to be provided for:</strong></td>
<td><strong>-32</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.5</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Commentary:** 32 pitches worth of spare or headroom capacity on grass pitches equals 160 match equivalents. With demand for additional artificial pitches, this capacity is not “surplus”. Subject to where and on which surface type demand manifests, this has potential to absorb demand / capacity provided by around 2.5 artificial pitches. Therefore, the residual artificial demand which might be needed by 2033 could reduce to around 2 additional artificial pitches.

---

<sup>70</sup> Improving quality from “poor” to “good” or “standard” at Branksome Recreation Ground (P3)

<sup>71</sup> Improving quality from “poor” to “good” or “standard” at Branksome Recreation Ground (P3) to deliver one additional pitch, improving the quality of the artificial pitch at Whitecliff Recreation Ground (P5) from “poor / standard” to “good” to deliver up to one additional equivalent pitch and improving from “standard” to “good” at Broadstone Recreation Ground (P5) to deliver half a pitch equivalent additional capacity

<sup>72</sup> Securing equivalent of 1 additional pitch of capacity across both artificial pitches at Poole Grammar School

<sup>73</sup> At Parkstone Grammar School (P5), Poole Grammar School (P4) and Carter Community School (P1)

<sup>74</sup> At Broadstone Middle School (P5) and Carter Community School (P1)
### Christchurch: calculating the residual demand required if various solutions can be maximised

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Increased capacity from:</th>
<th>Potential Additional Capacity Provided (Pitches)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Increasing capacity of poor and standard rated secure quality pitches (notional figure to be tested against whether improvements will achieve real time availability of pitch time)</td>
<td>Grass: 0, Artificial: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Using notionally spare capacity on secure pitches (subject to testing to determine if practical to do so given match days and timeslots required)</td>
<td>Grass: 0, Artificial: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Securing formal community use agreements for club play taking place on unsecure sites</td>
<td>Grass: 975, Artificial: 276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Securing formal secure community use agreements for junior demand on unsecure education sites</td>
<td>Grass: 0, Artificial: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Securing community use on sites where no community access / is not currently permitted</td>
<td>Grass: 0, Artificial: 277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) New pitches in the pipeline being delivered</td>
<td>Grass: 0, Artificial: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Bringing “mothballed” pitches back into use where and when necessary (i.e. providing additional capacity on sites where grass pitches are not currently in use but where there have been pitches before)</td>
<td>Grass: 678, Artificial: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) Introducing additional artificial pitches to absorb projected demand on grass pitches, particularly for junior matches and in locations where no artificial pitches exist</td>
<td>Grass: 0, Artificial: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Provision of new additional grass pitches on existing grounds where feasible to do so (estimate)</td>
<td>Grass: 1479, Artificial: 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Additional Demand by 2033**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grass</th>
<th>Artificial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Less total a) – i)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grass</th>
<th>Artificial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Residual demand to be provided for:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grass</th>
<th>Artificial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-14</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Commentary: If the above measures are all practical and put into practice / delivered, no additional new grounds would be required to accommodate new projected demand.

---

13.19 Levels of actual and short-term demand will need to be closely monitored to understand how real demand increases during the lifetime of the strategy, particularly after the initial strategy period. As projections of demand and need are based on assumptions around increasing growth and participation, which may or may not come to fruition, additional provision after the first few years of the strategy period should be responsive to demonstrable levels of demand. This is particularly the case within cricket for the growth in junior teams given the ECB’s All Stars Cricket initiative, targets for which are relatively ambitious and may not come to fruition or the assumptions made in projecting demand and use of pitches / grounds and surface type prove different to how demand is actually accommodated “on the ground”.

---

75 At Winkton Fields, East Christchurch Sports and Social Club and Mudeford Rec
76 At Mudeford Rec and Wingfields Rec
77 At Highcliffe Academy and Highcliffe St Mark’s Primary School
78 At Wingfields where the grass square is currently unused. 6 pitches suggested, but it could be more subject to demand at the site
79 At Chapel Gate on the square where there are currently only 3 pitches, 5 at Winkton Fields where there is currently only 1 pitch
Key Issues Snapshot

13.20 The assessment data and discussion with members of the steering group suggest the following key issues are most prominent:

- Projections for growth suggest that the junior game is likely to see most growth, principally through the ECB All Stars programme. Increasing links with schools (including security of community use) and using their pitches and facilities seems to be key in accommodating the growth, if and when demand increases “on the ground”.
- The projections of growth are relatively high for cricket (given their basis, to a large extent on ECB participation targets). Provision of any additional cricket pitches or grounds should be made on the basis of known demand rather than on projections of growth which may or may not happen.
- Securing community use at club home grounds is critical to give clubs certainty.
- The pitch at Winkton can continue to be mothballed for cricket use due to lack of demand but could play a role in supporting additional grass pitch demand during the strategy period if these grass pitches cannot be accommodated at existing club home grounds.
- The indoor cricket centre at Hurn Bridge plays an important role in supporting cricket demand throughout the year.
- Slades Farm reinstatement presents a good opportunity to deliver additional high-quality grass and artificial pitches in Bournemouth. Mothballed sites in Bournemouth should be retained and may play a key role in providing capacity in the period to 2033. Both Slades Farm and mothballed sites could provide an opportunity to resolve short boundary issues at other pitches (by teams moving their home ground) and / or provide a home for teams displaced from the Borough who urgently need a new home ground.
- Junior and women’s teams have been identified as opportunities for growth in Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole. This is a particular gap in the Borough and the ECB is looking to address this through its current strategy. Growing junior play in the Borough will help to ensure succession into adult teams in the medium and long term.
- The pitches at Branksome Recreation Ground and Whitecliff Recreation Ground are in need of improvements to their quality.
- Prior to providing additional grounds for cricket, existing supply / assets and opportunities for improvements in quality and capacity should be maximised. Increased capacity can come from a variety of sources and could be from a combination of:
  o Increasing capacity of poor and standard rated quality pitches where improvements will achieve real time availability of pitch time;
  o Using notionally spare capacity on pitches where practical to do so given match days and timeslots required;
  o Securing formal community use agreements for play taking place on unsecure sites;
  o Securing written confirmation of secure community use for sport on the sites transferred to Neighbourhood and Town Councils;
  o Securing community use on sites where no community access is currently permitted;
  o New pitches in the pipeline being delivered;
  o Bringing “mothballed” pitches back into use where and when necessary (i.e. providing additional capacity on sites where grass pitches are not currently in use but where there have been pitches before);
  o Introducing additional artificial pitches to absorb projected demand on grass pitches, particularly for junior matches and in locations where no artificial pitches exist;
  o Provision of new additional grass pitches on existing grounds where feasible to do so; and,
  o Provision of new additional grass pitches at new grounds in appropriate locations.
- However, provision of new additional pitches after solutions have been exhausted on existing sites will need to respond to demonstrable demand “on the ground”.
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Demand Summary

13.21 The demand summary for the strategy and the “direction of travel” it should take for cricket is as follows. However, it is important to note that figures for supply, demand and standards should not be read or relied upon in isolation outside of the context provided by the strategy recommendations.

a) In Bournemouth, taking current demand into account and comparing to supply, there are 14 match equivalents of unused capacity on secure use grass pitches (equating to around 2 pitches of good quality) and 96 (equating to around 2 artificial pitches) on secure use artificial pitches. On unsecure community use pitches, the balance is 125 match equivalents (equating to around 25 grass pitches on grass pitches and 45 on artificial pitches (the equivalent of less than 1 pitch).

b) In Poole, taking current demand into account and comparing to supply, there are 93 match equivalents of unused capacity on secure use grass pitches (equating to around 18 pitches of good quality) and 108 (equating to around 2 artificial pitches) on secure use artificial pitches. On unsecure community use pitches, the balance is 50 match equivalents (equating to around 25 grass pitches on grass pitches and 0 (zero) on artificial pitches.

c) In Christchurch, taking current demand into account and comparing to supply, there are 0 match equivalents of unused capacity on secure use grass pitches and 46 match equivalents of over-use of secure artificial pitches (equating to around 1 artificial pitch). On unsecure community use pitches, the balance is 5 match equivalents of unused capacity (equating to around 1 grass pitch) on grass pitches and 25 on artificial pitches (the equivalent of less than 1 pitch).

d) Demand is projected to increase by 2033. Taking into account existing unused capacity, a desire to move use away from unsecure to secure sites and the demand for additional new capacity, this translates into an equivalent need for additional capacity of around 71 good quality grass pitches (i.e. wickets / strips) in Bournemouth, 24 in Christchurch and 0 (zero) in Poole (having spare or “headroom” capacity of around 11 pitches), and 7 good quality artificial pitches in Bournemouth, 4 in Christchurch and 10 in Poole.

e) However, it must be stressed that this does not equate to a need for pitch capacity to this total amount being provided at new grounds. In reality, additional capacity to accommodate demand could be provided through a combination of: delivery of pitches or grounds “in the pipeline” improving the quality of standard and poor quality pitches; securing community use on current unsecure sites; bringing “mothballed” pitches back into use where and when necessary; new additional pitches at existing grounds where capacity would be practically usable; additional artificial pitches to absorb projected demand on grass pitches; and / or, (if necessary) new additional grounds in sub-areas / locations where the demand is likely to occur.

f) For example, if current unsecure pitches can be transferred to secure community use, and spare capacity can be used, these numbers reduce to 6 additional grass pitches in Bournemouth, 15 in Christchurch and 0 in Poole, and to 0 artificial pitches in Bournemouth, 2 in Christchurch and 2 in Poole.

g) Potential imported demand from teams (Parley CC) which may be forced to return to Christchurch if their home ground is not available next season equates to 9 grass pitches and up to 3 artificial pitches.

h) Provision of new additional pitches will need to respond to demonstrable demand “on the ground”. A “plan, deliver, monitor, manage” approach should therefore be taken to the provision of additional capacity. The combination of provision between grass and artificial pitches will also need to be provided to fit with real demand (for example, to match increased participation in the junior and women’s game should it materialise as projected / targeted by the ECB / Dorset CB).
Recommendations

13.22 The above assessment conclusions suggest that the strategy should be as follows:

**PROTECT**

CR1) Protect pitches by seeking to establish security of tenure for grounds / pitches currently considered as unsecure and explore community use on those not currently available (also see Enhance below). The implications of any changes to security of use will need to be understood and factored into planning for delivery during the strategy period.

