Swindon Borough Playing Pitch Assessment

2016-2021

Appendix 10

Technical Paper:

Provision Standards Scenario and Model Testing

Stuart Todd (MRTPI), Director

Stuart Todd Associates Ltd.

23rd November, 2017

Introduction

This report was produced in October and November 2017 to inform discussion about the potential use of traditionally calculated provision standards as a baseline or starting point for planners to use in their negotiations with developers when considering requirements for playing pitches as part of new development. The PPS assessment and strategy both acknowledge that Sport England no longer supports the use of quantitative provision standards given that they can be inappropriately used and relied upon in isolation of PPS strategies (sometimes resulting in inappropriate or insufficient provision being made).

Any form of provision standard only simply provide a starting point for discussions and must be read alongside the recommendations of the PPS strategy and action plan to enable them to be used in a "grounded" way.

It has been recommended by Sport England that their emerging draft playing pitch calculator "template" could be used to replace use of traditional provision standards and its methodology, as a starting point for planning officers when discussing requirements arising from new development with developers.

We have therefore taken the opportunity to test the draft calculator using the PPS data to understand what provision the calculator suggests is required in Swindon during the strategy period.

Following discussion with Sport England officers, it is our understanding that the draft calculator is likely to be refined and become the "official" template made available (by request or alongside developing PPSs) to local authorities to use and tailor to their local circumstances in early 2018. We understand that the refinements taking place are largely related to clarification of definitions, how best to use the calculator and how it may deal with training demand, rather than substantial changes to the way the calculator works. The limitations of the calculator's use will also be clearly stated in the official version. Our testing set out in this paper was undertaken on the basis that the calculator could be used to generate figures (pitch numbers) for any given local authority area and population (which is how the draft calculator's data requirements are set-up) but Sport England has since confirmed that the intention is for the calculator to be used only to provide baseline data for new development.

Running figures through the draft calculator gave rise to a number of questions which we have discussed with Sport England officers responsible for developing the draft calculator.

The scenarios which have been run enable the options presented by the draft calculator to be explored. These options for variable data to be inserted according to local circumstances are reproduced from the calculator and shown in Appendix A.

The scenarios run are as follows:

Scenario 1. Basic: 100% of match play in peak period + Projected change in demand of 0%

Scenario 2a. Projected change adjustment: Scenario 1 + Projected change in demand based on change in TGR rates for football, rugby and cricket (see table below) and 50% for hockey (i.e. targets for increased participation)

Scenario 2b. Projected change adjustment: Scenario 1 + Projected change in demand based on assessment report conclusions (see table below) and 50% for hockey (i.e. targets for increased participation)

Scenario 3. Peak period adjustment: % of match play in peak period adjusted based on stage B and C data + Projected change in scenario 2a

The table below sets out model and scenario testing to identify differences in models, assumptions and scenarios used. It is important to read the commentary / observations and notes after the table to fully interpret the figures shown.

					Sport Eng	gland Playing I	Pitches Draft (Calculator			
	"Traditional" provision standards calculation		Scenario 1. Basic: 100% of match play in peak period + Projected change in demand of 0%		change adjustment: Scenario 1 + Projected change in demand based on change in TGR rates for football, rugby and cricket (see table below) and 50% for hockey (i.e. targets for increased participation)		change ac Scenario 1 change in de on assessn conclusion below) ar hockey (i.e	b. Projected ljustment: + Projected emand based nent report is (see table and 50% for targets for articipation)	Scenario 3. Peak period adjustment: % of match play in peak period adjusted based on stage B and C data + Projected change in scenario 2a		Commentary / observations
	No. of	Land	No. of	Land area	No. of	Land area	No. of	Land area	No. of	Land	
Adult football	pitches 67	area (ha) 59	pitches 41	(ha) 36	pitches 43	(ha) 38	pitches 49	(ha) 43	pitches 25	area (ha) 22	Figures could be summed with those for youth – see comments below.
Youth	37	24	57	40	68	47	77	54	28	20	It is not clear in the SE Calculator what comprises "youth" football pitches. U11 and U12 are classed as "youth" teams but play on a 9v9 pitch according to the most recent FA guidelines. Youth teams from U13 onwards play on 11v11 pitches, albeit different sizes for younger youth age groups until U17/U18 who play on adult 11v11 pitches. The STA provision standards calculator differentiates between the age group pitch sizes; we cannot see that the SE calculator does the same. The Sport England calculator equates "youth" pitches to the size used by U16s. We have assumed, therefore, that all youth pitches identified by the calculator will be 11v11 pitches used for age groups up to U16. Sport England has confirmed that this assumption is correct. However, the result is that more land than necessary may be identified if pitch requirements are translated back into hectares required by the various age groups.
(Adult + Youth)	104	83	98	76	111	85	126	97	53	42	
Mini football	50	12	40	12	43	13	69	21	21	6	It is not clear from the SE Calculator what comprises "mini" pitches. U7/U8 use 5v5 pitches and U9/U10 use 7v7 pitches, each requiring different size pitches. The STA provision standards calculator differentiates

