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1. **Introduction**

1.1 **Background**

1.1.1 The Open Space study forms one element of the 'evidence base' of the London Borough of Newham Local Development Framework (LDF) and responds to the need to assess recreational and open space requirements in the Borough. Planning Policy Guidance Note 17 (PPG17, 2002) on Sport, Open Space and Recreation, sets out central government’s guidance on Open Space, and recommends that local authorities carry out studies of its quality and availability. Local authorities are advised to adopt a methodology which assesses the wider recreational needs of the local community and to make appropriate provision in the light of those assessments. The study is set in this national and regional framework and aims to support and inform the following local initiatives:

- Funding bids and investment priorities;
- The Local Planning policies; and
- Management of public open spaces.

1.1.2 The need for a study has also been highlighted by the difficulties that many Local Authorities experience in improving and enhancing facilities given the lack of coordinated and accessible information on the type and quality of facilities which prevents an informed assessment of formal and informal recreation needs and opportunities. This report supports the current work on the Newham Parks Development Plan.

1.1.3 Policy 3D.12 of the London Plan (consolidated with Alterations since 2004) states that London Boroughs should produce open space strategies to protect, create and enhance all types of open space in their area. Such strategies should include approaches for the positive management of open space where appropriate to prevent or remedy degradation or enhance the beneficial use for the community. In addition the Mayor of London has produced a Guide to Preparing Open Space Strategies which has been taken into account in the production of this study.

1.1.4 The key output of the assessment will be a framework for the future management and planning of open space and recreation facilities in the borough.
1.2 **SCOPE OF THE STUDY**

1.2.1 The aim of the LB Newham Open Space Study was to assess and analyse the quantity, quality and accessibility of existing open space, the varied functions of open space and the needs of local people.

1.2.2 The results of this analysis will:

- Inform the evidence base for the LDF;
- Provide the Council with planning guidance on open space standards;
- Assist the Council in identifying changing community needs for new open space and outdoor recreational facilities;
- Inform the future management of open space including the identification of opportunities to enhance and reconfigure open space provision; and
- Enable the Council to set priorities for future investment and provide a rationale to secure external funding for the improvement and additional provision of facilities, particularly via developer contributions.

1.2.3 This report also includes an assessment of the quantity, quality and value of parks and open space.

1.3 **OPEN SPACE**

1.3.1 PPG17 states that well designed and implemented planning policies for open space, sport and recreation facilities are fundamental to delivering broader Government objectives, which include:

- supporting an urban renaissance
- promotion of social inclusion and community cohesion
- supporting health and well being
- Promoting more sustainable development.

1.3.2 The East London Green Grid Framework – Supplementary Planning Guidance to the London Plan is a sub-regional framework which aims to create a network of interlinked, high quality open spaces that connect town centres with public transport nodes, the Green Belt, the Thames, and major employment and residential areas. It provides direction on where and how the Green Grid should develop and describes how to integrate open space networks into planning the regeneration of East London.
1.3.3 The quality of public open spaces in the borough plays just as important a role as quantity. Public open spaces that are accessible, enjoyable, clean, well maintained and with good facilities form an important role in creating sustainable neighbourhoods.

1.3.4 The issue of public open space quality and accessibility is an important one as Newham anticipates a major growth in future population. Currently, park quality varies throughout the Borough and there are likely to be somewhat limited opportunities in existing residential areas of the Borough to increase the overall quantity of public spaces. There is a need therefore to improve the quality and accessibility of open spaces.

1.4 DEMOGRAPHICS

1.4.1 The London Borough of Newham is located in the east of London and has a population of 243,891 (ONS, 2001). Newham is the tenth most populated borough in London. The Borough’s population has grown steadily since 1991.

1.4.2 Newham has a higher proportion of younger people and lower proportion of older people than London as a whole. The latest available figures show that 40 per cent of Newham’s population is under the age of 25. Only 8.5 per cent of our population is over the age of 65. For London as a whole 31 per cent is under 25 and 12.1 per cent over 65.

1.4.3 According to national figures, in 2004 Newham was ranked the eleventh most deprived area in England and Wales and the fourth most deprived borough in London. This has changed since 2000, when the Borough was the fifth most deprived in England and Wales and the third most deprived in London. The change reflects action that has been taken by the Council and its partners to improve the quality of life in the Borough.

1.4.4 A full demographic profile is provided in Chapter 3 and an illustration of the ward and community forum area boundaries illustrated in Figure 1.
1.5 METHODOLOGY

1.5.1 The Open Space study was undertaken in four phases. In Phase 1 a desk top study looked at the national, regional and local initiatives and analysed the local context.

1.5.2 In Phase 2 an audit of supply was carried out, looking at the quantity and quality of the open spaces in the Borough and identifying opportunities for improvement and enhancement. It reported on a total of 190 open spaces throughout the Borough, classified them according to type, and calculated how accessible they were to the population at large. A quality assessment was applied consistently to all the open spaces.

1.5.3 In Phase 3 an assessment of need took place, identifying strategic, Borough wide concerns and incorporating previous assessments made on the demand for playing pitches.

1.5.4 A socio-economic profile was built of the Borough, looking at demography, population projections, ethnicity, socio-economic characteristics of the
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population (professions, occupations) working hours, car ownership, travel to work, housing, health and deprivation.

1.5.5 An analysis of open space supply and demand allowed initial accessibility standards to be developed, and these were used to identify shortages/deficiencies in provision. These assessments used existing regular public user survey data in relation to public parks and allotments.

1.5.6 Phase 4 saw the analysis of strategic demand and supply. The value of open space was addressed resulting in recommendations for the protection and enhancement of existing spaces. A further assessment was made of the need and availability of allotments. Finally, a detailed series of recommendations is made of improvements which could be made to open spaces in the Borough, in order to enable them to fulfil their potential and contribute to the overall health and social wealth of the Borough.

1.5.7 This report is structured as follows.

- Chapter 2 contains a review of the current national, regional and local strategies, guidance and initiatives;
- Chapter 3 provides an assessment of local open spaces needs and priorities;
- Chapter 4 outlines the approach to planning open space provision;
- Chapters 5, 6, 7 and 8 deal with an assessment of the quantity and quality of the supply of parks, children’s play, natural and semi-natural greenspace, and allotments;
- Chapter 9 considers quality issues;
- Chapter 10 looks at the value of Open Space;
- Chapters 11 summarises recommended local standards;
- Chapter 12 looks forward to the development of an open space strategy.
2. NATIONAL, REGIONAL AND LOCAL FRAMEWORK

2.1 INTRODUCTION

2.1.1 National, regional and local strategies and initiatives provide a framework to influence the development of an Open Space Study. Sport, open spaces and recreation all contribute to people’s quality of life and consequently cross a number of national and local government competences including: planning, leisure and recreation, health, education and crime. The Companion Guide to PPG17 recommends that open space assessments consider the implications of national, regional and local strategies in order to ensure that the multifunctional role of open space is recognised within the assessment.

2.1.2 Key implications of the relevant strategies relating to the Borough are considered below.

2.2 NATIONAL POLICY


2.2.1 PPS1 states that planning shapes the places where people live and work and the country we live in. The statement recognises that good planning ensures that there is a positive difference to people’s lives and helps to deliver homes, jobs, and better opportunities for all, whilst protecting and enhancing the natural and historic environment, and conserving the countryside and open spaces that are vital resources for everyone.

2.2.2 PPS1 supplement “Delivering Sustainable Development” sets out how planning should contribute to reducing emissions and stabilising climate change. The supplement recognises the contribution that existing and new opportunities for open space and green infrastructure can provide including to urban cooling, sustainable drainage systems, and conserving and enhancing biodiversity.

**PPG17: Planning for Open space, Sport and Recreation (2002)**

2.2.3 PPG17 states that Local authorities should undertake robust assessments of the existing and future needs of their communities for open space, sports and recreational facilities. Key planning objectives include:

- supporting an urban renaissance
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- promotion of social inclusion and community cohesion
- health and well being
- promoting more sustainable development

2.2.4 Guidelines describing how such assessments should be completed are set out in ‘Assessing Needs and Opportunities: A Companion Guide to PPG17’ (ODPM, 2002). The guidelines recommend that audits of local open space needs should:

- Cover the differing and distinctive needs of the population for open space and built sports and recreational facilities including those working in and visiting areas;
- Include audits of existing open space, sports and recreational facilities including usage, accessibility, costs and opportunities for new open space and facilities. Audits should establish the quantity and quality of spaces; and
- Identify specific needs and quantitative or qualitative deficits or surpluses.

Planning Guidance for Sport

2.2.5 Sport England is the agency responsible for advising the Government on sports matters. It also acts as a statutory consultee on certain developments relating to sports pitches.

2.2.6 Sports England have produced a number of policy guidance documents aimed at assisting Local Authorities in providing for sporting opportunities within their Boroughs. These documents include:

- Proofing for Sport and Active Recreation in Spatial Plans (2009)
- Spatial Planning for Sport and Active Recreation- Development Control Guidance Note (2009)
- Spatial Planning for Sport and Active Recreation -Guidance on Sport England’s Aspirations and Experience (2005)

2.2.7 These documents set out guidance for various authorities in the preparation of Local Development Frameworks (LDF) as well as providing a guide for development control matters which affect the interest of sport and recreation.
2.2.8 A consultation paper on a new Planning Policy Statement entitled Planning for a Natural and Healthy Environment was released for consultation in March 2010. The document covers planning for the natural environment, green infrastructure, open space, sport, recreation and play. The document recognises that strategic networks of green spaces, commonly referred to as green infrastructure, can provide a wide range of environmental benefits in both rural and urban areas.

2.2.9 Open space can serve as a vital focal point for community activities – bringing together members of communities and providing opportunities for social interaction. It plays a vital role in promoting healthy living and in the social development of children through play, sporting activities and interaction with others.

2.2.10 A key objective of the PPS is therefore to bring together related policies on the natural environment and on open and green spaces in rural and urban areas to ensure that the planning system delivers healthy sustainable communities which adapt to and are resilient to climate change and gives the appropriate level of protection to the natural environment.

2.2.11 The document sets out plan making policies including Policy NE1 Evidence for Plan Making, NE3 Local Planning Approach for the Natural Environment, Policy NE4 Local Planning Approach For Green Infrastructure and Policy NE5 Local Planning Approach To Open Space, Sport, Recreation And Play.


2.2.12 In May 2007 the previous Government published its white paper Planning for a Sustainable Future. The statement recognises that the planning system has a critically important role in delivering the land needed to meet the increased number of households being formed and our future demographic needs, while making full use of brownfield opportunities and protecting the land we value most, such as parks and open spaces in urban areas.

2.2.13 The paper states that particular protection should be afforded for parks and urban green spaces. It also recognises that these places make a huge contribution to the quality of urban life, as well as, through encouraging activity and sport, providing potential health benefits. Open green spaces are essential both in towns and cities, as well as in the countryside, to meet the diverse needs and general well being of local communities.
2.2.14 The CABE guide “Start with the Park” was produced for everyone involved in the processes of sustainable growth and renewal in England. The guide is relevant for those involved in the creation and care of green spaces in housing growth areas and housing market renewal areas.