CR2) Protect currently “mothballed” pitch sites from development, holding in reserve to ensure that headroom capacity is available to respond quickly to increasing demand during the strategy period.
   a) King’s Park x 2 grass squares (B6)
   b) Strouden Playing Fields x 1 grass square (B5)
   c) Littledown Park x 1 artificial (B6)
   d) Meyrick Park x 1 grass square (B1)
   e) Muscliff x 1 artificial (B5)
   f) Slades Farm x 1 grass square (B4) (although the site is in the pipeline to be brought back into use)
   g) Barrack Road (held in reserve to ensure that (subject to overcoming potential conflict of use of the site for the annual funfair) headroom capacity could be available to respond to potentially imported demand in the short-term should, for example, Parley CC need to be accommodated and if no other suitable site is available)

CR3) Protect long-term capacity on artificial pitches by ensuring the establishment of sinking fund by clubs and / or site owners / managers for surface replacement, also putting in place measures to ensure that such funds are collected and monitored.

CR4) Protection from loss also extends to where a club folds, as additional capacity on a lost ground and previously used for cricket may be required by other clubs and this should be explored in relation to potential demand where this scenario happens. Such sites also need protection for future supply as the anticipated growth in junior age groups moves through into the adult game towards during the strategy period.

CR5) Protect the well-used Hurn Indoor Cricket Centre through confirmation of a long-term sustainable business plan for the facility to ensure continuity of provision and use in the long-term.

**ENHANCE**

CR6) Gain the secure use of pitches which currently have unsecure community use through clubs and relevant authorities working with pitch providers / owners to seek a long-term secure use agreement to provide certainty of supply and reduce the need for additional new secure use pitches or grounds, for example, at the following sites (with a focus on securing junior capacity):
   a) Leaf Academy (B3);
   b) Winton Arts and Media College (B4);
   c) Bournemouth Boys Grammar (B5) (which already accommodates some club demand);
   d) Winkton Fields, in order to protect supply (but only subject to demand for both junior and senior play, given recent lack of use) (C4);
   e) Carter Community School (P1) (which would also need to see improvements to the quality of pitches and discussion about re-introduction of cricket for students / pupils);
   f) Poole Grammar School (P4) (which already accommodates some club demand);
   g) Broadstone Middle School (P5);
   h) Parkstone Grammar School (P5) (understood to be a hub for girls’ cricket).

CR7) Increase the current use of existing pitches where spare capacity notionally exists, where physically and logistically possible.
   a) Winton Recreation Ground (B4);
   b) Littledown Park (B6);
   c) Poole Park (P2);
   d) Whitecliff Recreation Ground (P2);
   e) Wallisdown Playing Fields (P3);
   f) Broadstone Cricket Club (P5);
g) Broadstone Recreation Ground (P5)

i) The Hamworthy Club (P5).

j) Artificial pitches on unsecured sites (Mudeford Recreation Ground (sub-area C1), Wingfields Recreation Ground (sub-area C2) and Chapel Gate (sub-area C5) if the sites can gain secure community use.

k) Winkton Fields (grass pitch), if security of community use can be gained and if ancillary facilities can be provided as part of the improvements to the site for football, in order to protect supply (subject to demand, given recent lack of use) (sub-area C4). If supply is unlikely to be taken up at Winkton Fields, consider providing replacement supply (1 grass pitch) at an alternative existing (secure community use) site.

CR8) Support projected growth in the women’s and junior games by ensuring that the quality of pitches and ancillary facilities meets their needs (i.e. that they are fit for purpose) where junior and women’s teams play and train.

CR9) Within the context of accommodating the projected / targeted increased demand for junior and women’s play, consider focusing junior play on grounds with limited or constrained boundary distances from the square (where any adult teams using the pitches / ground can realistically be relocated to a new permanent home ground which is fit for purpose and has capacity), for example (including but not limited to) at the following grounds:

a) Kinson Manor (B3) (discuss with Suttoners CC);

b) Winton Recreation Ground (B4) (discuss with Winton CC).

CR10) Seek to address overplay on specific secure sites if overplay is causing reduction in pitch quality (for example by changing formats of the game played and age groups playing at the ground or taking measures to improve maintenance to maintain or improve quality rating) or provision of additional or replacement artificial pitches, for example at:

a) Kinson Manor (B3) (discuss with Suttoners CC).

b) The artificial pitch at Hurn Bridge Sports Club (Christchurch CC) (sub-area C5) (discuss need with Christchurch CC).

CR11) Support the training needs of clubs by providing in-situ practice nets where necessary to improve the capacity for training which can help retain the quality of pitches on the main square.

CR12) Support the continual improvement of facilities to a good quality to help attract and retain players. While this applies to facilities of a standard quality, those with a rating of poor should be prioritised.

CR13) Support the continual improvement of pitches. While this applies to pitches of a standard quality, the focus should be on improving pitches of poor quality.

a) Branksome Recreation Ground (P3) grass and artificial pitches (improve from “poor” to “good”)

b) Broadstone Recreation Ground (P5) artificial pitch (improve from “standard” to “good”)

c) Whitecliff Recreation Ground (P5) artificial pitch (improve from “poor” to “good”)

d) Carter Community School (P1) artificial and grass pitches (if brought into community use and improvements made to reinstate)

e) Mudeford Recreation Ground (sub-area C1) artificial and grass pitches (improve from “standard” to “good”)

f) Wingfields Recreation Ground (sub-area C2) artificial and grass pitches (improve from “standard” to “good”)

CR14) Encourage clubs to sign legal leases with pitch / ground owners (long-term if possible / feasible) where a club makes the ground their “home” ground in addition to securing formal community use in order to give additional certainty.

CR15) Gain written reassurances from the Neighbourhood and Town Councils in control of transferred pitches that the security of use of the recreation grounds as public open green space extends to continued certainty of use as sports pitches:

- Mudeford Recreation Ground (sub-area C1); and,

- Wingfields Recreation Ground (sub-area C2).

This is important not only to give clubs certainty of use into the future but also in order for investment and / or contributions to be secured for improvements to be made to the pitches and / or facilities on the sites.

**PROVIDE**

CR16) Deliver pitches currently “in the pipeline”:

a) Slades Farm (c. 9 grass and 1 artificial) (B4)
CR17) Explore the provision of additional capacity at sites with no current community use, for example at:
  a) Talbot Heath School (B1)

CR18) Provide capacity to cater for additional demand to 2033 for 15 grass pitches in Christchurch, 22 in Bournemouth and 71 in Poole. Also provide capacity for 2 additional artificial pitches in Christchurch, 12 in Poole and 8 in Bournemouth. The total amount of supply should come from a variety of sources, i.e. the projected demand is unlikely to need to be delivered solely through additional, new pitches or grounds. Increased capacity to this amount will come from a combination of:
  a) Increasing capacity of poor and standard rated quality pitches where improvements will achieve real time availability of pitch time;
  b) Using notionally spare capacity on pitches where practical to do so given match days and timeslots required;
  c) Securing formal community use agreements for play taking place on unsecure sites;
  d) Securing community use on sites where no community access is currently permitted;
  e) New pitches in the pipeline being delivered;
  f) Bringing “mothballed” pitches back into use where and when necessary (i.e. providing additional capacity on sites where grass pitches are not currently in use but where there have been pitches before);
  g) Introducing additional artificial pitches to absorb projected demand on grass pitches, particularly for junior matches and in locations where no artificial pitches exist;
  h) Provision of new additional grass pitches on existing grounds where feasible to do so; and,
  i) Provision of new additional grass pitches at new grounds in appropriate locations.

Sites where these recommendations for increasing capacity from existing supply could be realised are highlighted in the tables above (at paragraph 13.18, table which show figures calculating the residual demand required if various solutions can be maximised). The examples, if opportunity can be maximised, suggest that there could be no need for additional grass pitches or artificial pitches in Bournemouth and no need for additional grass pitches in Poole. There could still be demand for up to 2 additional artificial pitches in Poole by 2033. If the solutions can be realised in Christchurch, there would be no need for additional grass or artificial pitches to 2033.