											between the two; we cannot see that the SE calculator does the same and we have assumed that the figures generated by the SE calculator means 7v7 pitches and not 5v5s. Sport England has confirmed that this is the case.
Rugby Union	19	24	8	11	9	12	20	26	8	11	The STA calculator figures are based on pitches available for community use for rugby, secured and unsecured. It therefore includes pitches provided on non-club sites. In reality these are likely to be used sparingly by clubs and so the figure would be reduced if the calculation is based on pitches used by clubs. Data from stages B and C has suggested a demand for 5 additional pitches to 2021 to provide sufficient capacity for growth and current latent, unmet and displaced demand. Adding this figure to the number of pitches currently used across
Rugby League			1		1		1		1		Union and League will still result in a higher number of pitches than the SE calculator suggests.
Cricket	20 (i.e. 200 pitches / wickets / strips if based on 10 per ground or 160 if based on 8 per ground))	29 (for 20 grounds)	8 grounds (i.e. 64 pitches / wickets / strips)	12	9 grounds (i.e. 73 pitches / wickets / strips)	13	12 grounds (i.e. 96 pitches / wickets / strips)	17	9 grounds (i.e. 73 pitches / wickets / strips)	13	For cricket, the SE Calculator results refer to "pitches". It means "grounds", with each ground assumed to accommodate 8 strips / wickets (called "pitches" in the PPS work). There are already 15 grounds in community use in the Borough. Evidence suggests 8 grounds to serve the population in 2021 would be insufficient. The calculator works out future demand based on projections from existing demand in terms of percentages. For cricket, there are currently no women's or junior teams in the Borough, meaning that there cannot be a percentage increase represented in the calculator even though there is projected change in team numbers.
Hockey	see comment	see comment	2	1.5	3	2	3	2	3	2	The STA traditional calculator does not provide figures for hockey as it is based on provision of grass pitches. However, the stage B and C work suggests that 2 and possibly up to 3 AGPs are required for hockey to 2021 if EH growth targets are realised. Size of pitch including run-off is 101.4m x 63m = 6,388.2 sqm.

Notes, questions and general observations

- Figures inserted into the Sport England calculator model for the scenarios are reproduced in Appendix B.
- Figures are all calculated with population base data and projections to 2021 provided by SBC.
- Figures for pitch numbers are rounded to the nearest whole pitch and to the nearest ha for area (apart from for hockey, which is rounded up to the nearest half hectare given that the required pitch numbers are so small).
- There is a column in the "Workings" tab for training sessions. However, it does not appear that the figures are taken into account in the calculations (correct because most teams would prefer to and be able to train on an artificial surface rather than grass). However, Sport England has confirmed that there may be a focus on additional training data in future iterations of the draft calculator, which is particularly important when considering hockey use of pitches during the peak period.
- The Sport England calculator is based on provision of natural grass pitches for football. It does not model the impact of 3G provision or the appropriate proportion of 3G provision. However, it is therefore comparable to the "traditional" provision standards calculation which also assumes a "3G policy off" position.
- The Sport England calculator does not appear to take into account adjusted future demand (unlike the PPS assessment report) nor does it take into account sub area requirements, providing just a single figure for the whole Borough. However, Sport England has confirmed that a future iteration of the calculator will enable sub-area figures to be inserted.
- It is not clear what quality the projected pitch figures from the Sport England calculator are. It can be assumed that they are intended to be of "good" quality and therefore host 3 matches per week to maintain this quality, but it is an assumption and so figures may need to be higher to reflect some pitches being of standard (or even poor!) quality in relation to existing supply which forms part of the resultant figure. Resultants costing figures calculated by the calculator reflect good quality pitches. A future version of the calculator may introduce calculations for ancillary facility costs too. However, it should be noted that the costings only provide a direction of travel for costs of new facilities; refurbishment of existing facilities and pitches and specificity in relation to site specific requirements and conditions are not and cannot be reflected in the figures. Sport England has confirmed that the focus of the calculator is on understanding peak period demand. Understanding the "ground level" quality issues in relation to existing supply are and will continue to be a task for PPS work to define. The calculator should be used as a starting point for provision, with local data and PPS assessment being used to ground figures in reality to specific locations and / or sub-areas.
- There is reference to "Part 5" of the "Calculator" sheet in the "Workings explained" tab. However, there is no "Part 5" in the "Calculator "sheet. Sport England has confirmed that this is a typo, left in from a previous draft version of the calculator and reference to it will be removed.
- We understand from Sport England that the calculator continues to be tested by a number of local authorities and a recent appeal did not find any concerns with the outputs from the calculator (even though the appeal was allowed based on other matters).
- We have assumed land areas for pitches based on the most up-to-date dimensions published by Sport England and NGBs. Dimensions are reproduced below from the STA Provision Standards Calculator and in the table notes above for hockey AGPs. They include required lengths for runoff areas.