2.2.15 The guide aims to inform and inspire strategic decision-makers working in local delivery and partnership bodies, local and regional authorities, government departments and other national agencies, private developers, house builders and registered social landlords and community and voluntary sector groups.

2.2.16 The guide recognises that a successful park or green space can be the making of a place and that green infrastructure is a key to healthier lifestyles, sustainable urban drainage and lifelong learning, providing space for relaxation, encouraging more sustainable transport and promoting economic development.

2.2.17 Since 2003 CABE Space has been contributing to a growing body of evidence that demonstrates how green spaces can offer lasting economic, social, cultural and environmental benefits. This work confirms the link between high-quality green spaces and increased house prices; their benefits in improving the image of an area and attracting investment; their contribution to biodiversity; their contribution to promoting exercise and the benefits to health; and the role of public space design and management in tackling social issues such as anti-social behaviour.

2.2.18 The guide provides a range of case studies from around the world which demonstrate various ways in which developments have successfully responded to the needs for useful and purposeful open spaces.

CABE - Open space strategies - Best Practice Guidance (2009)

2.2.19 CABE, in association with the Greater London Authority, have produced a document “Open Space Strategies “ which sets out guidance for those preparing an open space strategy as well as setting out best practice examples from around the country which demonstrate the value and practical benefits of a strategic approach to open space.

2.2.20 CABE recommend a six stage process in preparing an open space strategy with some stages and activities being able to be run parallel with each other. The guidance sets out the tasks which will need to be undertaken at each stage and suggests timeframes for each stage.

2.2.21 The final strategy should reflect a widely shared vision and should serve a wide variety of stakeholders. The aim is to understand supply and demand for open spaces and to identify deficiencies, secure new provision and improve quality through better management. CABE envisages that the
spatial elements of the open strategy will also feed into the LDF and form material considerations in the determination of planning applications.

### 2.3 Regional Policy

**London Plan (2004 consolidated with alterations)**

2.3.1 The London Plan recognises the importance of protecting the city’s distinctive network of open spaces. It seeks to make them more accessible and for them to be enhanced. The Plan identifies that as the use of land becomes more intense, the contribution of open space to physical and psychological health, to biodiversity and to the relatively open character of the city will become even more important.

2.3.2 One of the Mayor’s key objectives set out in the Plan is to accommodate London’s growth within its boundaries without encroaching on open spaces.

2.3.3 Policy 3D.8 states that “Policies in DPDs should treat the open space network as an integrated system that provides a “green infrastructure” containing many uses and performing a wide range of functions, such as the East London Green Grid.”

2.3.4 Policy 3D.12 relates to open space strategies and states that Boroughs should produce open space strategies to protect, create and enhance all types of open space in their area. Strategies should include approaches for the positive management of open space where appropriate to prevent or remedy degradation and enhance the beneficial for the community.

2.3.5 The policy recommends that Boroughs should undertake audits of existing open space and assessments of need in their area, considering both the qualitative and the quantitative elements of open space, wildlife sites, sports and recreational facilities, as part of an open space strategy and in accordance with the guidance given in PPG17. In doing so, they should have regard to the cross-borough nature and use of many open spaces in London.

2.3.6 Policy 3D.13 seeks to ensure that all children have safe access to good quality, well-designed, secure and stimulating play and informal recreation provision.

2.3.7 Boroughs are encouraged to produce strategies on play and informal recreation to improve access and opportunity for all children and young people in their area. In addition to this Boroughs should undertake audits of existing play and informal recreation provision and assessments of need in their areas, considering the qualitative, quantitative and accessibility elements of play and informal recreation facilities.
2.3.8 Further policies include those which seek the protection and enhancement of biodiversity and nature conservation as well as trees and woodlands (Policies 3D.14 and 3D.15).


2.3.9 The East London Green Grid, which forms supplementary guidance to the London Plan, aims to create a network of interlinked, high quality open spaces that connect town centres with public transport nodes, the Green Belt, the Thames, and major employment and residential areas.

2.3.10 The Green Grid Vision is;

A network of open spaces, river and other corridors connecting urban areas to the river Thames, the Green Belt and beyond to provide attractive, diverse landscapes and green infrastructure managed to the highest standards for people and wildlife.

2.3.11 The Green Grid will provide access to open space, routes for walking and cycling, nature conservation, opportunities for informal and formal recreation, healthy exercise, environmental education, flood risk management, adapting to and mitigating climate change, grey water treatment, improving urban micro-climates, moderating the impacts of heat, noise and air pollution, and improving landscape and townscape quality.

2.3.12 The framework sets out six Green Grid Areas which provide the basic framework from which Green Grid development and enhancement projects can be delivered. The document highlights the strategic open space opportunities that should be used to inform the implementation of the Green Grid, such as through development planning, master planning, borough Open Space Strategies and projects.

2.3.13 Green Grid Area 1 Lee Valley lies partly within Newham. The Lee Valley Regional Park is a 37km green corridor running from Newham and Tower Hamlets to Ware in Hertfordshire. From Hackney Marsh to the River Thames the River Lee splits into a number of separate channels which are all canalised and diverge at Bow Locks and is largely inaccessible to the south of Bow Creek. This represents a major recreation opportunity for Newham's residents but is also currently a barrier to access.

2.3.14 The framework recognises a number of strategic open space opportunities including:

- to provide at least 240-250ha of new and improved public open space as a major new park through the Lower Lea Valley to the Thames, which includes the Olympic Legacy proposals
- to complete the strategic north/south recreational route through the valley to the Thames
- to create new access routes across infrastructure barriers, including waterways, railways and major roads
- to improve the ecological value of watercourses and water bodies, especially the heavily engineered flood protection channels
- to improve the value and connectivity of habitats, optimising appropriate access
- to refurbish and enhance the Northern Outfall Sewer Link and connect it with the Thames Gateway Bridge proposals

2.3.15 Green Grid Area 2 Epping Forest/Roding Valley also falls partly within Newham. The Beckton Park Link comprises Beckton District Park, Newham City Farm and New Beckton Park. The framework recognises that currently there is no clear connection between Beckton District Park and the Greenway on the Northern Outfall Sewer, and no clear link between New Beckton Park and the Thames Riverside. Strategic opportunities within the borough include:
  - the creation of a Metropolitan Park from Ilford to the Thames (including Cross River Park), linking the River Roding from Ilford to the Beckton Park Link, the proposed Thames Gateway Bridge and on to the south side of the river, maximising pedestrian and cycle connectivity and improving ecological value
  - improved access to and awareness of rivers particularly in the lower part of the Green Grid Area without detriment to flood risk management and biodiversity

2.3.16 The framework recognises that East London has deficiencies in all the park categories identified in the London Plan. This shortfall results in a gap in the spatial character of London and the wider open space network. Through focusing Green Grid efforts to provide new open space and linkages a reduction in these deficient areas can be delivered. These efforts can include:
  - expansion of existing parks;
  - improving the quality, facilities and accessibility parks;
  - improving the linkages between parks; and
  - The provision of new parks.

2.3.17 The supplementary guidance sets out clear standards, backed up by good practice examples, for those involved in planning and designing local neighbourhoods.

2.3.18 The SPG responds to challenges faced by London and offers guidance to London boroughs on providing for the play and recreation needs of children and young people under the age of 18 and the use of benchmark standards in the preparation of play strategies and in the implementation of Policy 3D.13 as set out in the London Plan.

2.3.19 This policy states that all children should have safe access to good quality, well-designed, secure and stimulating play and informal recreation provision. Boroughs should produce strategies on play and informal recreation to improve access and opportunity for all children and young people in their area.

2.3.20 The application of benchmark standards set out in the guidance in developing local standards for provision will assist in the development of policies to address deficiencies, enhance existing provision and create new play and informal recreation opportunities. The emphasis should be on the achievement of improvements in both the quantity and quality of play space with a clear emphasis on implementation.

2.4 LOCAL POLICY

LB Newham current UDP Policy for Open Space

2.4.1 Newham’s UDP sets out a number of objectives for open space and recreation which are:

a) to safeguard existing open space and recreational buildings;

b) to secure the improvement of the quality of these facilities and heavily used public open spaces in town centres, as well as damaged and derelict areas of Metropolitan Open Land in the Roding and Lea valleys;

c) to seek the optimum use of these resources;

d) to secure new open space and recreational facilities that will be valued by local people; and

e) to improve access to a range of open space and recreational facilities for local people.

2.4.2 The UDP recognises that the need to protect open space has been recognised by the Government in PPG17. ‘Open Space Planning in
London’ (1992), by London Planning Advisory Council (LPAC) states that in Newham there are 794 persons per hectare of public open space. However, according to the Council’s previous estimates there are only 253 hectares of public open space, that is, one hectare of public open space per 933 persons in the Borough. By undertaking a full PPG17 compliant survey and assessment this study has sought to ensure a full and accurate record is established.

**Newham’s Core Strategy (2010)**

2.4.3 Newham are currently preparing their Core Strategy which will form a new spatial plan for the Borough. It will form the overarching development plan in the LDF and set out the long term spatial vision and spatial policies for the Borough.

2.4.4 A consultation on the Issues and Options was undertaken in early 2008. This sought the views of local people with regards to Newham’s’ future. The consultation report released in May 2010 provided a summary of the main topic areas including jobs, health and well being, open space etc.

2.4.5 In terms of open space the report found that consultation respondents expressed the following views:

- Improve and increase the availability of natural green space and linkages between them for the benefit of biodiversity and access;
- adoption of Natural England’s “Access to Natural Green-space Standards; balance between open space and public spaces and other land uses;
- success of parks rely on adjacent uses and activity;
- public access to riversides and the docks supported, but the future ownership and management of these areas needs consideration;
- increased provision of open space is supported given the existing low levels;
- access to riversides is paramount as is connectivity, and needs to be balanced with the conservation value of the river;
- waterside developments should be designed to minimise ecological impacts and allow access;
- ensure that open spaces of historic significance are fully understood appreciated and maintained;
- open spaces should be safe for everyone at all times;
- open spaces should be protected and new ones created together with community uses;
opportunities to extend the Lea Valley Park south to the Thames should be considered;

- arts and culture uses are supported;

- ensure open spaces can be more effectively used;

- improvements to hard and soft landscaping is vital to retain and attract residents to the borough."


2.4.6 Newham’s LDF Background Paper on Open Space and Outdoor recreation provided an initial assessment of the quantity and quality of open and recreation space in the Borough and has been used to inform this more detailed study. The paper was produced in 2006 and stated that 258ha of the Borough is covered with public open space which represent just 7% of the landmass in the Borough.

2.4.7 The paper recognises that there is currently a lack of clear, comprehensive policy guidance in the UDP or related Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) advice in ‘Residential Planning Guidance’ (1998) on:

- the protection of existing open space.

- quantitative standards and the range of public open space facilities required on new residential/mixed use development sites.

- quantitative and qualitative/design guidance relating to semi-private/private housing amenity open space, especially in high density contexts.