Where the additional demand is for capacity at existing club home grounds and there is no additional capacity on days when new teams require pitch use, an additional new ground may be required should the team generating the demand not be willing or able to play at sites where there may be available capacity when it is required (such as sites with spare capacity or “mothballed” sites). Most additional demand for grass pitches is likely to occur in sub-areas B6, C1 and C5 and for artificial demand in P2, P5, C1 and C5.

CR19) Provision of new additional pitches after solutions have been exhausted on existing sites will need to respond to demonstrable demand “on the ground”. This is particularly important in the latter part of the strategy period to ensure that projected demand has actually come forward. A “plan, deliver, monitor, manage” approach should therefore be taken to the provision of additional capacity. The combination of provision between grass and artificial pitches will also need to be provided to fit with real demand.

CR20) Provide additional capacity in reserve to accommodate teams currently displaced from the Borough, should they need quickly to find a new home ground or grounds to play within Bournemouth, Christchurch or Poole, for example:
  a) Parley (demand from Parley CC, 9 grass and 2-3 artificial pitches);
  b) Ferndown (demand from Winton CC, 4 grass pitches);

CR21) Where the loss of an existing pitch or practice nets is unavoidable, provide replacement pitch capacity to good quality standard in a location appropriate to demand to mitigate loss.

CR22) The management of existing supply and the balance between supply and demand should be closely monitored and provision managed to ensure that supply (i.e. grounds) is best suited to the type and format of the game played and when matches take place.

---

80 While projections have made assumptions about use, should for example, adult team demand come forward more for midweek than weekend matches, the balance between grass pitch and artificial pitch provision may need to change to reflect the preferred surface for midweek matches.
Advisory Standards

13.23 With regard to provision of new, additional and / or improved facilities and pitches, the following guidelines are provided:

i) Quality: Pitches and facilities should conform to the most up-to-date NGB guidance. New grass pitches should be provided to good quality able to accommodate 9 match equivalent sessions per season with an appropriate maintenance regime to maintain this quality. New artificial pitches should be provided to good quality able to accommodate 60 match equivalent sessions per season with an appropriate maintenance regime to maintain this quality.

ii) Accessibility: Pitches and facilities should conform to the most up-to-date Building Regulations and NGB guidance; be easily and safely accessible by cycle, foot and public transport; have secure cycle storage / parking; and, have sufficient car parking spaces to accommodate demand for the use of the facility and any associated shared uses and comply with the most up-to-date Highways Authority, Local Planning Authority and Sport England requirements / guidance. Ancillary facilities should be secure. Clubs and teams should be able to access a grass and / or artificial pitch (subject the teams’ needs for the appropriate surface) at or close to their home ground to ensure that the quality of the pitches is maintained at least to a “standard” quality and preferably to a “good” quality. However, provision of pitches should not be made in locations where the cost of ensuring quality across the ground, viability in the long-term (of the pitch or club) or security of a facility is in doubt.

iii) Quantity: see recommendations above. Alongside this assessment’s recommendations and the strategy for pitches, the Sport England Playing Pitch Calculator should be used by the local authority to generate baseline figures for pitch requirements relating to new development sites (usually at the pre-application stage of the planning process). Such figures must be used only as a starting point and not used in isolation without reference to area requirements for need and demand set out in the assessment report and strategy. It is important that users of the calculator obtain the latest version from Sport England as it is periodically updated.
14. RUGBY UNION

Summary

14.1 Rugby has a tradition of playing on grass pitches which tend to be subjected to significant wear and tear and therefore have additional pressure to maintain quality to a ‘standard’ condition. More recently, technology has moved sufficiently forward to enable training to take place on artificial grass surfaces where adequately sprung (where a pitch meets the World Cup 22 standard\(^{81}\)) and such surfaces can be shared with football. Club rugby tends to be played on pitches dedicated to a club as a home ground and the supply of pitches at schools tends only to feature in terms of club use if a club’s pitches are overplayed or waterlogged, therefore requiring additional capacity to train. Clubs also prefer to retain play (matches and training) at their home ground to retain any spend in the club’s social facilities.

14.2 In Bournemouth in the 2017/18 season there were 2 affiliated clubs (Oakmeadians RFC and East Dorset RFC) and 1 in Poole (Poole RFC), all with home grounds in the Borough. There are 27 teams in Bournemouth, 29 in Christchurch and 8 in Poole. In Bournemouth 8 of the teams are adult, vet and colts, in Christchurch 9 and in Poole the number is 2. Of these numbers there is one women’s team in Bournemouth and one in Christchurch, with a women’s section forming in Poole.

14.3 In Christchurch in the 2018/19 season there were 2 Rugby Football Union (RFU) affiliated clubs (Bournemouth RFC and Dockers RFC), both with home grounds in the Borough. The area also hosts the Bournemouth University club. Increasing student numbers (unquantifiable in the long-term with any real accuracy) could increase demand arising from the University outside of projections made in the assessment. Both Bournemouth RFC and Bournemouth University teams have their home ground at Chapel Gate while Dockers RFC play at Barrack Road Recreation Ground. Team numbers are summarised below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Club</th>
<th>Home Ground</th>
<th>Teams</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bournemouth RFC</td>
<td>Chapel Gate</td>
<td>5 Men, 1 Women, 20 Colt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dockers RFC</td>
<td>Barrack Road</td>
<td>1 Vet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bournemouth University</td>
<td>Chapel Gate</td>
<td>1 Men, 1 Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christchurch RFC</td>
<td>East Christchurch Sports and Social Club</td>
<td>1 Colt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakmeadians RFC</td>
<td>Meyrick Park</td>
<td>3 Men, 1 Women, 2 Colt, 13 Vets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Dorset RFC</td>
<td>Iford</td>
<td>1 Vet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poole RFC</td>
<td>Turlin Moor</td>
<td>2 Men, 1 Colt, 6 Vets</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{81}\) World Cup 22 relates to the standard required of artificial turf for rugby. Pitches need to be tested every 3 years to remain World Cup 22 compliant. See [http://playerwelfare.worldrugby.org/content/getfile.php?h=363a53bd2243e43b6a56a54cad04b996&p=pdfs/World_Rugby_Regulation_22_EN.pdf](http://playerwelfare.worldrugby.org/content/getfile.php?h=363a53bd2243e43b6a56a54cad04b996&p=pdfs/World_Rugby_Regulation_22_EN.pdf) for the full regulation.
14.4 The Chapel Gate site also accommodates other play during the year such as schools’ festivals and a rugby 7s tournament as well as hosting the University American Football team on the third pitch. There is a tag rugby (social) team which regularly books time on the pitch at Barrack Road throughout the year. We understand that a new club (Christchurch RFC) is also forming to start playing in the 2019/20 season and be based at the East Christchurch Sports and Social Club with a 1-year rolling lease, with the sports club having an 8 years remaining on the lease with the owners of the site. Meyrick Park also periodically hosts festivals, school and University matches and training. It is understood that the pitch at Barrack Road Recreation Ground is likely to be transferred from the local authority to a new Town Council82.

14.5 Across the Borough there are 13 pitches with secure community use, 4 of which are at Turlin Moor in Poole, 4 of which are at Meyrick Park in Bournemouth and 5 of which are in Christchurch. There are 10 pitches with unsecure community use (6 of which are in Bournemouth, 1 of which is in Christchurch and 3 of which in Poole). Of the total supply of pitches, 10 in Poole, 2 in Christchurch and 3 in Bournemouth are not available for community use, all of which are on school sites.

14.6 Spatially, sub-areas P1, C5 and B1 host the secure community use pitches used by clubs while the Iford Playing Field used by East Dorset RFC and considered unsecure is in the eastern part of Bournemouth in sub-area B6. The Barrack Road pitch is in C3. This potentially leaves much of the Borough (particularly Christchurch and Poole) without easy access to a rugby club or community use pitches, although this is not unusual for rugby union where catchments will often be wider than other sports such as football or cricket. However, the northern part of Poole may see players play at Wimborne RFC just north of the Borough boundaries. The western part of Poole also probably sees some exported demand to Lychett Minster RFC in the Purbeck area of Dorset while some players residing in Christchurch may play at Ringwood RFC to the north of the former Borough and Wimborne RFC to the north-west).

14.7 Taking into account the pitches’ quality (based on an assessment of drainage and maintenance regimes), carrying capacity in relation to their quality and how much play (both matches and training) is taking place, the secure use club pitches used by Oakmeadians RFC at Meyrick Park (Bournemouth) are being significantly over-used by over 15 match equivalents (around 5 pitches of capacity). This impact is compounded by a high number of cancellations due to pitches being unplayable. The pitches at Turlin Moor (Poole) used by Poole RFC have capacity of around 5 match equivalents (almost 2 pitches of capacity) although most of this spare capacity is one mini / midi pitches. The unsecure pitch used by East Dorset RFC at Iford Playing Field is being over-used by just over 3 match equivalents (equivalent to around 1 pitch of capacity). The 3 main senior pitches at Chapel Gate are being over-played by almost 8 match equivalents (around 2-3 pitches of capacity). The two mini / junior pitches currently show some capacity to accommodate some growth. The Barrack Road pitch is currently being slightly over-played by 0.5 match equivalents (only around one-sixth equivalent of a full-size pitch’s capacity).