			Faathall						-			
					Football				Rug	gby		
		Senior 11v11	Youth U17/U18 11v11	Youth U15/U16 11v11	Youth U13/U14 11v11	Youth U11/U12 9v9	Mini U9/U10 7v7	Mini U7/U8 5v5	Senior	Mini / Junior	Cricket	Total
	A: EXISTING SATISFIED DEMAND											
i	Existing number of pitches in community use (secure and unsecure use, as default) (grounds for	47	13	0	0	20	27	16	13	1	15	152
	Pitch length (max. size for 1 pitch in metres)	116	116	106	96	86	66	46	154	80	129	•
ii	Pitch width (max. size for 1 pitch in metres)	76	76	66	61	56	46	36	80	53	112	-
	Pitch area (metres squared)	8,816	8,816	6,996	5,856	4,816	3,036	1,656	12,320	4,240	14,448	-
iii	Existing total area of pitches (ha)	41.44	11.46	0.00	0.00	9.63	8.20	2.65	16.02	0.42	21.43	111.24
iv	Existing population (2016)						220,245					220,245
v	Area (ha) per 1,000 population (provision standard for satisfied											0.51

% changes in **scenario 2a** are based on the following figures (see grey shaded column on the end). Figures which show "#div/0!" are a result of 0 teams currently playing in that age category. Figures would be expected to increase for some groups, such as junior and women's cricket but TGR calculations do not allow for that:

Swindon Borough Total (Borough	-wide basis)						
Sport and Age Groups	Number of teams in age group within the area	Current population in age group within the	Future population in age group within the area	Current TGR	Population Change in Age Group	Potential Change in Team Numbers in Age Group	Future increase in demand %
Football Adult Men 11v11 (16-45yrs)	71	43249	45845	609.1408451	2596	4.3	6.
Football Adult Women 11v11 (16-45yrs)	4	41773	44024	10443.25	2251	0.2	5.
Football Adult 6-a-side (16-45 yrs)	100	43249	45845	432.49	2596	6.0	6.
Football Youth Boys11v11 (12-15yrs)	61	4864	5905	79.73770492	1041	13.1	21.
Football Youth Girls 11v11 (12-15yrs)	5	4508	5306	901.6	798	0.9	17.
Football Youth Boys 9v9 (10-11yrs)	38	2683	3124	70.60526316	441	6.2	16.
Football Youth Girls 9v9 (10-11yrs)	1	2427	2930	2427	503	0.2	20.
Football Mini Soccer Mixed 7v7 (8-9yrs)	43	5633	6160	131	527	4.0	9.
Football Mini Soccer Mixed 5v5 (6-7yrs)	31	5700	6005	183.8709677	305	1.7	5.
Cricket Open Age Mens (18-55yrs)	27	57474	60174	2128.666667	2700	1.3	4.
Cricket Open Age Womens (18-55yrs)	0	55590	57856	0	2266	0.0	#DIV/0!
Cricket Junior Boys (7-18yrs)	5	15491	17441	3098.2	1950	0.6	12.
Cricket Junior Girls (7-18yrs)	0	14530	16088	0	1558	0.0	#DIV/0!
Rugby Union Senior Men (19-45yrs)	6	39666	42118	6611	2452	0.4	6.
Rugby Union Senior Women (19-45yrs)	1	38248	40629	38248	2381	0.1	6.
Rugby Union Youth Boys (13-18yrs)	4	7228	8099	1807	871	0.5	12.
Rugby Union Youth Girls (13-18yrs)	2	6892	7385	3446	493	0.1	7.
Rugby Union Mini/Midi Mixed (7-12yrs)	9	15913	18041	1768.111111	2128	1.2	13.
Rugby League Adult Men (19-45yrs)	2	39666	42118	19833	2452	0.1	6.
Rugby League Adult Women (19-45yrs)	0	38248	40629	0	2381	0.0	#DIV/0!
Rugby League Youth & Junior Boys (12-18yrs)	0	8448	9629	0	1181	0.0	#DIV/0!
Rugby League Junior Girls (12-18yrs)	0	8032	8896	0	864	0.0	#DIV/0!
Rugby League Primary Mixed (7-11yrs)	0	13543	15200	0	1657	0.0	#DIV/0!
Hockey Senior Men (16-55yrs)	5	59878	62657	11975.6	2779	0.2	4.
Hockey Senior Women (16-55yrs)	4	57950	60141	14487.5	2191	0.2	3.
Hockey Junior Boys (11-15yrs)	2.5	6130	7434	2452	1304	0.5	21.
Hockey Junior Girls (11-15yrs)	3.5	5689	6717	1625.428571	1028	0.6	18.

• % changes in **scenario 2b** are based on the following figures. Figures would be expected to increase for some groups, such as junior and women's cricket but the SE calculations, based on % increases, do not allow for that.