2.4.8 The most significant issue facing the Borough was thought to be how to meet the public open space needs of a major growth in population. New development in the Borough is focussed in the ‘Arc of Opportunity’ which includes the Lea Valley, the Royal Docks, and the Beckton Area. These areas of the Borough were traditionally used for industry, and are generally devoid of areas of public open space.

2.4.9 A number of options and preferred policies are set out in the paper which seek to address various issues including setting standards for open space provision for new housing development as well as identifying new areas for development. Promotion of the Green Grid is also included as a preferred policy as well as the protection of open space by resisting inappropriate development which would result in the loss of areas of open space.
Newham’s Parks and Open Spaces Development Plan

2.4.10 Newham’s Parks and Open Spaces Development Plan envisages that by 2014 every resident will have access to high quality, safe and sustainable parks and open spaces. This will be achieved through the improvement in the quality and range of landscapes and facilities in Newham’s parks and open spaces and an increase in participation to help shape a better environment for all to enjoy.

Joint Strategic Needs Assessment (2009)

2.4.11 Newham’s Joint Strategic Needs Assessment was created to assess the health and well being needs of the population of Newham. The assessment covers a broad range of factors affecting health and wellbeing. The range of factors covered include lifestyles, children’s and young people’s health and well being, adult social care services etc. The assessment provides details on these factors in the Borough of Newham.

2.4.12 In terms of open space and sports participation the assessment provides key recommendations for each factor including for Newham Council and NHS Newham to continue to advocate for Newham residents benefitting from the legacy of the 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games in terms of community facilities, better housing, new high quality open space, and new employment opportunities.

Sustainability Community Strategy (2010)

2.4.13 Newham’s Sustainability Community Strategy sets out the way in which the Borough aims to commit to improve people’s lives by strengthening the partnership between individuals and service providers whilst improving public services to meet local needs.

2.4.14 The strategy states that London Borough of Newham wishes to build communities which form strong bonds of friendship between the population and service providers whilst encouraging people to live in Newham by:

- Getting people together through activities, from sports to events;
- Ensuring that our places and community are mixed by class, ethnicity and tenure; and
- Building community, friendship and common purpose.

2.4.15 The Strategy recognises the value of local parks and open spaces which amongst many functions host community events and provide facilities which encourage healthy lifestyles. The strategy refers to new open space to be brought forward as part of the Olympic proposals including part of the Olympic Park which will deliver a real legacy for local people. The Council and local partners have also presented a case for the new park to be
granted Royal Park status to reflect the aspiration for high quality public space.

2.5 Future Developments

2.5.1 Looking to the future, the Council are deciding on plans for the Borough up to 2026. This includes plans to achieve the right balance between homes, jobs and open spaces in order to create healthy communities with the best possible quality of life for everyone. A number of key developments have been identified in the Borough that may influence it population and spatial planning in future years.

Canning Town and Custom House (2008)

2.5.2 A supplementary planning document (SPD) has been prepared to reflect the revised masterplan framework for the Canning Town and Custom House Area. The regeneration of Canning Town and Custom House is a strategic priority for the London Borough of Newham, London Thames Gateway Development Corporation, Mayor of London and the London Development Agency.

2.5.3 Key themes emerging from local policy have informed the preparation of the document and these including providing appropriate housing, particularly family housing, by increasing housing density and mixing housing tenures as well as ensuring the right mix of uses, particularly making provision for community facilities and open space.

2.5.4 The document recognises that in the Canning Town and Custom House area there are significant areas of open space, but some public spaces are of poor quality and many would benefit from upgrading and improvements.

2.5.5 A number of development principles set out in the document include making new connections in the area with the creation of new streets and large open spaces, formal exercise areas and event areas to create activity at street level. The document also seeks to enhance and make the most of public, semi-public and private spaces. The scope of landscape provision and improvements ranges from refurbishment of existing spaces to the provision of new public realm, parks, semi-public spaces (such as opening up school grounds for wider public use) or sports facilities.

The Stratford and Lower Lea Valley AAP (2010)

2.5.6 The plan will provide policy for an area of London that is undergoing significant change. A consultation on the Issues and Opportunities stage of the Area Action Plan took place in Summer 2008.

2.5.7 The Issues and Options paper refers to open space as providing the main organising structure to the future layout of development in the AAP area,
which will build on existing open space that shall be improved. Detailed landscape and open space proposals are set out in the document. The issue of deficiency of open space in the area is specifically raised.

2.5.8 The consultation report, released in May 2010, on the issues and options provided a summary of the main topic areas and issues facing the area and those raised by local people. The events based consultation undertaken at the issues and options stage concluded that community, crime and public realm were top issues raised however open space was further down on the list of priorities.

**London Olympic and Paralympic Games**

2.5.9 The influence of the Olympics and their Legacy to Newham will be an essential consideration in future planning for open spaces. The London 2012 Olympic Games are scheduled to take place in East London in the summer of 2012. Although Borough’s all across the capital will be hosting events and training camps there are 5 main Boroughs in the vicinity of the Olympic Park area who will benefit from the Games:

- Waltham Forest;
- Tower Hamlets;
- Hackney;
- Greenwich; and
- Newham.

2.5.10 Newham stands to benefit substantially from the Games in terms of physical regeneration. Much of the Olympic Park itself is located within the Borough. In addition, the regeneration of Stratford City, a huge housing and retail project will be ready alongside the Games in 2012 and bring huge benefits to the area.

2.5.11 The London 2012 Games represent a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity for Newham to raise the profile of the borough, improve transport networks and inspire people to participate in sport and healthy lifestyles. In addition to this the Borough stands to benefit from the creation of thousands of jobs before and during the Games, businesses close to the locations stand to benefit from increased visitor numbers as well as general improvements in the area.

2.5.12 Newham have set 6 objectives including:

1. To maximise the opportunities from the Games delivery process to develop an environmental legacy for all - which is attractive, clean, safe, sustainable and accessible for all;
2. To maximise the benefits of the 2012 Games to deliver a legacy that celebrates culture and diversity - by building an active and inclusive community;

3. To maximise the opportunities from the 2012 Games to deliver a legacy of improved health and well-being - where individuals and communities take more responsibility for improving their own health and well-being;

4. To inspire and encourage participation and engagement of all our young people for the 2012 Games - in order to raise aspirations, develop self esteem and confidence;

5. To maximise the Games delivery process to develop a thriving economic legacy - where all people share in the growing prosperity; and

6. To act as a strategic influencer across the 2012 delivery programme - in order to join up and promote partnerships across Newham, London, the UK and Globally.

**Building Schools for the Future Business Case**

2.5.13 Newham’s BSF programme provides an opportunity of providing an educational provision for young people in Newham to enable them to realise their fullest potential and achieve high standards of attainment and qualification.

2.5.14 The programme provides a unique opportunity to accelerate the delivery of current targets and to enable move stretching targets for transformational change to be set and realised. BSF investment provides Newham with a unique opportunity to achieve a transformation of secondary education, tackling issues historically faced by schools in the borough including inadequate, inappropriate or insufficient facilities and resources.

2.5.15 The Building Schools for the Future Programme was programmed to take place over a 7 year period to finance the rebuilding and refurbishment of Secondary Schools in the Borough. Brampton, Rokeby, Eastlea, Lister, Royal Docks (Phase 1), Langdon, Forest Gate and Sarah Bonnell schools are being rebuilt as part of Wave 1 BSF programme. However, funding for Wave 5 is likely to be cut significantly in light of the Comprehensive Spending Review in October 2010.

2.5.16 However recent political announcement has thrown uncertainty into the future of the schools scheduled for Phase 2 and their delivery in now uncertain. The schools scheduled for Phase 1 are set out in Appendix A.

2.5.17 Schools that will not be subject to new build or complete reconstruction are likely to undergo major refurbishment works including investment in sports pitches and other leisure related facilities. This offers the opportunity for
the Council to seek to arrange partnerships with schools in which secured community usage of the facilities can be arranged. Where deficiencies in open space in the Borough are identified these types of spaces can provide the makeup for any shortfalls.

2.6 CONCLUSION

2.6.1 This open space assessment is compliant and consistent with planning guidance and other supporting guidance at the local, regional and national level.

2.6.2 The assessment of policy takes into account government thinking on sustainability and the important role open space plays in the quality of life of residents.

2.6.3 It recognises that most open space, with good planning and management can perform multiple functions and provide a variety of benefits which cut across the Council’s strategic priorities. An Open Space Study is vital to bring all those who are responsible and have an interest together with a common purpose and a shared understanding of what can be done to enhance and maintain green space for the future, and this assessment of all open space builds upon existing evidence and policy relating to open space and park provision within the Borough.
3. LOCAL OPEN SPACE NEEDS ASSESSMENT

3.1 INTRODUCTION

3.1.1 What is open space, and how do people use it? It is useful to break down open spaces into typologies based upon their primary purpose or function, so as to be better able to make future provision for it. PPG17 summarises these as follows:

- Parks and gardens, used for informal recreation;
- Natural and semi-natural greenspace, the main use of which is biodiversity and wildlife conservation;
- Green corridors, used for walking and cycling;
- Outdoor sports facilities;
- Amenity greenspace;
- Provision for children and young people;
- Allotments and community gardens; and
- Cemeteries and disused churchyards.

3.1.2 This study seeks to establish the need for open space, with key parameters being accessibility, quality and quantity.

- Accessibility: how far can people be expected to go to get to an open space? Some spaces, such as country parks, will draw people from a large area, while others, such as children’s play areas, will have a very small catchment;
- Quality: if an open space is uninviting, e.g. due to lack of facilities, it will have limited use; and
- Quantity: if there are not enough open spaces, those which are available may suffer from over-use.

3.2 METHODOLOGY

3.2.1 To establish the need for open space in Newham a three-strand study was undertaken. This consisted of:

- A postal survey of residents using the LB Newham annual Parks Survey;
- An analysis of a socio-economic profile of the Borough which aimed to establish how use of and attitudes towards open spaces and sports facilities differ according to age, gender and ethnicity; and
Other surveys / data including those from allotment users and waiting lists and schools.

**Park Survey**

3.2.2 The Newham Annual Parks Survey was carried out in 2005 and although results from a further survey were not able to be incorporated in time for this report, such surveys will be undertaken in the future to assist in informing the final strategy.

3.2.3 Newham residents were asked a range of questions about 39 parks and open spaces in the Borough including:

- How often do you use this park/open space;
- How do you get to this park/open space; and
- How much time do you normally spend in this park/open space.

3.2.4 The Survey identified that 56% of the 583 survey respondents use Newham parks and open spaces, 31% do not and the remaining 13% of people do not use any parks.

3.2.5 The survey found that those people who use parks and open spaces do so in different ways, seek different experiences and have differing expectations of the features and facilities that should be provided. The principle reasons stated by local residents for visiting parks and open spaces include;

- to take children to play (49%);
- to relax (35%); and
- to exercise (37%); and
- other significant reasons stated included to see events, family outings, to play sport and to take a shortcut.

3.2.6 82% of survey respondents use their closest park and 80% access parks and open spaces on foot indicating a localised pattern of use. 96% of respondents stated that ease of getting to or accessing parks was satisfactory.