14.8 Most unsecure pitches in the Borough are either available for community use and not used or not available for community use at all but given that (apart from the aforementioned Iford Playing Fields) they are all on education sites, they are unlikely to have much capacity for use without compromising their quality unless, for example, used only for mini / midi training or matches. However, established clubs are likely to prefer to use pitches at or close to their club base and so it is unlikely that any notional capacity will be used, particularly for adult teams where use requires floodlighting with most training for youth, colts and adult teams taking place on weekday evenings and where matches would

82 In all likelihood it seems that the use for sport of the land transferred will remain, but given uncertainty of the position on transfer and in the long-term for the rest of the PPS time period, for the purposes of understanding the balance between future demand and supply the pitch at Barrack Road will be classed as unsecure community use site. The club currently only has a one year rolling lease to use the pitch and so there is a questions over future certainty of use.
be unlikely to take place away from the club’s base / home ground. The lack of capacity will constrain clubs’ ambitions to grow particularly at Oakmeadians RFC at Meyrick Park but also for East Dorset RFC at Iford Playing Fields (with the latter also currently having uncertainty of future use on the current site which will need urgently to be resolved, especially around issues concerning the clubhouse). While the pitches at Turlin Moor that Poole RFC use have some capacity, most of this is on mini / midi pitches with some capacity spare on the senior pitches. It is noted that the club seems likely only to see limited growth in the future and so the pitch capacity should be protected to cater for current demand and future small-scale opportunities to grow. A pragmatic approach to protection of capacity on the site should be taken and demand on the site should be monitored to ensure the provision of supply is appropriate for demand.

14.9 The lack of capacity at Chapel Gate could constrain Bournemouth RFC’s ambitions to grow although improvements to the quality of the pitches and floodlighting on more pitches would increase capacity on the site. Reconfiguration of pitches on the site could also be considered to enable additional pitch capacity to be introduced. We have been made aware that Bournemouth RFC is interested in relocating away from Chapel Gate to a site within Bournemouth (with interest in the site at Bournemouth School). This could be in whole or in part (for example, the adult and junior teams playing on split sites. There has also been a suggestion that if this happens and some or most capacity at Chapel Gate is freed-up, there could be an opportunity for Dockers RFC and East Dorset RFC (the latter currently based at Iford Playing Fields in Bournemouth) to co-locate at Chapel Gate. However, at the current time, there is no certainty about when, or if at all, Bournemouth RFC might move their home ground and to what degree and so a pragmatic approach should be taken to the protection of capacity on the site and demand should be monitored to ensure the provision of supply is appropriate for demand.

14.10 It is understood that the use of the Barrack Road pitch for rugby is only seen as a temporary solution to host Dockers RFC, which has been a nomadic club for a number of seasons. Options are currently being explored, notwithstanding the discussion points above about the future of which club or clubs play at Chapel Gate, of East Dorset RFC and Dockers RFC sharing the current home ground for East Dorset RFC at Iford Playing Fields with football use on that site transferring to Barrack Road.

14.11 With regard to the new club forming (Christchurch RFC) which has started to play at the East Christchurch Sports and Social Club in the 2019/20 season, as the data that informs the assessment is based on last season the figures do not take into account this new formed club and we cannot assess the quality of the ground at this point (at the time of drafting in May 2019). Therefore, for the purposes of looking forward, we assume that the club will form a single adult team and play on a single pitch at the site and that supply and demand will be in balance with some capacity for the pitch to accommodate some additional play if the club grows.

14.12 Despite the potential churn in where clubs play, it is clear that the existing supply (capacity) of rugby pitches available to club teams should be protected. Improving capacity at club pitches might be possible on some pitches (but not all) by making improvements to drainage and maintenance regimes (where this is possible), to relieve pressure on overplayed pitches by making other pitches more accessible (for example by introducing floodlighting where the additional play will not compromise quality) and securing additional pitch capacity if possible.

14.13 It is clear that the existing stock and supply of rugby pitches available to club teams should be protected. Improving capacity at club pitches might be possible on some pitches (but not all) by making improvements to drainage and maintenance regimes (where this is possible), to relieve pressure on overplayed pitches by making other pitches more accessible (for example by introducing floodlighting where the additional play will not compromise quality) and securing additional pitch capacity if possible.

14.14 Projecting demand forward as a result of population change, identified latent demand and growth aspirations of clubs, and adding in the current under-supply / overplay of capacity (where future provision is made purely on grass pitches) and a desire to secure use on the unsecure club site (on Iford Playing Fields), the pitch capacity requirement (for pitches of M1/D3 standard) by 2033 could equate to an equivalent capacity of up to 9.5 full size pitches in Bournemouth (6.5 for Oakmeadians

---

83 It is understood that they have also explored use of East Dorset Sports and Social Club facilities owned by BAE at Hoburne.
RFC and 3 for East Dorset RFC), 11 in Christchurch and 0 (zero) in Poole (assuming that Poole RFC can find a way to utilise the spare capacity for their unmet demand and small amount of anticipated growth on their existing pitches).

14.15 The figures do not take into account improvements to the quality and capacity of existing pitches which could increase the amount of play that pitches can sustain and reduce the need for additional new pitches. Neither do they take into account the capacity which could be introduced by new pitches in the pipeline, namely, one new pitch which could form part of the facility at Slades Farm in Bournemouth. If this site in the pipeline is taken into account, this would reduce the demand in Bournemouth to 8.5 pitch equivalents. Improvements to the quality of club pitches could reduce the future demand for new pitches further. If, for example, the quality of pitches at Meyrick Park can be improved to “good” it could increase capacity by around 2 pitches, and if the Iford Playing Field pitch can be made secure community use and its quality can be improved it could increase capacity by around 0.5 a pitch. If the same approach is taken at Turlin Moor, capacity could increase by the equivalent of 1 pitch (helping to future proof provision for growth if it emerges as greater than that projected). This action is more urgent on the Meyrick Park pitches than Iford and Turlin Moor, given the existing overplay and projected additional growth at Oakmeadians RFC. It could also become important at Iford Playing Fields (East Dorset RFC) if current issues relating to security of tenure can be overcome (and if the suggestion that Dockers RFC could relocate to Iford from their temporary ground at Barrack Road). Making the improvements in Bournemouth in addition to the provision of one additional pitch at Slades Farm would reduce the future demand to an equivalent of around 6 additional pitches. If security of tenure can be resolved at Iford and if local authority concerns about use of the site for rugby can be satisfied, the use of one of the football pitches at Iford for rugby would help to deal with capacity issues on the site. However, it should be noted that at the current time, there remains debate about the Council’s preferred sports use on the site.

14.16 There is a significant amount of displaced demand which may need to return to the Borough if available supply on current sites used is lost. Capacity needed as a result of loss of current levels of use at Chapel Gate would equate to around 5 grass pitches provided to “good” quality (predominantly for Bournemouth RFC use but also Bournemouth University for rugby and American football use).

14.17 In Christchurch, if existing pitches can be secured for community use and improvements can be made to the quality of those in standard condition this amount of capacity required could reduce to around 3 additional pitches, a number which could be reduced further if floodlighting is provided where maintenance can sustain a good quality pitch (D3 / M2 standard being able to accommodate 3.5 match equivalents per week).

14.18 The figures represent a “top end” figure for supply which would need to be carefully monitored to understand the realistic need for this number of pitches. As projections of demand and need are based on assumptions around increasing growth and participation, which may or may not come to fruition, additional provision should be responsive to demonstrable levels of demand prior to going ahead. The figures do not take account of a role that a 3G surface could play in adding significant capacity if it proves feasible, desirable and viable.

14.19 It is clear that additional pitch capacity may need to be identified or made available in Christchurch and Bournemouth in particular to accommodate demand to 2033 by the end of the strategy period. The provision of additional capacity will help to future proof and provide supply for club growth to 2033 and beyond. Any new pitches should be close to club grounds if possible, to maintain and enhance the financial viability and security of the clubs and minimise need for additional changing or clubhouse facilities. Reconfiguration of pitches at Chapel Gate could provide a small amount of additional capacity to accommodate current over-play from existing demand, for example for mini /
midi use and / or additional training capacity where floodlit but will not satisfy demand generated by current over-play and the projected demand to 2033. Equally, as identified above, a rugby compliant 3G pitch at Chapel Gate would increase capacity significantly to accommodate growth in demand and might also prove attractive for other clubs to utilise it given the site’s role as a strategic multi-sport site serving both Christchurch, Bournemouth and a wider Dorset catchment. This opportunity should be explored within the context of the needs for football at the site if the 3G delivery strategy is followed for football which will enable all teams to have the opportunity to train on a 3G pitch.

14.20 Disused other sport pitches could help to provide additional supply if in the right location for use and where clubs will use grounds away from their home ground with the right facilities and secured community use and options should be explored during the strategy’s delivery. However, a first step should be to maximise the capacity of the current pitches used by clubs with secure sites and a number of options for these sites are considered below.