Age Group	No. of teams within the age group within the area (base date)	Assessment report conclusion on no. of additional teams to 2021	Projected change in demand (%)
Football Adult Men 11v11 (16-45yrs)	71	13	18%
Football Adult Women 11v11 (16-45yrs)	4	2	50%
Football Youth Boys11v11 (12-15yrs)	61	17	28%
Football Youth Girls 11v11 (12-15yrs)	5	4	80%
Football Youth Boys 9v9 (10-11yrs)	38	15	39%
Football Youth Girls 9v9 (10-11yrs)	1	0.2	20%
Football Mini Soccer Mixed 7v7 (8-9yrs)	43	21	49%
Football Mini Soccer Mixed 5v5 (6-7yrs)	31	32	103%
Cricket Open Age Mens (18-55yrs)	27	9	33%
Cricket Open Age Womens (18-55yrs)	0	2	~
Cricket Junior Boys (7-18yrs)	5	6	120%
Cricket Junior Girls (7-18yrs)	0	2.5	~
Rugby Union Senior Men (19-45yrs)	6	3	50%
Rugby Union Senior Women (19-45yrs)	1	1	100%
Rugby Union Youth Boys (13-18yrs)	4	12	300%
Rugby Union Youth Girls (13-18yrs)	2	0.2	10%
Rugby Union Mini/Midi Mixed (7-12yrs)	9	18	200%
Rugby League Adult Men (19-45yrs)	2	0.5	25%
Rugby League Adult Women (19-45yrs)	0	0	0%
Rugby League Youth & Junior Boys (12-18yrs)	0	0	0%
Rugby League Junior Girls (12-18yrs)	0	0	0%
Rugby League Primary Mixed (7-11yrs)	0	0	0%
Hockey Senior Men (16-55yrs)	5	2.5	50%
Hockey Senior Women (16-55yrs)	4	2	50%
Hockey Junior Boys (11-15yrs)	2.5	1.25	50%
Hockey Junior Girls (11-15yrs)	3.5	1.75	50%

- Figures for peak period play used in **scenario 3** are derived from figures in the assessment report: Figures F20 and F26 for football; Figure H15 for hockey; and, Figure R21 for Rugby.
- Scenario 3 assumes that pitch and game time management can be maintained to maximise efficient use of pitches. This may not always be possible and therefore the figures for pitches may be too low in reality. It also assumes that the number of teams playing during the peak period for matches will remain constant, which is unlikely from year to year.

Comparing Scenarios

With Sport England preferring use of its draft calculator to a traditional provision standards model, it is appropriate to seek to reconcile the two. Traditional provision standards and their methodology, while considered as only a starting point for provision requirements, are "tried and tested" in planning. As already referenced, provision standards are caveated heavily with regards to their use in the assessment report and strategy.

Quantitative provision standards are only used as a starting point for planners when discussing need arising from major developments. The strategy is then used to better understand what more localised requirements are likely to be, both in terms of the number of grass pitches, size of those pitches and pitches discounted should 3G be part of the solution for football.

Running test scenarios, we have found a number of concerns in relation to reliance on the new draft calculator (attached as Appendix C – see separate MS Excel file) which do not necessarily put it in a stronger position than traditional provision standards calculations. This may, of course, change as the calculator is developed further by Sport England. Sport England has, in the past (and rightly), been clear about the limitations of such calculators, in line with the sorts of caveats which also apply to the traditional provision standard methodology. However, the emerging calculator provides outputs which can be used to benchmark against a traditional provision standards approach.

Use of "optional information" which can be entered into the emerging calculator needs to be used with caution. The calculator gives the user flexibility to insert data appropriate to local circumstances. However, in doing so, it provides greater uncertainty in which figures that result are the most appropriate. Option a) in the calculator enables the user to insert appropriate figures for the percentage of match play in the peak period for each sport. However, this type of data will change from season to season, for football at least, and figures for peak time use may simply be a reflection of insufficient number of good quality pitches to accommodate play within the same age group at the same time or location, which in turn is not a position that figures would necessarily be sought to repeat for the future. Therefore, it is our view that scenario 3 should not be considered for benchmarking which follows alongside other scenarios tested and the traditional provision standards calculation.

Benchmarking

Across the scenarios and traditional provision standards figures, it is sensible to compare land areas (for grass pitches) which have resulted from the calculations rather than the number of pitches, given that traditional provision standards is summed to area per 1,000 persons. The caveats and observations identified above should be borne in mind while comparing figures. Figures which have emerged from the calculator which are most similar to those produced from the traditional provision standards approach are highlighted.

					Sport England Playi	ng Pitches Draft Calc	ulator	
					Scenario 2a. Projected o	change adjustment:	Scenario 2b. Projected ch	nange adjustment:
	"Traditional" nr	ovision standards	Scenario 1	L. Basic:	scenario 1 + Projected change in demand		scenario 1 + Projected change in demand	
	=	lation	100% of match play in peak		based on change in TGR	R rates for football,	based on assessment report conclusions (see	
	calculation		period + Projected change in		rugby and cricket (see ta	ble below) and 50%	table below) and 50% for l	hockey (i.e. targets
			demand	of 0%	for hockey (i.e. targe		for increased part	ticipation)
		Г			participat			
	No. of pitches	Land area (ha)	No. of pitches	Land area (ha)	No. of pitches	Land area (ha)	No. of pitches	Land area (ha)
Adult football	67	59	41	36	43	38	49	43
Youth football	37	24	57	40	68	47	77	54
(Adult + Youth)	104	83	98	76	111	85	126	97
Mini football	50	12	40	12	43	13	69	21
Rugby Union	19	24	8	11	9	12	20	26
Rugby League	19	24	1	11	1	12	1	26
Cricket	20 (i.e. 200 pitches / wickets / strips if based on 10 per ground or 160 if based on 8 per ground))	29 (for 20 grounds)	8 grounds (i.e. 64 pitches / wickets / strips)	12	9 grounds (i.e. 73 pitches / wickets / strips)	13	12 grounds (i.e. 96 pitches / wickets / strips)	17
Hockey	2	1.5	2	1.5	3	2	3	2

Converting these scenarios to a quantitative provision standard (for grass only) results in the following figures (rounded to the nearest hundredth of a hectare) when based on the projected population in 2021 of 239,993.