3.2.7 In terms of satisfaction with Parks and open spaces, 87% of respondents were happy with the cleanliness of their parks / open spaces whilst 86% were happy with the general appearance of the parks. In terms of park facilities 78% of respondents were happy with flowers and shrubs at their parks and 79% were happy with play areas within the parks but just 19% were satisfied with the toilet facilities in parks and open spaces indicating a need for improvement in this area.
3.2.8 In terms of quality of life 65% of respondents stated that they used parks and open spaces for relaxation whilst 51% used them for health and wellbeing. 32% of respondents indicated that they used parks for sporting activities. 52% of respondents used the park for play.

3.2.9 Five main reasons for not visiting our parks and open spaces were offered by respondents;

- Lack of, or poor condition of, facilities;
- Fear of crime and anti-social behaviour;
- Concerns about dogs and dog fouling;
- Age or disability; and
- Lack of leisure time.

3.2.10 The survey highlighted several key areas for improvement including:

- Improved play provision, including paddling pools;
- Improved provision of café’s and kiosks;
- Increased attendance, patrolling and the use of CCTV;
- Wider range of events, particularly for young people and families;
- Improved landscape quality;
- Improved sports and exercise facilities; and
- Improved toilet provision and better maintenance of existing toilet facilities.

3.2.11 The survey also noted some difference in the means of getting to parks. The survey indicates that those who use the Borough’s 3 District parks were marginally more likely to travel to the sites by car as opposed to those who used more locally based parks. This suggests a wider catchment area for these District Parks. 15% of those surveyed said they travel by car to West Ham Park as opposed to the more local Brampton Park for example where none of those surveyed travelled by car, preferring to walk (100% of respondents).

3.2.12 The Council’s Annual Liveability Survey now incorporates questions relating to non-use of open spaces. This will report in November 2010 and will be incorporated into the Council’s corporate Open Space Strategy.
3.3 Socio-Economic Characterisation of Newham

Demographic Profile

3.3.1 The age profile of a Borough directly influences open space usage, especially related to participation in sport. Table 3-1 below illustrates the demographic profile of the Borough in comparison to regional and national averages.

3.3.2 The 2001 census estimated that there were 243,891 people in Newham. Mid-year population estimates from the Office of National Statistics (ONS) have estimated that there are 247,600 people in the Borough in 2009 indicating a 1% increase since 2001. The 2001 census figures have been used in the assessment undertaken in this study.

3.3.3 Alternative population estimates from the Great London Authority (GLA) do however suggest a figure of 268,459 based on detailed information on new housing developments and future immigration/emigration. Each figure is likely to be subject to some error due to the non consideration of new developments and immigration (ONS figures) and overestimation due to the fact that the impact of the recession may not have been taken into account (GLA).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Range</th>
<th>Newham</th>
<th>London</th>
<th>England</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>8.53</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>5.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-7</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>3.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-9</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>2.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14</td>
<td>7.91</td>
<td>6.07</td>
<td>6.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-17</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>2.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-19</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>6.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>9.32</td>
<td>9.65</td>
<td>6.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-44</td>
<td>24.51</td>
<td>25.67</td>
<td>22.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-59</td>
<td>13.08</td>
<td>16.05</td>
<td>18.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-64</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>4.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The table above indicates that over a quarter of the population of Newham is under the age of 16, typical frequent users of parks and open spaces. Newham has proportionally more children aged 0-10 than the England average, and a higher proportion of population aged 25-39 than the England average. 25% of the population is over the age of 45 as opposed to the London wide figure of almost 40%. This indicates that within the Borough there is a high potential of park/open space users below the age of 45 as opposed to London and England as a whole.

In terms of population projections GLA projections suggest there will be a rapid rate of population growth with an expected growth of 20% in the next 5 years. GLA projects the population to increase to 328,343 by 2016 and to 345,516 by 2021. The ONS however does not project major changes in the population of Newham. GLA population projections have been used to assess future open space requirements for the Borough.

**Ethnicity**

The 2001 census shows that Newham has the largest proportion of non-white ethnic groups in the country. Almost two-thirds (61 per cent) of Newham’s population are people from ethnic minority communities.

Newham has the second highest percentage of Asians in England and Wales, with the second highest percentage of Bangladeshis. It also has the second highest percentage of Black Africans. However, there is considerable variation in the distribution of ethnic groups across the Borough.

Recent population flows include an unquantifiable number of people from Eastern European countries. More foreign nationals register for work in Newham than any other Borough in the UK. In 2007/8 out of 20,500 such registrations, 15% were from India, 14% Polish, 11% Romanian, 9% Lithuanian, 7% Bangladeshi and 4% were Bulgarian.

Research has indicated that ethnicity influences sport participation levels and people from black and ethnic minority communities are less likely to participate in sport related activities than white people. A recent study commissioned by Sport England examined the key trends in sports participation.
participation in England and placed them in the broader context of social and demographic change. The study found that a number of ethnic minority groups have lower participation rates than the national average of 46% taking part on at least one occasion in the previous 4 weeks. Thirty nine percent of the Black Caribbean and Indian populations take part in sport at this level of frequency while even smaller proportions of Pakistanis (31%) and Bangladeshis (30%) do so.

3.3.10 The Department for Culture, Media and Sport, during the period 05/06 – 07/08, had a target to increase participation in cultural and sporting opportunities by 3 per cent amongst ‘priority groups’ – women; people from black and minority ethnic communities; people with a limiting disability; and those in lower socio-economic groups. The Department did not meet its overall target for participation in culture or sport or the two sub-targets for sport: weekly participation in ‘moderate intensity sport’ amongst priority groups increased by between 0.1 per cent and 1.8 per cent; monthly participation in ‘active sport’ decreased in all but one of the priority groups, and participation by women, the largest group, fell by 1.6 per cent. The Department now has a Public Service Agreement target to increase the number of adults who participate in two or more different cultural or sport sectors by 2 per cent by March 2011.

Socio-economic characteristics

3.3.11 Research into reasons given for sports participation and non-participation was undertaken by Mintel and published in the report ‘Sports Participation’ (May 2000). The Mintel report indicated that areas with a high proportion of individuals working in the service sector are likely to display higher levels of participation in sport. This is due to the fact that such individuals are likely to compensate for the relatively less physically demanding nature of their occupations by actively engaging in leisure based activities.

3.3.12 There is a sharp difference in those engaged in higher professional occupations and higher managerial occupations in Newham as opposed to London as a whole and wider England. Newham also has higher levels of persons employed in semi routine occupations than the London and National average. The percentage of those who have never worked within the Borough far exceeds the London and National figures.
### Socio-economic classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Socio-economic classification</th>
<th>Newham</th>
<th>London</th>
<th>England</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Large employers and higher managerial occupations</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher professional occupations</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>7.67</td>
<td>5.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower managerial and professional occupations</td>
<td>14.61</td>
<td>22.23</td>
<td>18.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate occupations</td>
<td>9.05</td>
<td>10.24</td>
<td>9.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small employers and own account workers</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower supervisory and technical occupations</td>
<td>5.65</td>
<td>4.99</td>
<td>7.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-routine occupations</td>
<td>12.22</td>
<td>9.04</td>
<td>11.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Routine occupations</td>
<td>7.88</td>
<td>5.79</td>
<td>9.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never worked</td>
<td>11.37</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>2.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-term unemployed</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time students</td>
<td>12.84</td>
<td>9.03</td>
<td>7.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not classifiable for other reasons</td>
<td>14.25</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>17.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3-2 Socio-economic classification

#### Working Hours

3.3.13 Those in employment sometimes have difficulties in accessing recreational opportunities due to a lack of time rather than financial resources. The increasing demands that are being placed on individuals both from the workplace and from within the family have gradually eroded the amount of time that is available to participate in leisure activities. For many, further issues arise from the fact that an opportunity to participate in a leisure activity may not necessarily coincide with an individual’s working hours, thereby preventing participation. Both of these factors play a crucial role in determining the leisure activities that an individual or family is likely to participate.
3.3.14 It should also be noted that parks open dawn to dusk which creates access issues in the winter for working people.

3.3.15 Table 3-3 below shows the working hours of employees in Newham. The figures indicate that men are almost twice as likely to work longer than 38 hours than females with 23,792 males stating this as opposed to 12,158 females. Just over four times as many males stated that they worked 49 hours or more as opposed to females.

3.3.16 Research has indicated that there has traditionally been a significant gender difference between men and women with men more likely to participate in sport than woman. A recent study “The family factor in sport” (Kay, 2004) recognises that work hours tend to be longest at the two extremes of the scale – among high status professional/managerial workers vulnerable to the ‘long work hours’ culture, and among low-paid workers who may work additional hours out of financial necessity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hours Worked</th>
<th>Newham</th>
<th>London</th>
<th>England</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All males aged 16-74 in employment</td>
<td>48718</td>
<td>1775020</td>
<td>12155166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males aged 16-74 in employment working (hours a week): Part-time: 1-5</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>8965</td>
<td>62475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males aged 16-74 in employment working (hours a week): Part-time: 6-15</td>
<td>1784</td>
<td>55968</td>
<td>359106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males aged 16-74 in employment working (hours a week): Full-time: 31-37</td>
<td>9189</td>
<td>265411</td>
<td>1790321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males aged 16-74 in employment working (hours a week): Full-time: 38-48</td>
<td>23792</td>
<td>879574</td>
<td>6250252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males aged 16-74 in employment working (hours a week): Full-time: 38-48</td>
<td>48.84</td>
<td>49.55</td>
<td>51.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males aged 16-74 in employment working (hours a week): Full-time: 49 or more</td>
<td>8048</td>
<td>437494</td>
<td>2942771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males aged 16-74 in employment working (hours a week): Full-time: 49 or more</td>
<td>16.52</td>
<td>24.65</td>
<td>24.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All females aged 16-74 in employment</strong></td>
<td>37710</td>
<td>1544114</td>
<td>10286332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females aged 16-74 in employment working (hours a week): Part-time: 1-5</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>19542</td>
<td>192479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females aged 16-74 in employment working (hours a week): Part-time: 1-5</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>1.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females aged 16-74 in employment working (hours a week): Part-time: 6-15</td>
<td>3190</td>
<td>139874</td>
<td>1252151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females aged 16-74 in employment working (hours a week): Part-time: 6-15</td>
<td>8.46</td>
<td>9.06</td>
<td>12.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females aged 16-74 in employment working (hours a week): Part-time: 16-30</td>
<td>7420</td>
<td>315384</td>
<td>2914758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females aged 16-74 in employment working (hours a week): Part-time: 16-30</td>
<td>19.68</td>
<td>20.42</td>
<td>28.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females aged 16-74 in employment working (hours a week): Full-time: 31-37</td>
<td>12252</td>
<td>369560</td>
<td>2285236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females aged 16-74 in employment working (hours a week): Full-time: 31-37</td>
<td>32.49</td>
<td>23.93</td>
<td>22.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females aged 16-74 in employment working (hours a week): Full-time: 38-48</td>
<td>12158</td>
<td>549053</td>
<td>2930722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females aged 16-74 in employment working (hours a week): Full-time: 38-48</td>
<td>32.24</td>
<td>35.56</td>
<td>28.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females aged 16-74 in employment working (hours a week): Full-time: 49 or more</td>
<td>2307</td>
<td>150701</td>
<td>710986</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3 Local Open Space Needs Assessment

### Females aged 16-74 in employment working (hours a week): Full-time: 49 or more

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.12</td>
<td>9.76</td>
<td>6.91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Average (mean) hours worked: Male**

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39.52</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>42.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Average (mean) hours worked: Female**

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33.67</td>
<td>34.31</td>
<td>31.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3-3 Working Hours

3.3.17 Although these longer working hours may tend to suppress the ability to participate in sport leisure and recreation amongst high earners, long working hours traditionally attributed to high professional/managerial occupations and generally middle/high income households are best resourced for sports participation, have high levels of car ownership; the parents themselves are likely to be current or former sports participants, and the family as a whole commonly values sport (Kay, 2004). Therefore these members of society have relevance to sport policymakers as they will affect high participation sectors of the population.