Key Issues Snapshot

14.21 The assessment data and discussion with members of the steering group suggest the following key issues are most prominent:

- **Oakmeadians RFC** is a large club with potential to grow the number of teams in the future. However, it has limited capacity to do so on its current site (Meyrick Park) and pitches are overplayed. Pitch quality improvements are key to ensuring the club can sustain current levels of (and increase) play at the site. A new pitch in the pipeline at Slades Farm will provide some additional capacity but not a sufficient amount to not require quality improvements to be made at Meyrick Park (i.e. Slades Farm is not a solution to overcoming capacity issues).

- **Poole RFC** has capacity to grow at their ground at Turlin Moor, capacity which should be protected for future demand which could appear in the long-term. However, monitoring of demand should take place to ensure there is an understanding of the appropriate use of the capacity on-site. In light of current proposals for housing development at Turlin Moor, it will be important that capacity for rugby at the site is not reduced or displaced by the relocation of football pitches.

- **East Dorset RFC's ground at Iford Playing Fields** does not have security of use for the club. This is a key issue which needs resolving in order for the club to access funding from RFU to improve capacity through provision of floodlighting. The site should be protected for rugby union use and discussions should continue about whether a football pitch on the site can be utilised for rugby in the future if the club grows and where current clubs and teams using the football pitch as their home ground are relocated to a permanent alternative secure community use pitch. There are other issues relating to the club’s use of the facilities that need resolving between BCP Council and the rugby club.

- **Bournemouth RFC** is a large club, and which has expressed an intention to move away from Chapel Gate. However, the capacity at the site should be protected as current tenants moving away could provide an opportunity for other clubs (for example, Dockers RFC and East Dorset RFC have indicated a willingness to consolidate on a single site and move away from their current grounds at Barrack Road and Ifford respectively).

- **While Chapel Gate is considered a strategically important facility across a wider area than just Christchurch (including Bournemouth and southern Dorset), it’s location on the northern edge of the Borough means that it is not well-related (in terms of proximity) to much of Bournemouth’s and Christchurch’s main population along the coast.**

- **A rugby compliant 3G pitch could be explored to increase available capacity for rugby and also help deliver additional capacity for football training at Chapel Gate or Slades Farm (as a second 3G pitch alongside the football 3G in the pipeline) or another site.**
Demand Summary

14.22 The demand summary for the strategy and the “direction of travel” it should take for rugby union provision is as follows. However, it is important to note that figures should not be read or relied upon in isolation outside of the context provided by the strategy recommendations.

i) Taking current demand into account and comparing to supply, pitches with secure use at Oakmeadians RFC (Meyrick Park) are overplayed by a total of 15.25 match equivalent sessions per week (an equivalent of around 5 good quality pitches of capacity). Pitches at Poole RFC (Turlin Moor) have a small amount of residual capacity of 5.5 match equivalents (an equivalent of around 2 good quality pitches of capacity) although much of this arises on mini / midi pitches. Pitches at East Dorset RFC (Iford Playing Fields, currently unsecure use) are overplayed by a total of -3 match equivalents (an equivalent of around 1 good quality pitch of capacity). Senior pitches at Chapel Gate are overplayed by a total of 7.75 match equivalent sessions per week (an equivalent of around 2-3 good quality pitches of capacity). The junior / mini pitches at Chapel Gate have capacity equating to 1 full size match equivalent. The pitch at Barrack Road sees a small amount of over-play of 0.5 match equivalent per week.

ii) Other unsecure community use pitches are likely to have negligible (if any) unused capacity, but in any case, cannot be relied upon for club use given that they have no long-term security of use. Rugby clubs are also unlikely to use spare capacity away from their home ground, particularly for senior matches.

iii) Demand is projected to increase by 2033. Taking into account overplay at existing sites, a desire to move away from or secure use of unsecure sites the need to accommodate a small amount of latent demand (in Christchurch) and the demand for additional new capacity, this translates into an equivalent need for additional capacity of 9.5 good quality full size pitches in Bournemouth, 3 good quality full size grass pitches in Christchurch and none in Poole. Additional pitch capacity could be provided through a combination of: improving the quality and / or maintenance regimes of existing pitches to improve quality from “poor” or “standard” to “good”; providing floodlighting to increase evening training capacity; securing community use on current unsecure sites; new additional pitches at existing club grounds where feasible; introduction of the new pipeline pitch at Slades Farm; consolidating rugby use and increasing pitch capacity on shared sports pitch sites and / or, a rugby focused 3G pitch.

iv) Provision of new additional pitches will need to respond to demonstrable demand “on the ground”. A “plan, deliver, monitor, manage” approach should therefore be taken to the provision of additional capacity.

Recommendations

14.23 The above assessment conclusions suggest that the approach to the PPS strategy for rugby should be as follows:

**PROTECT**

RR1) Protect, in particular, club sites, pitches and their capacity at Meyrick Park (Bournemouth), Chapel Gate (Christchurch), Turlin Moor (Poole), Iford Playing Fields (Bournemouth) and “overflow” capacity provided at Slades Farm (Bournemouth). This will protect carrying (playing) capacity for current and projected demand as well as any capital investment made to date to support the clubs (for example, RFU investment at Iford). Regular monitoring of the balance between supply and demand should take place to ensure that appropriate use of available capacity is being made and confirm that any spare “headroom” capacity to accommodate growth is not surplus to rugby union use. In light of current proposals for housing development at Turlin Moor, it will be important that capacity for rugby at the site is not reduced or displaced by the relocation of football pitches.

RR2) Whether or not Bournemouth RFC remain at Chapel Gate in whole or in part, the substantial amount of rugby pitch capacity at Chapel Gate should be protected as any spare capacity realised from the current club moving could benefit other clubs in Christchurch and Bournemouth and continue to benefit the University rugby teams. The pitch at Barrack Road should be protected for rugby union
use in the short term, at least while it remains Dockers RFC’s home ground and until a suitable replacement (preferably permanent secure use ground) is found.

RR3) Monitor the position in relation to clubs which have rolling annual, short- and medium-term leases for their home ground during the strategy period to ensure in advance of their expiry that they are renewed to provide certainty into a new period, preferably for the long-term.

RR4) Regular monitoring of the balance between supply and demand should take place to ensure that appropriate use of available capacity is being made and confirm that any spare “headroom” capacity to accommodate growth is not surplus to rugby union use.

RR5) Protect the quality of changing facilities through formal agreements to maintain the quality to a good standard including regular and timely cleaning.

**ENHANCE**

RR6) Enhance capacity on existing club pitches (at Meyrick Park (Bournemouth), Turlin Moor (Poole), Chapel Gate (Christchurch) and Iford Playing Fields (Bournemouth)) by improving quality through improved drainage (where viable / subject to funding and a business plan being in place to ensure maintenance costs are catered for in the long-term), by introducing floodlights where necessary and feasible and by improving maintenance to ensure that the better quality is sustained in the long-term. Improvements in the quality of the pitches at Meyrick Park and Chapel Gate are particularly important given the size of the clubs which use them, and levels of play experienced on the pitches.

RR7) Enhance the quality of changing and other ancillary facilities where necessary and possible to help ensure the quality of the experience for the sport is enhanced.

RR8) Seek to enhance capacity and quality by enabling the consolidation of rugby at home grounds, considering the resettling of other sports sharing use of rugby pitches or sites where feasible and viable and where in the interests of both clubs using the pitches (for example, to improve quality and capacity for both uses). For example, this should continue to be explored during the strategy period should demand require it at Iford Playing Fields (East Dorset RFC).

RR9) Gain the secure community use of clubs’ home pitches which do not currently have secure community use, to provide certainty of future supply and enable clubs and users to access necessary funding to invest in improvements, unless alternative reasonable secure community use sites can be found for relocation.

**PROVIDE**

RR10) Seek to provide additional capacity, where needed, at (or, if this is not possible, within close proximity to) existing club home grounds as a preference over sites far from home grounds, where physical, ownership and planning constraints do not prevent such change. This will help to ensure the long-term financial stability of clubs given the social tradition and culture of the sport. Developer contributions sought for pitch provision / improvements for rugby should (for example, from the Community Infrastructure Levy or section 106 planning obligations) where feasible within planning regulations be considered first as contributions towards existing rugby club sites given the nature of how and where rugby is played (as a club on-site based sport). This could help to avoid contributions being sought or spent inappropriately on sites which may be remote from existing club home grounds and infrastructure and help to ensure any new provision or additional capacity provided through development is used (and in the most effective way).

RR11) Enable the supply of additional pitch capacity to accommodate existing overplay and future demand to a total equivalent capacity of 9.5 good quality full size pitches across Bournemouth and 11 in Christchurch (10 of which are required at Chapel Gate). 4 of this capacity in Christchurch is generated by additional demand to 2033 and 7 pitch equivalents are the result of the amount of over-play on existing pitches at Chapel Gate. (In Poole, there is insufficient demand for identification of additional pitch capacity with a focus required on increasing capacity through pitch improvements (see Enhance). However, current provision should be protected, and needs monitored to cater for potential growth.)