					Sport England Playi	ng Pitches Draft Calc	ulator	
	"Traditional" provision standards calculation		Scenario 1. Basic: 100% of match play in peak period + Projected change in demand of 0%		Scenario 2a. Projected change adjustment: scenario 1 + Projected change in demand based on change in TGR rates for football, rugby and cricket (see table below) and 50% for hockey (i.e. targets for increased participation)		Scenario 2b. Projected change adjustment: scenario 1 + Projected change in demand based on assessment report conclusions (see table below) and 50% for hockey (i.e. targets for increased participation)	
	Land area (ha)	Area per 1,000 persons (ha)	Land area (ha)	Area per 1,000 persons (ha)	Land area (ha)	Area per 1,000 persons (ha)	Land area (ha)	Area per 1,000 persons (ha)
Adult football	59		36		38		43	
Youth football	24		40		47		54	
Mini football	12		12		13		21	
Rugby Union Rugby League	24		11		12		26	
Cricket	29		12		13		17	
Sub-total	148	0.62	111	0.46	122	0.5	161	0.67
+c.10% for pitch rotation, maintenance etc.	-	0.06	-	0.05	-	0.05	-	0.07
Total	-	0.68	-	0.51	-	0.55	-	0.74
Rounded provision standard	-	0.7	-	0.5	-	0.6	-	0.8

From the table above, there is little difference between the standard which results from the traditional provision standards approach and that employed by the new draft pitch calculator.

Scenario 1 sees a much lower figure than the traditional approach, which is understandable given that no adjustment has been made in the calculations to allow for a change in demand. The PPS assessment and draft strategy take into account changes in demand (growth) and so it is probably not appropriate to base future planning on the figure which results from scenario 1.

Scenario 2a uses TGR figures only as its basis for adjusting for future demand. Using TGRs as a basis for understanding future demand is well-established and supported by the PPS guidance. However, there are some weaknesses in using this data on its own (it only provides a data driven projection rather than taking into account qualitative and locally gathered evidence and it cannot factor in a % figure for growth for age groups where there are currently zero ("0") teams). The resulting calculator figure of 0.6 ha per 1,000 being lower than that established through the traditional model is therefore understandable but it is recommended that this figure from scenario 2a is not used as the basis for long term planning in the PPS given the gaps in relying solely on TGR data for future planning of provision.

Scenario 2b provides a slightly higher figure for land required per 1,000m population, although "in line" with that produced by the traditional standards approach. This is reassuring that a slightly different scenario produces very similar figures. The difference of 0.1 ha per 1,000 population could be explained by the additional data "plugged in" to the calculator. Instead of relying solely on TGR projections, scenario 2b uses the findings of the assessment report which moderate the TGR figures by looking across at locally identified figures for displaced, unmet, aspirational and latent demand. As acknowledged in the assessment report, this produces a "top end" figure for pitch requirements which needs to be monitored and managed during the strategy's delivery to ensure that provision required "on the ground" matches additional supply, i.e. that the data alone is not relied upon to deliver pitch capacity but moderated to reflect actual demand in reality. It is, arguably, reassuring that scenario 2b produces a figure very similar to that of the traditional standards approach.

For hockey, all scenarios seem to reproduce the assessment's conclusion that two AGPs are necessary with a third possibly being required subject to demonstration of demand on the ground towards the end of the strategy period. However, we note that England Hockey continue to have discussions with Sport England about how best to factor training demand into the peak period into calculations.

Conclusions

- While the calculator provides figures for pitches (and costs), the next logical step is to use the
 figures to calculate a provision standard to use as a basis for negotiation (even though the
 calculator does not do this calculation), despite Sport England not supporting the use of provision
 standards.
- Will planning officers, NGBs and the development industry consider the new calculator robust given that it not yet "tried and tested" in developer negotiations (particularly in the immediate future)? Continuing testing by local authorities and minor refinements being made by Sport England may provide the confidence required for use of the calculator over the traditional method. However, the decision to rely on the outputs from the calculator, if the calculator is a tool "offered" to local authorities to use and not a requirement (the position understood to be the case), should rest with the local authority, at least at the current time. What remains clear is that whatever tool and / or scenario is preferred, the figures are only a starting point for