**Lifestyles and Participation**

3.3.18 The Mintel report findings suggest that although age and gender explain a significant proportion of the variation in sports participation amongst adults, the life stage of individuals is also significant. Participation is influenced by individuals’ family status and occupational group – for example levels are highest amongst those who are employed and not married.

3.3.19 With recent demographic trends indicating an ageing population this had served to result in an increase in the level of non-participation amongst the population as a whole. 8% of the population in Newham is over the age of 65 where participation levels would be typically low. In contrast however the London figure indicates 12% of the population is over the age of 65 and almost 16% at the national level. This indicates that there is an overall younger population within the Borough which may place pressure on the quantity of parks and open spaces which are used for recreation.

**Car ownership Levels**

3.3.20 Car ownership levels influence the extent to which residents can access leisure facilities and open spaces which are beyond walking distance. Newham has a significantly higher percentage of households who do not have access to a car when compared against the London and National average. This will impact upon the levels of people visiting open spaces in the Borough. Overall, car ownership levels in the borough are lower than the London and national average with 41% of households owning one car.
3.3.21 Those persons having access to a car are less likely to undertake a journey by foot than those living in area with lower car ownership levels. They may also be less likely to undertake exercise. However, high car ownership levels can result in high sports participation levels as leisure facilities become more accessible. In Newham however, the levels of persons not having access to a car outnumbers those with a car therefore it can be assumed that participation in sports has the potential to be lower than in those areas with elevated levels of car ownership.

3.3.22 Those living outside the catchment areas of parks or open spaces and not having access to a car are likely to struggle accessing parks and therefore in participating in sporting activities.

**Housing Type**

3.3.23 Housing type provides an indication of access to private open space in the form of gardens or yards with larger houses likely to have better access. Table 3-4 highlights those wards with the highest proportion of smaller properties in the Borough.

3.3.24 The table indicates that a high proportion of the population of Newham are living in smaller properties e.g. terraced housing or purpose built flats. This would indicate that access to private open space is likely to be a significant problem for these households. In Canning Town South just over 90% of households in the borough consist of smaller properties with over half the population living in flats.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward Name</th>
<th>Total dwellings</th>
<th>% Terrace</th>
<th>Purpose built flats</th>
<th>%Part of Converted</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Green Street East</td>
<td>4037</td>
<td>58.06</td>
<td>14.33</td>
<td>10.41</td>
<td>82.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Ham North</td>
<td>3409</td>
<td>57.42</td>
<td>17.75</td>
<td>10.25</td>
<td>85.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Street West</td>
<td>3824</td>
<td>52.55</td>
<td>13.54</td>
<td>15.77</td>
<td>81.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manor Park</td>
<td>4301</td>
<td>47.32</td>
<td>26.45</td>
<td>11.56</td>
<td>85.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Ilford</td>
<td>4824</td>
<td>45.28</td>
<td>31.23</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>86.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wall End</td>
<td>4294</td>
<td>56.67</td>
<td>19.21</td>
<td>6.32</td>
<td>82.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Ham Central</td>
<td>4178</td>
<td>56.84</td>
<td>18.89</td>
<td>9.11</td>
<td>84.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Gate South</td>
<td>5237</td>
<td>35.13</td>
<td>26.52</td>
<td>21.69</td>
<td>83.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plaistow North</td>
<td>5129</td>
<td>38.51</td>
<td>37.92</td>
<td>11.96</td>
<td>88.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boleyn</td>
<td>4605</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>27.04</td>
<td>6.88</td>
<td>87.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Gate North</td>
<td>5105</td>
<td>46.57</td>
<td>28.49</td>
<td>12.27</td>
<td>87.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Ham</td>
<td>5072</td>
<td>43.29</td>
<td>40.17</td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td>88.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stratford and New Town</td>
<td>5529</td>
<td>34.95</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>6.91</td>
<td>89.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beckton</td>
<td>5117</td>
<td>40.89</td>
<td>30.06</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>76.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plaistow South</td>
<td>4714</td>
<td>61.53</td>
<td>18.75</td>
<td>5.45</td>
<td>85.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canning Town North</td>
<td>5096</td>
<td>34.63</td>
<td>48.14</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>87.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Ham South</td>
<td>5041</td>
<td>51.9</td>
<td>31.22</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>87.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Custom House</td>
<td>4753</td>
<td>41.52</td>
<td>32.22</td>
<td>5.53</td>
<td>79.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canning Town South</td>
<td>4799</td>
<td>31.64</td>
<td>50.14</td>
<td>8.41</td>
<td>90.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Docks</td>
<td>2761</td>
<td>27.69</td>
<td>56.63</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>89.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3-4 Housing Type

Open Space Needs Indicators and Baseline

3.3.25 Two other sets of indicators which might have a bearing on demand for open space within the Borough were looked at. These are:

- Child densities; and
- Health.

3.3.26 These indicators were mapped, to see whether special attention should be paid to particular areas. [Refer to Figures 2 and 3 on Page 36].

Child Densities

3.3.27 The percentage of the population under 16 years of age provides an indication of the need for children’s play and young people’s leisure provision within the Borough. Table 3-5 below illustrates child densities for each Ward in LB Newham.

3.3.28 The table indicates that in most of the wards in Newham over one quarter of the total ward population is made up of children aged 15 or under. This highlights the need to provide sufficient areas of recreation for younger children and teenagers.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>Total Ward</th>
<th>Children 15 and under</th>
<th>Children 0-15 as a % of ward</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Green Street East</td>
<td>13212</td>
<td>3786</td>
<td>28.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Ham North</td>
<td>11381</td>
<td>3130</td>
<td>27.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Street West</td>
<td>12860</td>
<td>3574</td>
<td>27.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manor Park</td>
<td>12103</td>
<td>3115</td>
<td>25.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Ilford</td>
<td>13329</td>
<td>3827</td>
<td>28.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wall End</td>
<td>12392</td>
<td>3560</td>
<td>28.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Ham Central</td>
<td>12162</td>
<td>3127</td>
<td>25.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Gate South</td>
<td>13929</td>
<td>3378</td>
<td>24.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plaistow North</td>
<td>13236</td>
<td>3584</td>
<td>27.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boleyn</td>
<td>12289</td>
<td>3219</td>
<td>26.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Gate North</td>
<td>12634</td>
<td>3134</td>
<td>24.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Ham</td>
<td>12637</td>
<td>3090</td>
<td>24.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stratford and New Town</td>
<td>12378</td>
<td>2911</td>
<td>23.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beckton</td>
<td>13112</td>
<td>3533</td>
<td>26.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plaistow South</td>
<td>11832</td>
<td>2868</td>
<td>24.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canning Town North</td>
<td>12061</td>
<td>3108</td>
<td>25.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Ham South</td>
<td>12465</td>
<td>3273</td>
<td>26.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Custom House</td>
<td>11875</td>
<td>3149</td>
<td>26.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canning Town South</td>
<td>11278</td>
<td>2975</td>
<td>26.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Docks</td>
<td>6186</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>24.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>London</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,172,091</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,448,236</strong></td>
<td><strong>20.19</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>England</strong></td>
<td><strong>49,138,831</strong></td>
<td><strong>9,901,581</strong></td>
<td><strong>20.15</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3-5 Child Density

Health

3.3.29 The general health of those residing in the locality can be an important factor influencing sporting participation rates.

3.3.30 For the period (2001-2003), Newham’s life expectancy for men is 2.5 years lower than the same figure for England. Focusing on women in the same period, Newham’s life expectancy is 1.8 years below the England figure.

3.3.31 Mortality rates in young people and adults (15 to 64 years) in Newham are higher than in London and England. The rates are slowly reducing year-on-year, but neither the gap with London nor England is narrowing. Infant mortality in Newham is higher than in London or England.

3.3.32 The table below indicates the wards within the Borough which exhibit the highest proportion of people of “not good health”.
### 3-6 General Health of the Borough

3.3.33 The figures in table 3-6 above indicate that in terms of the percentage of persons in each Ward in Newham there is no major difference in those stating that they were in Good Health when compared with the London and National figures. This is also true of those who stated that they were in fairly good health. However when the figures for those who consider themselves to be in poor health are compared with the London and national figures it is clear that in a number of wards the number of people Not in good health exceeds London and National averages. In Canning...
Town North and South 12.6% of the population in the ward considered themselves to be in bad health as opposed to the London figure of 8.28% and 9.03% nationally.

3.3.34 The levels of the population in Newham who consider themselves to be in “not good health” will have a direct impact on sports participation levels. The figure is likely to be made up of a combination of elderly persons and those who are considered ill over a significant period of time. This figure may include persons who are temporarily not in good health so participation in sport in the future is a possibility.

3.3.35 It is recognised that lower socio-economic groups consistently have lower health status than the rest of the population and these groups also have the lowest levels of sport participation. Evidence also suggests that those in these groups who do take part in sport have higher health status indicators than those in higher socio-economic group who do not participate in sporting activities (Gratton, 2004). Therefore it is clear that future policy makers ensure that participation in sport is concentrated in the informal, non competitive or semi competitive area of sport as this is likely to yield the highest health benefits from those groups suffering from lack of participation including lower socio-economic groups, older age groups etc.

3.3.36 The distribution of both age and health indicators outlined above has been mapped, and can be seen on Figures 2 and 3. They show:

- Areas with child densities significantly above the National average (> % of the population aged 0-15) Figure 2; and
- Areas where the percentage of the population not in good health is greater than the national average (9.03%) Figure 3.

3.3.37 Although these maps provide a good indication of these socio economic indicators the finer level of detail provided at Super Output Area level may provide a more detailed analysis of needs in the Borough. This level of information however was unavailable for consultation as part of this study.
Figure 2 Child Densities

Figure 3 Population not in Good Health
3.4 Conclusions

3.4.1 Two of the main issues identified in the socio-economic assessment of the Borough in relation to open space are access to open space and participation in sport and other physical activity.

Participation

3.4.2 There are a variety of socio-economic factors which influence the Borough’s open space needs and levels of participation among residents. The age profile of Newham shows that over a quarter of the population are under the age of 16 which is an indication of the need for a variety of open and recreation spaces for younger children as well as teenagers. With some future population projections suggesting a rapid rate of growth in the borough in the coming years it is vital that improvements in the quality and range of landscapes and facilities in Newham’s parks and open space is delivered.