RR12) The total amount of additional supply should come from a variety of sources, i.e. the projected demand is unlikely to need to be delivered solely through additional, new, grass pitches. Increased capacity to this amount will come from a combination of:

a. Increase reliability of pitch use and improving the quality and / or maintenance regimes of existing pitches to improve quality from “poor” or “standard” to “good” (where viable / subject
to funding and a business plan being in place to ensure maintenance costs are catered for in the long-term) (see Enhance)\(^8\);  
\(b\). providing floodlighting to increase evening training capacity (see Enhance)\(^8\);  
\(c\). securing community use on current non-club unsecure sites if possible and feasible for club use;  
\(d\). using any available spare capacity at other club grounds within the Borough where feasible\(^8\);  
\(e\). new additional pitches at existing club grounds where feasible;  
\(f\). introduction of new grass pitch at the Slades Farm pipeline site\(^7\);  
\(g\). consolidating rugby use on shared sports pitch sites or exchanging use of a football pitch to rugby use where feasible\(^8\); and / or,  
\(h\). a rugby focused 3G pitch, for example at Chapel Gate or Slades Farm (as a second 3G pitch alongside the football 3G in the pipeline) or another site.  
The total capacity provided by the above measures (not including a rugby compliant 3G pitch) could equate to additional 8.5 pitches of capacity provided in Bournemouth and 3-4 in Christchurch, if they are all possible and feasible. Monitoring can then establish whether the additional 1 pitch in Bournemouth would be necessary to 2033 if demand “on the ground” demonstrates need. If growth projected in Christchurch appears “on the ground”, after these measures have been taken, up to a further 7 grass pitches could still be required. This points towards exploring whether additional grass pitches can be provided at Chapel Gate and serious consideration of locating a rugby compliant 3G pitch as a solution which should be considered in the medium to long-term of the strategy period if demand emerges as projected. If a shared rugby and football 3G is seen as a solution for both sports, a programme of use and certainty of availability for each sport should be agreed.

### Advisory Standards

14.24 With regard to provision of new, additional and / or improved facilities and pitches, the following advisory guidelines are provided:

i) Quality: Pitches and facilities should conform to the most up-to-date NGB guidance. New pitches should be provided to good quality able to accommodate 3.5 match equivalent sessions per week with an appropriate maintenance regime to maintain this quality.

ii) Accessibility: Pitches and facilities should conform to the most up-to-date Building Regulations and NGB guidance; be easily and safely accessible by cycle, foot and public transport; have secure cycle storage / parking; and, have sufficient car parking spaces to accommodate demand for the use of the facility and any associated shared uses and comply with the most up-to-date Highways Authority, Local Planning Authority and Sport England requirements / guidance. Ancillary facilities should be secure. Clubs and teams should be able to access a grass pitch for matches or training at or close to the home ground, subject to the balance of provision with rugby compliant 3G pitches. However, provision of grass pitches should not be made in locations where the cost of ensuring quality, viability in the long-term (of the pitch or club) or security of a facility is in doubt.

iii) Quantity: see recommendations above. Alongside this assessment’s recommendations and the strategy for pitches, the Sport England Playing Pitch Calculator should be used by the local authority to generate baseline figures for pitch requirements relating to new development sites (usually at the pre-application stage of the planning process). Such figures must be used only as a starting point and not used in isolation without reference to area requirements for need and demand set out in the assessment report and strategy. It is important that users of the calculator obtain the latest version from Sport England as it is periodically updated.

---

\(^8\) would introduce equivalent of 2.5 pitches capacity in Bournemouth and additional 1 pitch in Poole

\(^7\) one seventh of a full-size pitch per adult team based on 0.5 match equivalent for training in evening for 1 team and good quality pitch accommodating 3.5 match equivalents

\(^6\) additional 1 pitch equivalent capacity spare

\(^5\) additional 1 pitch

\(^8\) for example, 1 additional at Iford if the football pitch use is changed to rugby
15. CROSS-SPORT

Recommendations

15.1 The following recommendations are common across all sports.

**PROTECT**

GR1) Proposals for development which have an implication for the use of an existing pitch (such as change of land use) should take into account the recommendations of this strategy and policies of relevance in adopted Development Plans relevant to the site / pitch (i.e. Adopted Local Plans, other Development Plan Documents and Made Neighbourhood Plans).

GR2) Maintain the quality of existing pitches to at least current standards where they have a quality rating of “standard” or “good”.

GR3) Protect the existing supply of pitches identified in the assessment (and the capacity they provide) unless the strategy proposes their replacement or alternative re-use for sport, leisure and recreation or unless replacement equivalent capacity can be provided elsewhere to an equal or better standard (i.e. “net improvements”) reflecting the demand and type of use required “on the ground” by clubs. The PROVIDE sections set out criteria which responds to proposals where the loss of a pitch is unavoidable. Where pitches are lost for formal pitch use, where appropriate, seek to ensure that there is significant policy protection through the Local Plan or Neighbourhood Plans or legal means to prevent their loss as open or green space.

**ENHANCE**

GR4) Improve the current use of existing pitches, where physically and logistically possible, by considering flexibility of when matches take place.

GR5) Enhance the quality of existing secure community use pitches or consider replacement, for example, where flooding / waterlogging is known to be an issue preventing consistency and certainty of play by improving drainage (where viable / subject to funding and a business plan being in place to ensure maintenance costs are catered for in the long-term).

GR6) Gain the secure use of pitch sites which currently have unsecure use through clubs and relevant authorities working with pitch providers / owners to seek a long-term secure use agreement to provide certainty of supply and reduce the need for additional new pitches (where desirable by the club and provider).

**PROVIDE**

GR7) Where the loss of an existing pitch is unavoidable, ensure that replacement pitch capacity and associated facilities are provided to a good quality standard in a location appropriate to demand to mitigate loss and compliant with NGB requirements. Opportunities should be taken to replace pitches to a better quality than the provision they are replacing.

GR8) Ensure that the provision of any new pitches, floodlighting and facilities meet the most up-to-date quality design standards and dimensions supported by the relevant NGB and Sport England. Sport England’s up-to-date design guidance documents[^89] should be used and particular reference within the wider context of development should be made to Sport England / Public Health England’s Active Design guidance[^90] alongside the Government’s national design guidance.

GR9) Ensure that any new facilities and other associated pitch infrastructure are provided to meet the most up-to-date Building Regulations, including, but not restricted to, those relating to accessibility.

[^89]: See [https://www.sportengland.org/facilities-and-planning/design-and-cost-guidance/](https://www.sportengland.org/facilities-and-planning/design-and-cost-guidance/)
[^90]: See [https://www.sportengland.org/facilities-and-planning/active-design/](https://www.sportengland.org/facilities-and-planning/active-design/)
GR10) Ensure that any new pitches and facilities have a sustainable long-term business and financial management plan in place to ensure long-term viability. This must include arrangements for a maintenance programme agreed between the provider, local authority and the NGB and a sinking fund to ensure that the replacement or refurbishment of the pitch surface is viable when renewal is likely to be required or a sink fund to cover costs of maintenance of the playing surface where grassed. Sink funds established should be monitored to ensure that collection is taking place. It should also include a management and maintenance regime appropriate for the surface and level of use agreed with the appropriate bodies (for example, BCP Council, NGBs and / or Sport England). The provider must report to the local authority, Sport England and the NGB on an annual basis on the state of the sink fund and statement of availability and use during the agreed peak period hours. Sink funds established should be monitored to ensure that collection is taking place.

GR11) Ensure that any proposed new pitches with community use have certainty of users (clubs / teams) committed to them and that commitments to the management and maintenance of the ground are in place prior to delivery.

GR12) Ensure that all new pitches and facilities have a secure community use agreement in place for the long-term (preferably in perpetuity) and that the appropriate body is identified to monitor and enforce such agreements.

GR13) New pitches and ancillary facilities should be as physically secure as possible and, where feasible, be resistant to dog fouling and vandalism.

GR14) Provision of new additional pitches which increase net capacity / supply will need to respond to demonstrable demand “on the ground”. This is particularly important in the latter part of the strategy period to ensure that supply responds to demand which has actually come forward particularly in relation to the balance of supply to accommodate demand for match play between artificial and grass surfaces.

GR15) A “plan, deliver, monitor, manage” approach should therefore be taken to the management and any necessary “re-packaging” of existing supply and the provision of additional capacity.

GR16) The provision of additional pitches and / or facilities should be closely co-ordinated between NGBs, clubs, leagues, Sport England, the local authority, and the land-owner (where not one of the aforementioned bodies) to ensure that additional supply responds to required demand.

GR17) Support opportunities to utilise sites not currently available for community use where the provider has indicated a desire to do so, where they fill a spatial gap in supply, address a local team’s demand not already catered for locally and where secure use can be agreed.

GR18) For development detailed in the adopted Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Infrastructure list, CIL monies could in theory be secured towards the upgrade and management of existing strategic outdoor sports and recreation provision and creation of new provision and associated facilities (this includes playing pitches as identified in the PPS). However, current established CIL spending priorities suggest this is unlikely. It is recommended that local authority officers consider the benefits of bringing forward new and improved facilities related to development through s106 planning obligations as the most appropriate mechanism to understand and apply requirements generated for sports pitches and ancillary facilities by a given population.
16. OTHER PITCH SPORTS

16.1 In addition to undertaking a fully compliant PPS guidance assessment for the main pitch sports, we were asked by the Borough Council to undertake a short assessment of some other pitch sports that we were advised by the steering group to consider: Lacrosse and American Football.