- negotiations, with the PPS assessment and strategy having a strong and clear role in defining the evidence based need "on the ground" while taking note of the figures that the calculator suggests.
- It seems, that on balance, the figure suggested by the traditional standards approach of 0.7 ha per 1,000 population is broadly correct when compared to the figures which result from the three scenarios run using the new draft calculator. However, moderation of this figure alongside the scenarios *could* suggest a slight uplift in the requirement to 0.75 (or even rounded to 0.8 ha per 1,000 population). For hockey, the scenarios seem to fit with the findings of the PPS assessment (although it is understood that further changes to the calculator may take place in the future to better take account of hockey training demand during the peak period).
- If a scenario is chosen as a preference over the traditional method of calculating standards, any significant differences in specific sport pitch provision will need to be accepted. However there are, for example, clear differences between the traditional method's calculation for cricket pitches and the results for cricket across all calculator scenarios, largely due to assumptions made.
- We understand that PPS guidance is likely to reflect use of the calculator in a future iteration when revised. It will need to be clear about the appropriate time to utilise the calculator during the process (i.e. as part of the assessment and strategy development stage than during stage A or prior to that) and about caveats attached to its use. There will need to be clarity that use of the calculator cannot be a substitute for developing robust evidence through the PPS process.
- An "official" calculator is likely to be available from Sport England in early 2018. This will be
 timely for the strategy process in Swindon and should be referenced in the final assessment
 report and strategy. What is clear, however, is that similar caveats applied to the text in the draft
 assessment report and draft strategy to use of provision standards will also need to be applied to
 references to the new calculator.
- The official calculator will be clear that it should only be used to calculate basic provision for new development. We understand that the draft version will be adjusted to enable smaller than local authority area calculations to easily be made. It will be most appropriate therefore for the calculator to be used at the "right time" in the planning process for new development sites. Using the calculator when the site becomes "live" will help to ensure that up-to-date figures for population arising from the development can be used. This "right time" will be at the preapplication stage when SBC officers need to provide advice to developers on the appropriate pitch provision on a new site or as a result of the additional population generated. Any figures will produce through the calculator will need to be "grounded" and moderated against what the strategy and accompanying assessment say about real likely demand and need in the area "on the ground".

Appendix A – PPS Data required by Calculator and Optional Data

Playing Pitch Demand Calculator - PPS Data Required

To provide an estimate of demand the calculator requires the following information from the local authority's playing pitch strategy assessment work:

- 1. The current population in each pitch sport age group
- 2. The Team Generation Rate (TGR) for each pitch sport age group

The above information should be available fromt he asessment work and should be copied across/entered into the sections below.

As a default, the calculator assumes that:

- a. All of the estimated demand generated from the new population will take place at the peak time in the week for the respective sports and age groups within the authority area, and
- b. The level of demand is in line with the current level of demand in the area (i.e. it uses current TGRs for the area with no change in the level of demand for any sports).

The two assumptions can be overridden by amending the ('Percentage of match play in the peak period' and 'Projected change in demand') details below against any of the individual pitch sport age groups, in line with information from the authority's playing pitch straegy assessment work.

	Required Ir	nformation	Optional In	formation
	Current population in each pitch sport age	2. Current team	a. Percentage of match play in the peak period	b. Projected change in
Sport and Age Groups	group in	generation rates for	(N/a for Cricket*. If unknown for	demand
	group in		other sports leave as 100%)	aciliana
Football Adult Men 11v11 (16-45yrs)	43,249	609	100%	18%
Football Adult Women 11v11 (16-45yrs)	41,773	10,443	100%	50%
Football Youth Boys11v11 (12-15yrs)	4,864	80	100%	28%
Football Youth Girls 11v11 (12-15yrs)	4,508	902	100%	80%
Football Youth Boys 9v9 (10-11yrs)	2,683	71	100%	39%
Football Youth Girls 9v9 (10-11yrs)	2,427	2,427	100%	20%
Football Mini Soccer Mixed 7v7 (8-9yrs)	5,633	131	100%	49%
Football Mini Soccer Mixed 5v5 (6-7yrs)	5,700	184	100%	103%
Cricket Open Age Mens (18-55yrs)	57,474	2,129	N/a	33%
Cricket Open Age Womens (18-55yrs)	55,590	0	N/a	0%
Cricket Junior Boys (7-18yrs)	15,491	3,098	N/a	120%
Cricket Junior Girls (7-18yrs)	14,530	0	N/a	0%
Rugby Union Senior Men (19-45yrs)	39,666	6,611	100%	50%
Rugby Union Senior Women (19-45yrs)	38,248	38,248	100%	100%
Rugby Union Youth Boys (13-18yrs)	7,228	1,807	100%	300%
Rugby Union Youth Girls (13-18yrs)	6,892	3,446	100%	10%
Rugby Union Mini/Midi Mixed (7-12yrs)	15,913	1,768	100%	200%
Rugby League Adult Men (19-45yrs)	39,666	19,833	100%	25%
Rugby League Adult Women (19-45yrs)	38,248	0	100%	0%
Rugby League Youth & Junior Boys (12-18y	8,448	0	100%	0%
Rugby League Junior Girls (12-18yrs)	8,032	0	100%	0%
Rugby League Primary Mixed (7-11yrs)	13,543	0	100%	0%
Hockey Senior Men (16-55yrs)	59,878	11,976	100%	50%
Hockey Senior Women (16-55yrs)	57,950	14,488	100%	50%
Hockey Junior Boys (11-15yrs)	6,130	2,452	100%	50%
Hockey Junior Girls (11-15yrs)	5,689	1,625	100%	50%

^{*.} N/a for Cricket as demand is assessed across the season as opposed to the across the week.