3.4.3 A number of factors have been identified which influence the levels of participation in physical activity in the Borough. Research has indicated that ethnicity influences sport participation levels and people from black and ethnic minority communities are less likely to engage in sport related activities. This is particularly relevant for Newham as the Borough has the largest proportion of non-white ethnic groups in the country. This is likely to influence the number of persons partaking in sporting activities in the Borough. Another indicator for participation rates is lifestyles and working hours. Those in employment where increasing demands on working hours are occurring are likely to have difficulties in accessing sporting opportunities.

Access

3.4.4 Access to open space is an important issue for Newham. It has been identified that car ownership levels influence the extent to which residents can access open space and leisure and recreation facilities. Car ownership levels in Newham are lower than the London and national averages which is indicative of the problem faced by residents of the Borough in accessing open space and recreation facilities apart from their own local park. This highlights the need to improve the quality and accessibility of local open space.

3.4.5 Additionally it has been shown that housing type provides an indication of access to private open space with smaller properties suffering from a lack of access to private open spaces. This is true of Newham where high proportions of the Borough consist of flats or terraced housing which indicates that access to these open spaces is likely to be a significant problem.
3.4.6 The population’s health is also a good indicator for those who are likely to be able to participate in sporting activities. In Newham the number of persons indicating that they were “not in good health” exceeds the London and National averages. This means that they are less likely to participate in sporting activities or indeed access areas of open space and recreation.
4. SURVEY OF OPEN SPACE PROVISION

4.1 INTRODUCTION

4.1.1 PPG17 advises local authorities to draw up their own standards for open space, sports and recreation provision for inclusion within their Local Plans. These standards should be based upon a locally based assessment of open space needs.

4.2 APPROACHES TO PLANNING OPEN SPACE PROVISION

4.2.1 PPG17 recommends that any assessment takes into account:

- The overall level of supply, including the degree to which provision meets needs from beyond the local authority boundary;
- The accessibility of locations;
- The level of usage of facilities;
- The particular functions which certain facilities may perform, for example as a meeting place for one age group or community;
- The potential for a recreational use to contribute to wider social or regeneration objectives for Newham;
- The potential for new use, for example by achieving dual use of a facility or by bringing a private open space into public use; and
- The potential to focus improved recreational provision of a particular site, in preference to lower level use of less accessible locations.

4.2.2 The two main approaches traditionally used to assess open space needs are the National Playing Fields Association (NPFA) six acre standard and use of an open space hierarchy.

4.2.3 The NPFA standard relates playing space provision to population and recommends that there should be a minimum of 6 acres (2.43 hectares) of outdoor playing/recreational space per 1000 people. The standard recommends that the 6 acre provision is broken down to take account of the different needs of different age groups. This standard can be easily applied but takes little account of the distribution of open space and people’s access to it. In the urban context where the quantum of open space is necessarily limited.

4.2.4 Recreational roles can be either active/formal e.g. organised sports, or passive/informal e.g. dog walking. The activity may have dedicated provision e.g. sports pitches, or informal provision where there are no
formal facilities but other evidence suggests an activity takes place. Non-
recreational roles include the ecological, educational, social, cultural and
amenity roles that an open space might play.

4.2.5 The Government’s companion guide to PPG17 ‘Assessing Needs and
Opportunities’ (2002) recommends that the hierarchy approach can provide
the basis to develop local standards as it identifies characteristics, size
and effective catchment of different types of open spaces.

4.2.6 However, it is recommended that local authorities develop their own open
space typologies to reflect local characteristics and facilities and the
recreational and non-recreational functions of open spaces. An
understanding of the types of open space will provide a basis for analysing
the results of the site audits and enable an assessment of whether the
range and types of open space functions in the local area meet the needs
of local people.

Survey Methodology

4.2.7 A qualitative and quantitative survey of public, private and educational
open spaces was undertaken by LB Newham over a period of time ranging
from 2000-2009. In order to update the initial database of sites a green
spaces workshop was held with officers of the Council including Planning
and Leisure Divisions on 20 November 2009 enabling updates and
corrections to the database to be verified.

Data Sources

4.2.8 Open space sites within the District were identified from the following
information sources:

- A review of the Council’s adopted Local Plan proposals map;
- The Council’s ground maintenance contract database;
- A desk top assessment of Ordnance Survey mapping and other
  mapping services; and
- Existing GIS datasets supplied by LB Newham.

Open Space Typology

4.2.9 The existing database provided by LB Newham Parks Department
provided a comprehensive list of sites and their function. Nevertheless
during the review of the site assessment work, each open space was
considered and where necessary reclassified with reference to the
typology of open space types included within the Annex to PPG17. The
identification of the open space type was based upon consideration of the
size, the primary role and function, recreational value, access
arrangements and physical characteristics. The other roles performed by
spaces are considered in Chapters 5-8. The categories of open space
were reviewed against the following categories identified within the London plan and PPG17, identified in Table 4.1.

**Parks**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park Typologies</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Size guidelines</th>
<th>Distances from home</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regional Parks</td>
<td>Large areas, corridors or networks of open space the majority of which will be publicly accessible and provide a range of facilities offering recreational, ecological, landscape, cultural or green infrastructure benefits. Offer a combination of facilities and features that are unique within London are readily accessible by public transport and are managed to meet best practice quality standards.</td>
<td>400ha</td>
<td>3.2 - 8km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan parks</td>
<td>Large areas of open space that provide a similar range of benefits to regional parks and offer a combination of facilities and features at the sub-regional level, are readily accessible by public transport and are managed to meet best practice quality standards.</td>
<td>60ha</td>
<td>3.2km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Parks</td>
<td>Large areas of open space that provide a landscape setting with a variety of natural features providing for a wide range of activities including outdoor sports facilities and playing fields, children's play for different age groups and informal recreation pursuits.</td>
<td>20ha</td>
<td>1.2km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Parks and open spaces</td>
<td>Providing for court games, children’s play spaces or other areas of a specialist nature, including nature conservation areas</td>
<td>2ha</td>
<td>400m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small open spaces</td>
<td>Gardens, sitting out areas, children’s play spaces or other areas of a specialist nature, including nature conservation areas</td>
<td>Under 2 ha</td>
<td>Less than 400metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pocket Parks</td>
<td>Small areas of open space that provide natural surfaces and shaded areas for informal play and passive recreation and that sometimes have seating and play equipment</td>
<td>Under 0.4ha</td>
<td>Less than 400metres</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Linear Open spaces

| Open spaces and towpaths alongside the Thames, canals and other waterways, paths, disused railways, nature conservation areas, and other routes that provide opportunities for informal recreation. Often characterised by features or attractive areas that are not fully accessible to the public but contribute to the enjoyment of the space | Variable | Wherever feasible |

#### 4-1 Park Typologies

4.2.10 In order to identify shortfalls and investment requirements for the Borough, the re-categorisation of parks in this study has identified the following PPG17 typologies within the Borough.

- District Parks;
- Local Parks;
- Small open space (Neighbourhood Greens); and
- Pocket parks.

#### Other open spaces

4.2.11 Using the existing and updated database it has also been possible to identify all open spaces within the local authority area regardless of ownership and the extent of public access, except private gardens. Given the relatively dense urban character of the London Borough of Newham, and the fact that small sites are likely to be valuable locally, a minimum size threshold of each typology has not been used and in a number of occasions even relatively small sites have been included in the assessment. The typologies of other open spaces are listed in Table 4.2 below.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Typology (Other open spaces)</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provision for children and teenagers (incorporated into public park hierarchy);</td>
<td>including play areas, skateboard parks and outdoor basketball hoops, and other more informal areas (for example, hanging out areas, teenage shelters)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear open spaces;</td>
<td>including river and canal banks, cycleways and rights of way. other routes which provide opportunities for informal recreation, including nature conservation. They are often characterised by features or attractive areas which are not fully accessible to the public but contribute to the enjoyment of the space. They play a vital role in linking open space. They should not be taken for granted, though it is not appropriate to try to define a standard for them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural or Semi-Natural greenspace;</td>
<td>including woodlands, urban forestry, scrub, grasslands (for example, downlands, commons and meadows), wetlands, open and running water, wastelands, and derelict open land and rock areas (for example, cliffs, quarries and pits).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Spaces within grounds of institutions;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amenity Green Space;</td>
<td>(most commonly but not exclusively in housing areas) including informal recreation spaces, green spaces in and around housing, domestic gardens and village greens.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allotments;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cemeteries and churchyards;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Spaces/Pedestrianised areas;</td>
<td>including civic and market squares, and other hard-surfaced areas designed for pedestrians.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Sports Facilities / Playing Fields</td>
<td>(with natural or artificial surfaces and either publicly or privately owned) – including tennis courts, bowling greens, sports pitches, golf courses, athletics tracks and school and</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4-2 Other Open Space Typologies (PPG17)

4.2.12 A public park hierarchy has been defined in order to set out appropriate levels of parks provision for different typologies within the Borough. The hierarchy is based upon the following factors:

- Analysis of the existing range and type of open space provision available within individual settlements;
- Analysis of the typical sizes of different park types within the Borough; and
- Identification of effective catchment areas for each park type based upon the findings of the residents survey which identified park usage and travel patterns to different open space types.

4.2.13 The hierarchy is defined in Table 4.1. The term ‘Public Parks’ used within this assessment refers to the types of open space identified in Table 4.1.

4.2.14 Parks were classified according to the most appropriate park category based upon their role, size and range of facilities. The size criteria represent a guide to the typical size of parks within each category. In a small number of cases there are a number of open spaces on the margins between different categories. Where a park does not fulfil the size thresholds defined in a particular park type but performs the range of functions identified as being associated with that park type, the park has been classified on the basis of its range of functions.

**Park Catchment Areas**

4.2.15 Consultation has identified the concerns and needs of local residents, their reasons for visiting parks and the barriers that can prevent them from accessing the benefits of our parks and open spaces. The Annual Parks Survey between 2002 and 2005 highlighted several key issues that have helped determine catchment areas:

- 82% of survey respondents use their closest park; and
- 80% access parks and open spaces on foot indicating a local pattern of use.

4.2.16 A review of distance parameters was undertaken to ensure that factors influencing walking time/distances on a Borough wide basis such as topography, street morphology, and urban grain and the distribution of open space provision and its relationship with patterns of residential development were taken into account. The catchment area and population for each individual park will therefore be different even within the same level of the hierarchy.
4.2.17 The distances identified below relate to the typical effective catchment area of each park type. The effective catchment area represents the area within which around 80% of park users are likely to be drawn. The catchment definition assumes that 400 metres is the equivalent of a five minute walk, 800 metres is a ten minute walk etc.

4.2.18 The overall number and frequency of visits is influenced by factors including:

- The range of facilities and environments within the park and their quality and condition affect the attractiveness of the space to potential users. Parks with a wider range of facilities may have larger catchments than shown in Table 4.1. The number and frequency of visits is also likely to be higher;
- The demographic and socio-economic structure of the population in the catchment and the extent to which park facilities meet their needs;
- The pattern of land use within the park catchment particularly patterns of residential development and population density; and
- Choice of other open space nearby.