American Football

16.2 There is one American Football club operating in Bournemouth, Bournemouth Bobcats. They are formerly a nomadic club, currently having no home ground as there was no base year after year. There have been discussions about shared use of East Dorset RFC’s rugby ground in the past if a second rugby pitch could be secured at the site, but this option use has proven challenging to secure at the site. There could be opportunities to accommodate the club at the new pitch site at Slades Farm and this is an option which should be considered moving forward. Bournemouth University has an American Football team which plays predominantly at Chapel Gate. Figures for demand were incorporated into use of the rugby pitches.

Lacrosse

16.3 Lacrosse in the study area has had a history of having sufficient numbers to form a club with teams in some years and not in others. Distance is a key issue for club members with the sparsity of clubs meaning that there are long travelling distances which is not always convenient for players, although tournament format for matches can help mitigate this issue. Participation numbers ebb and flow and can change from year to year with a good proportion of players being students from the University. This reliance on student numbers means that club formation is very reliant on a fluctuating pool of players. However, the University can have as many as 3 teams, mainly at Chapel Gate.

16.4 England Lacrosse has been trying to establish a club with a more stable number of players to maintain 1 women’s and 1 men’s team. Teams can use a good quality grass pitch for matches but there is a preference to use a 3G pitch, with sand based artificial pitches only acceptable for training. Clubs have used both Chapel Gate and Talbot Heath School in the past and provision should be made as this strategy is delivered for certainty of capacity to be established at a site suitable for a club’s demand within the Borough through ongoing discussion with England Lacrosse, the Club and pitch providers.

17. Action Plan Framework
(What needs to be done to implement the strategy?)

17.1 PPS guidance requires an Action Plan to be consulted upon with the strategy. Following consultation on the draft strategy and any changes made as a result, confirmed recommendations and actions will be set out and monitored in a “live” action plan framework which members of the steering group will have a responsibility to update and implement. As noted earlier this implementation will also depend on steering group members co-ordinating and working closely with clubs, teams, league organisers, providers, owners of current pitches and owners of pitches and potential sites for additional pitches. The action plan framework will, in time, be updated by BCP Council to confirm options presented in this strategy as further work during implementation is done on feasibility, viability and implications of other actions is fully understood. The action plan table below sets out priorities identified by each member of the steering group.

17.2 We have also set out a table below which summarises the recommendation reference numbers against those who are likely to use or have responsibility for them and a guide for local authority officers with regard to the key factors to think about when considering development proposals.
Guide to Interface between Delivery and Use of Strategy Recommendations to Inform Planning Applications

**Stage E PPS Delivery Steering Group**
(Active Dorset, BCP (leisure / parks and planning policy), Sport England and NGBs)

**PPS Recommendations**
- Informs 2019 baseline requirements for specific sports, pitches, sub-areas and locations and provision guidelines (quality, quantity, accessibility, design)

**Development Management**
Planning application requirements

**Sport England Pitch Calculator**
- Use only for snapshot of demand arising from large scale development alongside PPS recommendations and up-to-date position from Action Plan monitoring

**PPS Action Plan**
- Monitoring by PPS Delivery Steering Group informs up-to-date position on supply, demand, quality improvements, capacity, new provision needed in relation to PPS recommendations

Monitored by...

Monitors and leads on delivery of...
18. Monitoring and Review
(How will the implementation of the strategy and action framework be monitored and reviewed?)

18.1 As referred to in the strategy recommendations, it is important that the strategy and impact of its actions are monitored to ensure that supply matches demand “on the ground”. This is particularly important later during the strategy period given that future demand in the longer-term is less accurate given that it is based on projections. As actions are implemented, a “plan, deliver, monitor, manage” approach should be employed.

18.2 It is recommended that the strategy is reviewed after a period of 3 years or before this time should substantive changes be made to supply, demand or implications of change likely to take place during the strategy period (such as significant confirmed or adopted changes in levels of housing or population growth). Equally, other triggers for a review before this time could be changes to planning or sports policy or the methodology used to assess playing pitches and / or facilities or the desire to better understand likely provision required beyond the current adopted development plan periods.
19. Glossary  
(Explanation of technical terms and abbreviations)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3G</td>
<td>Third generation AGP usually dressed with rubber crumb. The surface is commonly used for football but can also be used for rugby where sufficiently sprung to reduce / absorb impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGP</td>
<td>Artificial Grass Pitch, sometimes referred to as an ATP (Artificial Turf Pitch). The term covers all types of artificial pitch including, sand based, sand dressed, water based and 3G.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrying capacity</td>
<td>Knowing the quality of a grass pitch allows us to make an assumption of how many matches each size and type of pitch should be able to accommodate without leading to deterioration of the pitch’s quality. This is called its carrying capacity. The figures are provided as “match equivalent sessions per season” for cricket pitches and “match equivalent sessions per week” for rugby union and football. Any use of a pitch, when demand is considered is converted to this unit of measurement for ease of comparison. The assumption of match equivalent sessions for quality ratings is based on guidelines provided by sports governing bodies. The carrying capacity of AGPs is measured in the amount of time in hours available for community use in the peak period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demand:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current demand</td>
<td>Demand demonstrated as existing “on the ground” during the season when data is collected for the PPS.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Latent demand      | “Whereas unmet demand is known to exist latent demand is demand that evidence suggests may be generated from the current population should they have access to more or better provision. This could include feedback from a sports club who may feel that they could set up and run an additional team if they had access to better provision. Details of the potential amount and type of any latent demand in the study area should be sought.”
  (Paragraph B37, Playing Pitch Strategy Guidance, 2013, Sport England) |
| Unmet demand       | “Current unmet demand could be in the form of a team that has currently got access to a pitch for its matches but nowhere to train or vice versa. It could also be from an educational establishment that is currently using an indoor facility because of the lack of access to outdoor pitch provision. Along with a lack of pitches of a particular type being available to the community unmet demand may be due to the poor quality and therefore limited capacity of pitches in the area and/or a lack of provision and ancillary facilities which meet a certain standard of play/league requirement. League secretaries may be aware of some unmet demand as they may have refused applications from teams wishing to enter their competitions due to a lack of pitch provision which in turn is hindering the growth of the league. As it is known to exists any unmet demand recorded should be easily quantifiable e.g. a training session for one team on a weekday evening.”
| Aspirational future demand | Demand that a club might identify as likely or desirable to come forward during the strategy period.                                                                                                           |
| Displaced demand   | “Displaced demand generally relates to play by teams or other users of playing pitches from within the study area (i.e. from residents of the study area) which takes place outside the area. It is important to know whether this displaced demand is due to issues with the provision of pitches and ancillary facilities in the study area, just reflective of how the sports are played (e.g. at a central venue for the wider area) or due to the most convenient site for the respective users just falling outside
of the LA/study area. It is therefore important to establish:

- What displaced demand exists and why including the amount and type of demand (e.g. a senior match on a natural grass pitch, a junior training session on an AGP);
- Whether those generating the displaced demand would prefer to play within the study area and where.” (Paragraph B34, Playing Pitch Strategy Guidance, 2013, Sport England)

### Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DCB</td>
<td>Dorset Cricket Board, the county cricket association.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECB</td>
<td>England Cricket Board, the NGB for cricket.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EH</td>
<td>England Hockey, the NGB for hockey.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FA</td>
<td>Football Association, the NGB for football.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FF</td>
<td>Football Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP</td>
<td>Local Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Match equivalents</td>
<td>See “carrying capacity”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGB</td>
<td>National Governing Body (for sport)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP</td>
<td>Neighbourhood Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPPF</td>
<td>National Planning Policy Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPPG</td>
<td>National Planning Practice Guidance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peak period</td>
<td>The period of time used to compare community use on AGPs. The peak period is typically Mon-Thurs 5pm-9pm, Fri 5pm-7pm and Sat and Sun 9am-5pm, a total of 34 hours per week.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPS</td>
<td>Playing Pitch Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFU</td>
<td>Rugby Football Union, the NGB for rugby union.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td>Sport England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TGR</td>
<td>Team Generation Rate, a calculation used to estimate future numbers of teams for the main pitch sports based on population projections set against the existing number of teams within the current population.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HFA</td>
<td>Hampshire FA, the county football association.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFA</td>
<td>Dorset FA, the county football association.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 1: Location of Pitches
Pitches Key for Tables which Follow