Appendix B – Figures inserted into calculator for scenarios

Scenario 1

	Required Ir	nformation	Optional I	nformation
Sport and Age Groups	Current population in each pitch sport age group in	2. Current team generation rates for	a. Percentage of match play in the peak period (N/a for Cricket*. If unknown for other sports leave as 100%)	b. Projected change in demand
Football Adult Men 11v11 (16-45yrs)	43,249	609	100%	0%
Football Adult Women 11v11 (16-45yrs)	41,773	10,443	100%	0%
Football Youth Boys11v11 (12-15yrs)	4,864	80	100%	0%
Football Youth Girls 11v11 (12-15yrs)	4,508	902	100%	0%
Football Youth Boys 9v9 (10-11yrs)	2,683	71	100%	
Football Youth Girls 9v9 (10-11yrs)	2,427	2,427	100%	0%
Football Mini Soccer Mixed 7v7 (8-9yrs)	5,633	131	100%	0%
Football Mini Soccer Mixed 5v5 (6-7yrs)	5,700	184	100%	0%
Cricket Open Age Mens (18-55yrs)	57,474	2,129	N/a	
Cricket Open Age Womens (18-55yrs)	55,590	0	N/a	0%
Cricket Junior Boys (7-18yrs)	15,491	3,098	N/a	
Cricket Junior Girls (7-18yrs)	14,530	0	N/a	
Rugby Union Senior Men (19-45yrs)	39,666	6,611	100%	0%
Rugby Union Senior Women (19-45yrs)	38,248	38,248	100%	0%
Rugby Union Youth Boys (13-18yrs)	7,228	1,807	100%	0%
Rugby Union Youth Girls (13-18yrs)	6,892	3,446	100%	0%
Rugby Union Mini/Midi Mixed (7-12yrs)	15,913	1,768	100%	0%
Rugby League Adult Men (19-45yrs)	39,666	19,833	100%	
Rugby League Adult Women (19-45yrs)	38,248	0	100%	0%
Rugby League Youth & Junior Boys (12-18yrs)	8,448	0	100%	0%
Rugby League Junior Girls (12-18yrs)	8,032	0	100%	
Rugby League Primary Mixed (7-11yrs)	13,543	0	100%	
Hockey Senior Men (16-55yrs)	59,878	11,976	100%	0%
Hockey Senior Women (16-55yrs)	57,950	14,488	100%	
Hockey Junior Boys (11-15yrs)	6,130	2,452	100%	0%
Hockey Junior Girls (11-15yrs)	5,689	1,625	100%	0%

^{*.} N/a for Cricket as demand is assessed across the season as opposed to the across the week.

Scenario 2a

	Required I	nformation	Optional Ir	nformation
Sport and Age Groups	Current population in each pitch sport age group in	2. Current team generation rates for	a. Percentage of match play in the peak period (N/a for Cricket*. If unknown for	b. Projected change in demand
			other sports leave as 100%)	
Football Adult Men 11v11 (16-45yrs)	43,249	609	100%	6%
Football Adult Women 11v11 (16-45yrs)	41,773	10,443	100%	5%
Football Youth Boys11v11 (12-15yrs)	4,864	80	100%	21%
Football Youth Girls 11v11 (12-15yrs)	4,508	902	100%	18%
Football Youth Boys 9v9 (10-11yrs)	2,683	71	100%	16%
Football Youth Girls 9v9 (10-11yrs)	2,427	2,427	100%	21%
Football Mini Soccer Mixed 7v7 (8-9yrs)	5,633	131	100%	9%
Football Mini Soccer Mixed 5v5 (6-7yrs)	5,700	184	100%	5%
Cricket Open Age Mens (18-55yrs)	57,474	2,129	N/a	5%
Cricket Open Age Womens (18-55yrs)	55,590	0	N/a	0%
Cricket Junior Boys (7-18yrs)	15,491	3,098	N/a	13%
Cricket Junior Girls (7-18yrs)	14,530	0	N/a	0%
Rugby Union Senior Men (19-45yrs)	39,666	6,611	100%	6%
Rugby Union Senior Women (19-45yrs)	38,248	38,248	100%	6%
Rugby Union Youth Boys (13-18yrs)	7,228	1,807	100%	12%
Rugby Union Youth Girls (13-18yrs)	6,892	3,446	100%	7%
Rugby Union Mini/Midi Mixed (7-12yrs)	15,913	1,768	100%	13%
Rugby League Adult Men (19-45yrs)	39,666	19,833	100%	6%
Rugby League Adult Women (19-45yrs)	38,248	0	100%	0%
Rugby League Youth & Junior Boys (12-18yrs)	8,448	0	100%	0%
Rugby League Junior Girls (12-18yrs)	8,032	0	100%	0%
Rugby League Primary Mixed (7-11yrs)	13,543	0	100%	0%
Hockey Senior Men (16-55yrs)	59,878	11,976	100%	50%
Hockey Senior Women (16-55yrs)	57,950	14,488	100%	50%
Hockey Junior Boys (11-15yrs)	6,130	2,452	100%	50%
Hockey Junior Girls (11-15yrs)	5,689	1,625	100%	50%

^{*.} N/a for Cricket as demand is assessed across the season as opposed to the across the week.