4.2.19 For the purposes of consistency and cross-boundary thinking the GLA hierarchy has been used as the basis for public park classification within the study (Table 4-1). While not included as part of the survey (and therefore the assessment of supply in Section 5), it should be noted that the Olympic Park is likely to be completed within the time period of the Core Strategy. At 102 hectares, it would perform the function of a Metropolitan Park (see table 4.3 below).

4.2.20 Table 4-3 below provides a benchmark for the catchment distances in London and in bordering boroughs. As can be seen from the table, many boroughs rely heavily on the distances set by the GLA as they are considered appropriate for these inner London Boroughs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park Typologies</th>
<th>Size Guidelines</th>
<th>GLA Distances</th>
<th>LB Tower Hamlets</th>
<th>LB Hackney</th>
<th>LB Newham Suggested Catchment areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regional Parks</td>
<td>400ha</td>
<td>3.2 - 8km</td>
<td>3.2 - 8km</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>N/A (out of Borough only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan parks</td>
<td>60ha</td>
<td>3.2km</td>
<td>3.2km</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>N/A (out of Borough only)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4-3 Catchment Benchmarks and Recommended Standards

**Standards**

4.2.21 One of the key issues for this assessment is deciding on the most appropriate standards for an inner London Borough like Newham.

4.2.22 To understand the adequacy of overall provision, the Council compared actual provision with the National Playing Field Association Standard 2.4 hectares per 1000 population. This standard has long been used as the national benchmark for open space provision and is still used for comparison purposes. The standard was developed to quantify the amount of open land required for the sports and play needs of local communities and it therefore focuses on green space that is fully accessible to the public and that can be used for these purposes. Therefore, not all types of open space can be considered as contributing towards this type of provision.

4.2.23 Locally based standards of provision for the following categories of open space, where it is important that local needs are provided for on a consistent basis are recommended. Issues considered include quantity, accessibility/distribution, quality, value.

- Parks;
- Provision for children and teenagers;
- Outdoor sports and playing fields;
- Natural or semi-natural green space; and
- Allotments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Parks</th>
<th>20ha</th>
<th>1.2km</th>
<th>1.2km (extended by 400m close to transport corridors)</th>
<th>1.2</th>
<th>1.2km (extended by 400m close to transport corridors)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Parks and open spaces</td>
<td>2ha</td>
<td>400m</td>
<td>400m</td>
<td>400m</td>
<td>400m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small open spaces</td>
<td>Under 2 ha</td>
<td>Less than 400metres</td>
<td>Less than 400metres</td>
<td>400m</td>
<td>Less than 400m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pocket Parks</td>
<td>Under 0.4ha</td>
<td>Less than 400metres</td>
<td>Less than 400metres</td>
<td>400m</td>
<td>Less than 400m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear Open spaces</td>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Wherever feasible</td>
<td>Wherever feasible</td>
<td>Wherever feasible</td>
<td>Wherever feasible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2.24 It is not appropriate to set borough-wide standards of provision for cemeteries. The London Borough of Newham, unlike many other London boroughs, is well served, with two public and two privately run cemeteries, with approximately 10,000 burial plots remaining. Further provision within the plan period is therefore unlikely to be required.

4.2.25 Amenity green spaces were found to include a range of uses, varying from small occasional areas of green open space supporting mostly passive recreation, to open grassland featuring occasional sports activities. Only three civic spaces were identified in the Borough. As their name implies, they have less of a recreational role and are more formal urban spaces. They are not considered further in this assessment. However, the potential for new and improved civic spaces in the borough is a key concern and will be taken forward as part of a corporate Open Space Strategy.

4.2.26 The exact level and type of new open space provision should be responsive to the nature of the development and the existing level and type of open space provision.

4.2.27 Within certain areas of the Borough amenity green space and other forms of open space form an integral part of the fabric of the settlements and contribute towards local character and distinctiveness.

4.2.28 For this reason it is not appropriate to define a consistent quantity or access standards relating to such provision. Within areas with shortfalls in other forms of open space provision such other spaces can be of particular value and represent possible opportunities for meeting local deficiencies.

4.3 **CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

4.3.1 It is considered that the use of a parks hierarchy concept is the most appropriate means of planning open spaces in LB Newham. This assessment has used this approach to address the issues identified in PPG17. The hierarchy of open space has been amended to reflect local conditions and the typology of open space expanded to reflect the findings of the Users Survey and Liveability Survey the roles of different open space types and accessibility issues. In the next chapter the significance of the application of the hierarchy to existing spaces within the Borough is demonstrated.

4.3.2 It is recommended that locally based standards of provision for categories of open space such as parks, provision for children and teenagers etc. are set as it is important that local needs are provided for on a consistent basis in these areas.

4.3.3 New areas of open space should reflect the nature of new development as well as existing levels of open space and although standards relating to
amenity green space and other forms of open space are not defined it is recommended that in areas with shortfall, other forms of open space can provide a valuable opportunity to meet these deficiencies.

5. **ASSESSMENT OF SUPPLY - PARKS**

5.1 **INTRODUCTION**

5.1.1 People value parks and green spaces. Over 30 million people in England use them, making over 2 billion visits in total each year (“Green Spaces, Better Places” - final report of The Urban Green Spaces Taskforce). With about 80 percent of the population of England living in medium to large towns, the countryside and its open spaces are seen as resources with the potential to enhance quality of life.

5.1.2 This chapter examines the distribution of public parks and provision for children and teenagers within the Borough through the application of the hierarchy defined in the previous chapter. It contains the following:

- A summary of the open space audit, and the role of parks in the hierarchy;
- An analysis of the quantity and accessibility of current provision;
- A consideration of the range of functions of open space; and
- An identification of deficiencies in accessibility to parks.

5.2 **EXISTING OPEN SPACE PROVISION**

5.2.1 A summary of open space provision within the Borough by type and ward can be found in Appendix B. A total of 186 open spaces were identified within the Borough comprising a total of 476ha. Open space amounts to almost 13% of the total area of the Borough. This includes land that is currently not fully accessible by the public, but which could become more accessible with qualitative improvements.
5.2.2 Where a space lies within 2 or more wards, it has been included in the ward which includes its greatest proportion.

5.2.3 Table 5.1 illustrates that Cemeteries and Churchyards represent the largest proportion of open space in terms of area (27.36% of total open space area) and Local Parks the second largest open space area in the Borough (22.22%). In terms of number of spaces, amenity green space represents the most abundant open space type in Newham (with 74 sites).

5.3 DISTRIBUTION AND ACCESS TO OPEN SPACE

5.3.1 Distribution and access to public parks within the Borough has been considered looking at their distribution by ward/population, and distribution by distance from residential areas.

5.3.2 These findings have then been used to identify and consider the significance of shortfalls in public park provision in terms of access and quantity.

Existing Provision

5.3.3 Tables 5-1 below shows the total figures of open space in the Borough set out in respect of the PPG17 typologies and GLA Parks Hierarchy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>% of Total Open Space Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PPG17 Typologies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear Open spaces</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>41.55</td>
<td>8.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amenity Greenspace</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>42.91</td>
<td>8.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allotments</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18.34</td>
<td>3.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cemeteries and Churchyards</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>131.04</td>
<td>27.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenspaces within grounds</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural/semi natural green</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>44.94</td>
<td>9.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Open Space*</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>4.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Open Space total</strong></td>
<td>154</td>
<td>299.37</td>
<td>62.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GLA Hierarchy - Public Parks</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Park</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan park</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Park</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>68.90</td>
<td>14.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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5.3.4 Within the Borough of Newham there is 476ha of open space and an average of 1.95ha of open space provision per 1000 population (based on 2001 census data).

5.3.5 Table 5.2 below indicates that the level of public park provision varies between wards. Wards such as Beckton and Custom House, located to the south and south west of the borough, have more open space than those located within the centre of the borough. Green Street East and Green Street West suffer from a severe lack of open space with neither ward benefitting from any areas of open space. The slight variation in open space provision noted in the table below compared with the figure in 5.3.4 above is due to slight inaccuracies in population figures recorded in the Census when broken down by ward.

5.3.6 However, ward levels should be taken in the context of overall levels of open space provision and the pattern of land uses in each ward / community forum area. For example, Priory Park (a local park) falls within the Boleyn ward and is within 400m of Green Street. West Ham (District) Park lies just outside the boundary of Green Street West ward and is within 1.2km of Green Street.

5.3.7 Many of the wards fall below the average of 0.78ha of park area per 1000 population for the Borough. This is indicative of the level of park provision in the Borough. Some wards exceed the ward average a number of times over and indicate those areas which benefit from large parks or a number of parks.

5.3.8 The total open space per 1000 population falls short of the NPFA standard of 2.4ha per 1000 population however as mentioned previously not all

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Parks/ Open Space</th>
<th>22</th>
<th>106.48</th>
<th>22.22</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Including Neighbourhood Greens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pocket Parks</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Park Total</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>177.04</td>
<td>36.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Open Space</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>476ha</td>
<td>100.00 (rounded up)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Provision for Children and Outdoor Sports facilities
types of open space can be considered as contributing towards this type of provision.
### 5.2 Distribution of Public Park Open Space by Ward

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>Total Area of Public Parks (ha)</th>
<th>Total Open Space (ha)</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Public Parks per 1,000 popn.(ha)</th>
<th>Total Open Space per 1,000 popn. (ha)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Green Street East</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>13212.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Ham North</td>
<td>7.55</td>
<td>8.29</td>
<td>11381.00</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Street West</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>12860.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manor Park</td>
<td>8.18</td>
<td>37.31</td>
<td>12103.00</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>3.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Ilford</td>
<td>10.46</td>
<td>82.91</td>
<td>13329.00</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>6.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wall End</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>12392.00</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Ham Central</td>
<td>9.87</td>
<td>9.87</td>
<td>12162.00</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Gate South</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>13929.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plaistow North</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>13236.00</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boleyn</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>12289.00</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Gate North</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>15.60</td>
<td>12634.00</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Ham</td>
<td>30.73</td>
<td>37.88</td>
<td>12637.00</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stratford and New Town</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>14.95</td>
<td>12378.00</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beckton</td>
<td>7.05</td>
<td>48.79</td>
<td>13112.00</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>3.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plaistow South</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>18.84</td>
<td>11832.00</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>1.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canning Town North</td>
<td>21.54</td>
<td>38.01</td>
<td>12061.00</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Ham South</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>49.86</td>
<td>12465.00</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Custom House</td>
<td>45.63</td>
<td>61.55</td>
<td>11875.00</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>5.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canning Town South</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>5.86</td>
<td>11278.00</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Docks</td>
<td>14.29</td>
<td>17.47</td>
<td>6186.00</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>2.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>177ha</strong></td>
<td><strong>476ha</strong></td>
<td><strong>243351.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.78</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.98</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5 Assessment of Supply - Parks
Catchment populations

5.3.9 The estimated number of people within the catchment areas of different types of park was calculated by counting the number of address points within the catchment radii applicable to the type of park, and factoring it up by the average household size of 2.64. However, some parts of the borough have significantly higher than average household size. More sensitive analysis at Output Area level (smaller than electoral wards), reveals particular hotspots where Output Areas have a population density of greater than 3.5 persons per household, including East Ham, Manor Park and Green Street, with smaller concentrations in Canning Town, Stratford and Beckton (shown on figure 5 below).