PPS Id – C = cricket; n = nets, a or b = artificial, F = grass football, AGP = artificial grass pitch, R = rugby union
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PPS Id</th>
<th>Pitch / Ground Name / Location</th>
<th>PPS Id</th>
<th>Pitch / Ground Name / Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C43, C44a</td>
<td>Bournemouth Boys Grammar School</td>
<td>F1, F2</td>
<td>Ashdown Leisure Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1, C2a, C2b</td>
<td>Branksome Recreation Ground</td>
<td>F210</td>
<td>Barrack Road Rec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3, C4a, C4b</td>
<td>Broadstone Cricket Club</td>
<td>F4</td>
<td>Bournemouth Collegiate School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C48a</td>
<td>Broadstone Middle School</td>
<td>F5</td>
<td>Bournemouth Collegiate School Prep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C5, C45a</td>
<td>Broadstone Recreation Ground</td>
<td>F6, F7, F8</td>
<td>Bournemouth Electric Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C8, C9a</td>
<td>Carter Community School</td>
<td>F153, F154, F155, F156</td>
<td>Bournemouth School for Girls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C49, C29a, C49n, C50, C50n1, C50n2, C51, C51a</td>
<td>Chapel Gate</td>
<td>F9</td>
<td>Branksome Heath Middle School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C53a</td>
<td>Christchurch Junior School</td>
<td>F10, F11, F12, F13</td>
<td>Branksome Recreation Ground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C10a</td>
<td>Corfe Hills School</td>
<td>F149, F152</td>
<td>Broadstone Middle School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C11</td>
<td>Dean Park</td>
<td>F213</td>
<td>Burton C of E Primary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C52</td>
<td>East Christchurch Sports and Social Club</td>
<td>F211</td>
<td>Burton Rec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C12a</td>
<td>Harewood College</td>
<td>F157, F158, F159</td>
<td>Canford Heath Middle School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C54a</td>
<td>Highcliffe Academy</td>
<td>F15, F16, F17, F18, F19, F20, F21, F22</td>
<td>Canford Park Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C55a</td>
<td>Highcliffe St Mark Primary School</td>
<td>F23</td>
<td>Carter Community School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C56, C56a</td>
<td>Hurn Bridge Sports Club</td>
<td>F164, F219, F175, F184, F192, F201, F165, F166, F167, F168, F169, F173, F220, F212, F218</td>
<td>Chapel Gate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C14</td>
<td>Kings Park 1</td>
<td>F170</td>
<td>Christchurch Junior School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C16, C17a</td>
<td>Kinson Manor Playing Fields</td>
<td>F24</td>
<td>Cobham Sports and Social Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C18</td>
<td>Littledown Park</td>
<td>F25, F26</td>
<td>Corfe Hills School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C57, C57a</td>
<td>Mudeford Rec</td>
<td>F171, F172</td>
<td>East Christchurch Sports and Social Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C22</td>
<td>Oakmead College of Technology</td>
<td>F27, F28, F29</td>
<td>Fenners Playing Field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C23</td>
<td>Parkstone Grammar School</td>
<td>F30, F31, F139, F140</td>
<td>Fernheath Playing Fields</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C24, C25a, C26, C27a, C27b</td>
<td>Poole Grammar School</td>
<td>F33, F34</td>
<td>Harewood College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C28a</td>
<td>Poole High School</td>
<td>F36, F37</td>
<td>Haymoor School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C29, C30a</td>
<td>Poole Park</td>
<td>F177, F178, F179</td>
<td>Highcliffe Academy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C32a</td>
<td>St Peters Catholic School (Lower School)</td>
<td>F176</td>
<td>Highcliffe Rec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C33a</td>
<td>St Peters Catholic School (Upper School)</td>
<td>F180</td>
<td>Highcliffe St Mark Primary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C34, C35a, C35b</td>
<td>The Hamworthy Club</td>
<td>F181</td>
<td>Hurn Bridge Sports Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C36, C37a</td>
<td>Wallisdown Playing Fields</td>
<td>F39, F40</td>
<td>Iford Playing Fields</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C38, C47a</td>
<td>Whitecliff Recreation Ground</td>
<td>F49, F50</td>
<td>Kings Park (AFCB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C58, C58a</td>
<td>Wingfields Rec</td>
<td>F47, F48, F51,</td>
<td>Kings Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C59</td>
<td>Winkton Fields</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C39a, C39b, C40</td>
<td>Winton Arts and Media College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C41, C42a</td>
<td>Winton Recreation Ground</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPS Id</td>
<td>Pitch / Ground Name / Location</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F52, F53, F54, F55</td>
<td>Kinson Manor Playing Fields</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F56, F57</td>
<td>Leaf Elite Athlete Academy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F76, F77</td>
<td>Learoyd Playing Fields 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F58, F59, F60, F144, F145</td>
<td>Littledown Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F61, F62, F63, F64, F65, F66, F67, F68, F69, F70, F71</td>
<td>Manorside Academy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F151, F182, F183</td>
<td>Mudford Junior School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F185</td>
<td>Mudford Wood Community Centre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F72, F73</td>
<td>Muscliff Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F74, F75 (Poole Town FC)</td>
<td>Oakdale Middle School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F76, F77</td>
<td>Parkstone Grammar School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F79, F80, F81</td>
<td>Pelhams Park Leisure Centre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F82, F83, F84, F85, F146, F147, F148</td>
<td>Plainfields Farm Recreation Ground</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F86, F87, F88, F89</td>
<td>Poole Grammar School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F90, F91, F162, F163</td>
<td>Poole High School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F92, F93</td>
<td>Rossmore Leisure Centre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F94</td>
<td>Royal Marines Poole</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F95, F96, F97, F98, F99, F100</td>
<td>Sherborn Crescent OS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F186, F187</td>
<td>Somerford Primary Community School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F107</td>
<td>St Edwards School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F174</td>
<td>St Joseph's Catholic School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F140</td>
<td>St Joseph's School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F108, F109</td>
<td>St Peters Catholic School (Lower School)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F110</td>
<td>St Peters Catholic School (Upper School)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F111, F112, F113, F114</td>
<td>Strouden Playing Fields</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F150</td>
<td>Talbot Primary School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F115</td>
<td>The Bicknell School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F116, F117</td>
<td>The Bishop of Winchester Academy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F118</td>
<td>The Bourne Academy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F188, F189, F190, F214</td>
<td>The Grange Academy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PPS Id</th>
<th>Pitch / Ground Name / Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F215, F216, F217</td>
<td>Kinson Manor Playing Fields</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F119</td>
<td>Leaf Elite Athlete Academy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F120</td>
<td>Learoyd Playing Fields 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F121, F122, F123, F124</td>
<td>Littledown Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F191, F193, F194</td>
<td>Manorside Academy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F127</td>
<td>Mudford Junior School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F44</td>
<td>Mudford Wood Community Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F72, F73</td>
<td>Muscliff Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F74, F75 (Poole Town FC)</td>
<td>Oakdale Middle School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F76, F77</td>
<td>Parkstone Grammar School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F79, F80, F81</td>
<td>Pelhams Park Leisure Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F82, F83, F84, F85, F146, F147, F148</td>
<td>Plainfields Farm Recreation Ground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F86, F87, F88, F89</td>
<td>Poole Grammar School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F90, F91, F162, F163</td>
<td>Poole High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F92, F93</td>
<td>Rossmore Leisure Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F94</td>
<td>Royal Marines Poole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F95, F96, F97, F98, F99, F100</td>
<td>Sherborn Crescent OS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F186, F187</td>
<td>Somerford Primary Community School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F107</td>
<td>St Edwards School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F174</td>
<td>St Joseph's Catholic School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F140</td>
<td>St Joseph's School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F108, F109</td>
<td>St Peters Catholic School (Lower School)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F110</td>
<td>St Peters Catholic School (Upper School)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F111, F112, F113, F114</td>
<td>Strouden Playing Fields</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F150</td>
<td>Talbot Primary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F115</td>
<td>The Bicknell School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F116, F117</td>
<td>The Bishop of Winchester Academy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F118</td>
<td>The Bourne Academy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F188, F189, F190, F214</td>
<td>The Grange Academy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPS Id</td>
<td>Pitch / Ground Name / Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R25</td>
<td>Winton Arts and Media College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGP1</td>
<td>Ashdown Leisure Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGP40</td>
<td>Mudeford Wood Community Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGP34, AGP35</td>
<td>Chapel Gate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGP36</td>
<td>The Grange Academy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGP11, AGP12</td>
<td>Canford School Sports Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGP38, AGP39</td>
<td>Two Riversmeet LC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGP13</td>
<td>The County Ground (Dorset County FA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGP14, AGP15, AGP16, AGP17, AGP18, AGP19</td>
<td>Littledown Leisure Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGP20,</td>
<td>Pelhams Park Leisure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PPS Id</th>
<th>Pitch / Ground Name / Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AGP21, AGP22, AGP23, AGP24, AGP25, AGP26, AGP27</td>
<td>Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGP7, AGP29, AGP30</td>
<td>Sir David English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGP4</td>
<td>Canford Park Sports Ltd Astroturf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGP3, AGP10</td>
<td>Bournemouth University Sports Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGP31, AGP9</td>
<td>The Hamworthy Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGP5</td>
<td>Carter Community School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGP28</td>
<td>Kingsleigh Primary School</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FOOTBALL

All pitches (grass)
All pitches (grass secure community use)
All pitches (3G secure community use)
All pitches (3G unsecure community use)
HOCKEY (matches and training) and FOOTBALL (informal / training)
All pitches (sand / water secure community use)
All pitches (sand / water unsecure community use)
CRICKET
All pitches (grass and artificial)
All pitches (secure community use - grass)
All pitches (unsecure community use - grass)
All pitches (secure community use – artificial and in situ nets)
All pitches (unsecure community use – artificial and in situ nets)
All pitches (grass)
All pitches (grass secure community use)
All pitches (grass unsecure community use)