Scenario 2b

	Required In	formation	Optional Ir	nformation
Sport and Age Groups	Current population in each pitch sport age group in	2. Current team generation rates for	a. Percentage of match play in the peak period (N/a for Cricket*. If unknown for other sports leave as 100%)	b. Projected change in demand
Football Adult Men 11v11 (16-45yrs)	43,249	609	100%	18%
Football Adult Women 11v11 (16-45yrs)	41,773	10,443	100%	50%
Football Youth Boys11v11 (12-15yrs)	4,864	80	100%	28%
Football Youth Girls 11v11 (12-15yrs)	4,508	902	100%	80%
Football Youth Boys 9v9 (10-11yrs)	2,683	71	100%	39%
Football Youth Girls 9v9 (10-11yrs)	2,427	2,427	100%	20%
Football Mini Soccer Mixed 7v7 (8-9yrs)	5,633	131	100%	49%
Football Mini Soccer Mixed 5v5 (6-7yrs)	5,700	184	100%	103%
Cricket Open Age Mens (18-55yrs)	57,474	2,129	N/a	33%
Cricket Open Age Womens (18-55yrs)	55,590	0	N/a	0%
Cricket Junior Boys (7-18yrs)	15,491	3,098	N/a	120%
Cricket Junior Girls (7-18yrs)	14,530	0	N/a	0%
Rugby Union Senior Men (19-45yrs)	39,666	6,611	100%	50%
Rugby Union Senior Women (19-45yrs)	38,248	38,248	100%	100%
Rugby Union Youth Boys (13-18yrs)	7,228	1,807	100%	300%
Rugby Union Youth Girls (13-18yrs)	6,892	3,446	100%	10%
Rugby Union Mini/Midi Mixed (7-12yrs)	15,913	1,768	100%	200%
Rugby League Adult Men (19-45yrs)	39,666	19,833	100%	25%
Rugby League Adult Women (19-45yrs)	38,248	0	100%	0%
Rugby League Youth & Junior Boys (12-18yrs)	8,448	0	100%	0%
Rugby League Junior Girls (12-18yrs)	8,032	0	100%	0%
Rugby League Primary Mixed (7-11yrs)	13,543	0	100%	0%
Hockey Senior Men (16-55yrs)	59,878	11,976	100%	50%
Hockey Senior Women (16-55yrs)	57,950	14,488	100%	50%
Hockey Junior Boys (11-15yrs)	6,130	2,452	100%	50%
Hockey Junior Girls (11-15yrs)	5,689	1,625	100%	50%

^{*} M/s for Cricket as domand is accorded across the coason as appared to the across the week

Scenario 3

	Required In	nformation	Optional In	formation
Sport and Age Groups	Current population in each pitch sport age group in	2. Current team generation rates for	a. Percentage of match play in the peak period (N/a for Cricket*. If unknown for other sports leave as 100%)	b. Projected change in demand
Football Adult Men 11v11 (16-45vrs)	43.249	609	56%	6%
Football Adult Women 11v11 (16-45yrs)	41,773	10,443	100%	5%
Football Youth Boys11v11 (12-15yrs)	4.864	80	39%	21%
Football Youth Girls 11v11 (12-15yrs)	4,508	902	39%	18%
Football Youth Boys 9v9 (10-11yrs)	2,683	71	44%	16%
Football Youth Girls 9v9 (10-11yrs)	2,427	2,427	44%	21%
Football Mini Soccer Mixed 7v7 (8-9yrs)	5,633	131	49%	9%
Football Mini Soccer Mixed 5v5 (6-7yrs)	5,700	184	46%	5%
Cricket Open Age Mens (18-55yrs)	57,474	2,129	N/a	5%
Cricket Open Age Womens (18-55yrs)	55,590	0	N/a	0%
Cricket Junior Boys (7-18yrs)	15,491	3,098	N/a	13%
Cricket Junior Girls (7-18yrs)	14,530	0	N/a	0%
Rugby Union Senior Men (19-45yrs)	39,666	6,611	100%	6%
Rugby Union Senior Women (19-45yrs)	38,248	38,248	100%	6%
Rugby Union Youth Boys (13-18yrs)	7,228	1,807	75%	12%
Rugby Union Youth Girls (13-18yrs)	6,892	3,446	100%	7%
Rugby Union Mini/Midi Mixed (7-12yrs)	15,913	1,768	100%	13%
Rugby League Adult Men (19-45yrs)	39,666	19,833	100%	6%
Rugby League Adult Women (19-45yrs)	38,248	0	100%	0%
Rugby League Youth & Junior Boys (12-18yrs)	8,448	0	100%	0%
Rugby League Junior Girls (12-18yrs)	8,032	0	100%	0%
Rugby League Primary Mixed (7-11yrs)	13,543	0	100%	0%
Hockey Senior Men (16-55yrs)	59,878	11,976	100%	50%
Hockey Senior Women (16-55yrs)	57,950	14,488	100%	50%
Hockey Junior Boys (11-15yrs)	6,130	2,452	100%	50%
Hockey Junior Girls (11-15yrs)	5,689	1,625	100%	50%

^{*.} N/a for Cricket as demand is assessed across the season as opposed to the across the week.