5.3.10 The population outside the park’s catchment, but inside the park’s ward was also calculated. This made it possible to get an indication of numbers of people not well served by public park provision. The method represents a good degree of accuracy as it only relates to residential property and does not include businesses which would otherwise exaggerate total numbers in many areas. It also provides a graphic representation which allows one to make a good estimate of the situation on the ground. This exercise was undertaken for small local parks/neighbourhood parks, and for the Borough’s three District Parks and based on walking distances.
5.4 PARKS IN NEWHAM

5.4.1 The distribution of Parks across the borough is illustrated in Figure 5 above. A total of 32 public parks were identified in the Borough. These parks have been categorised using the GLA Parks Hierarchy.

5.4.2 There are 3 District Parks in the Borough providing large areas of open space which provide a landscape setting with a variety of natural features providing for a wide range of activities including outdoor sports facilities and playing fields, children's play for different age groups and informal recreation pursuits. The 22 Local Parks/open spaces in the Borough provide for court games, children’s play spaces and other areas of a
specialist nature, including nature conservation areas. The 7 Pocket Parks in the Borough form small areas of open space that provide natural surfaces and shaded areas for informal play and passive recreation and that sometimes have seating and play equipment.

**District Parks**

5.4.3 The assessment identified three district parks within the Borough and details are provided below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Address</th>
<th>Unique ID</th>
<th>Ha</th>
<th>Ward</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>West Ham Park</td>
<td>LBN_OS_078</td>
<td>26.46</td>
<td>West Ham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beckton District Park</td>
<td>LBN_OS_097</td>
<td>32.56</td>
<td>Custom House / Beckton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Park</td>
<td>LBN_OS_019</td>
<td>9.87</td>
<td>East Ham Central</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Local Parks/Open Spaces**

5.4.4 The assessment identified 22 Local Parks/Open Spaces within the Borough. Their details are contained within Table 5-4 below and their distribution across the Borough is illustrated in Figure 5e.
### Figure 5e Local Parks/Open Spaces

**Legend**
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Address</th>
<th>Unique ID</th>
<th>Ha</th>
<th>Ward</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stratford Park</td>
<td>LBN_OS_009</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>West Ham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plashet Park</td>
<td>LBN_OS_010</td>
<td>7.55</td>
<td>East Ham North</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Ilford Park</td>
<td>LBN_OS_011</td>
<td>10.46</td>
<td>Little Ilford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priory Park</td>
<td>LBN_OS_016</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>Boleyn</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park Name</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barking Road Recreation Ground</td>
<td>LBN_OS_018</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>Wall End</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brampton Park</td>
<td>LBN_OS_020</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>East Ham South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plaistow Park</td>
<td>LBN_OS_022</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>Plaistow South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memorial Recreation Ground</td>
<td>LBN_OS_023</td>
<td>12.22</td>
<td>Canning Town North</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Star Park</td>
<td>LBN_OS_025</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>Canning Town North</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cundy Park</td>
<td>LBN_OS_029</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>Custom House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Beckton Park</td>
<td>LBN_OS_030</td>
<td>6.61</td>
<td>Beckton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hermit Road Recreation Ground</td>
<td>LBN_OS_059</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>Canning Town North</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kier Hardy Recreation Ground</td>
<td>LBN_OS_064</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>Canning Town South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyle Park</td>
<td>LBN_OS_071</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>Royal Docks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canning Town Recreation Ground</td>
<td>LBN_OS_072</td>
<td>7.75</td>
<td>Custom House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King George V Park</td>
<td>LBN_OS_073</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>Custom House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Victoria Gardens</td>
<td>LBN_OS_076</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>Royal Docks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thames Barrier Park</td>
<td>LBN_OS_079</td>
<td>7.37</td>
<td>Royal Docks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Lane Park</td>
<td>LBN_OS_089</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>Forest Gate North</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three Mills</td>
<td>LBN_OS_095</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>Stratford &amp; New Town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manor Park</td>
<td>LBN_OS_113</td>
<td>8.18</td>
<td>Manor Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openspace</td>
<td>LBN_OS_169</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>Canning Town North</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5.4 Local Parks/Neighbourhood Greens

#### Pocket Parks

5.4.5 The assessment identified 7 Pocket Parks in the Borough. These parks are defined under the GLA Hierarchy as being under 0.4ha in size. The pocket parks in Newham provide small areas of open space for residents which provide natural surfaces and shaded areas for informal play and passive recreation. These areas sometimes have seating and play equipment. These pocket parks are important to residents in the Borough as they provide small areas of green space close to residential areas in the Borough.
urban environment. Their details are contained in table 5-5 below and their distribution across the Borough contained in figure 5d below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Address</th>
<th>Unique ID</th>
<th>Ha</th>
<th>Ward</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amenity Space</td>
<td>LBN_OS_098</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>Custom House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amenity Space</td>
<td>LBN_OS_099</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>Beckton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openspace</td>
<td>LBN_OS_130</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>East Ham South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openspace</td>
<td>LBN_OS_146</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>Canning Town South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openspace</td>
<td>LBN_OS_044</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>Stratford &amp; New Town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openspace</td>
<td>LBN_OS_045</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>Beckton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lister Gardens</td>
<td>LBN_OS_058</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>Plaistow North</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5-5 Pocket Park
Figure 5d: Pocket Parks
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5.5 **SHORTFALLS**

5.5.1 This section aims to identify those areas of the Borough where shortfalls in the provision of open space have been identified. Figures 6 to 14 have been analysed and the resulting areas of deficiency have been identified. At this level of analysis the 9 Community Forum areas have been used to consider specific shortfalls in access to all parks.

5.5.2 Shortages should be considered in the context of the character, density and other needs in the Borough. Shortages in areas with a high proportion of small dwellings such as terraced houses, flats or apartments are likely to be more significant than areas where residents have more access to private gardens.

5.5.3 A number of the wards in the Borough have elevated levels of high density housing including Canning Town South, Stratford and New Town and the Royal Docks. Investment in a few well selected locations in these areas could aid in meeting the need of a large number of people in these areas.
Figure 7 Community Forum Area 2 Green Street
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Figure 8 Community Forum Area 3 Royal Docks
Figure 9 Community Forum Area 4 East Ham
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Figure 10 Community Forum Area 5 Beckton
Figure 11 Community Forum Area 6 Canning Town & Custom House

Figure 12 Community Forum Area 7 Plaistow
Figure 13 Community Forum Area 8 Forest Gate.

Figure 14 Community Forum Area 9 Stratford & West Ham
### 5.6 Populations not served by parks

5.5.4 Analysis demonstrates that in relation to accessibility to all types of parks a total population of 30,302 persons are not served by existing park provision approximately 12% of the total population of the Borough.

5.5.5 The most significant areas being within Manor Park (5.2%) and Forest Gate (3%).

5.5.6 Figures 6 to 14 illustrate the shortfall in accessibility in each community forum area and the populations not served by any park.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Forum Area</th>
<th>Total Number of Residential Properties</th>
<th>Number of Properties Inside Catchment areas (LBN only)</th>
<th>Number of Properties Outside Catchments (LBN only)</th>
<th>Population outside Catchment Areas (2.64 average size)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beckton</td>
<td>5903</td>
<td>5668</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canning Town &amp; Custom House</td>
<td>17428</td>
<td>16116</td>
<td>1312</td>
<td>3464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Ham</td>
<td>14089</td>
<td>13760</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Gate</td>
<td>12298</td>
<td>9559</td>
<td>2739</td>
<td>7231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Street</td>
<td>13173</td>
<td>12732</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>1164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manor Park</td>
<td>12943</td>
<td>8125</td>
<td>4818</td>
<td>12720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plaistow</td>
<td>10517</td>
<td>10517</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Docks</td>
<td>4473</td>
<td>4068</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>1069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stratford &amp; West Ham</td>
<td>13085</td>
<td>11886</td>
<td>1199</td>
<td>3165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>103909</strong></td>
<td><strong>92431</strong></td>
<td><strong>11478</strong></td>
<td><strong>30302</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5-7 Out of Borough Influence

5.5.7 The influence of out of Borough Parks upon the accessibility to parks should be taken into account to consider future priorities. Although no survey of each out of Borough parks was undertaken as part of this study, out of Borough Parks have been categorised according to size and their catchment areas plotted to illustrate the potential populations served by such parks.

5.5.8 This analysis reveals a somewhat different picture with a far reduced population not served by any park (2.1% of total population, concentrated within Canning Town / Custom House and Royal Docks Community Forum areas).

5.5.9 This data coincides with the health socio economic indicator referred to earlier in that the Canning Town North and Canning Town South wards were identified as having a percentage of people not in good health significantly above the national average. The Royal Docks area was also above the national average.

5.5.10 In terms of child density, all the wards in the Borough were found to be above the national average with Canning Town South and Custom House having quite high levels at 26% as a percentage of their respective wards compared to the national average of 20%.

5.5.11 This highlights a key area of focus for the Borough in terms of developing priorities for future provision and planned improvements to open space.

5.5.12 The following parks have however been identified as potential ‘Neighbourhood Greens’ in the Council’s Parks Development Plan. These are selected open spaces to supplement public parks provision in areas of deficiency.
### 5.6 Range of Facilities in Public Parks

#### 5.6.1

The variety of user demands or aspirations is recognised as a fundamental principle of the Parks Hierarchy (Table 4.1). However, in practice, even if an area is not deficient in open space it may be that the open space leaves certain recreational needs unmet.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park Type/Features</th>
<th>District Park</th>
<th>Local Park/Open Space</th>
<th>Pocket Park</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pitch Sports</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court Sports</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf/Putting</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watersports</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noisy Sports</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Activity</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5-9 above illustrates that a large proportion of public parks in the borough provide a full range of typical facilities that could be expected of such spaces. Common facilities such as pitch sports, walking and dog walking as well as children’s play are well represented. 13 of the 32 parks have pitch sports whilst 29 of the 32 parks have facilities for walking and dog walking. 23 of the sites have facilities for children’s play.

It is considered that the analysis of facilities should be undertaken on a park-by-park basis taking into account both the character of the parks and proximity of other parks which may have an oversupply of facilities. Chapters 9 and 10 look at the quality of provision and different roles the open spaces play in more detail.

Generally this means that priority for future provision should therefore be given to the following areas:

- South western corner of the Borough in Canning Town South and Royal Docks - improvements to existing parks to enable them to perform District Park functions
- Pockets identified in the north/north eastern corner of the Borough – to provide local provision including children’s playspace / neighbourhood greens

These areas are illustrated on Figures 5 (see page 53 for Figure 5), 5a, 5b and 5c below.
Figure 5a Pedestrian Access to District Parks
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- Open Spaces: District Park
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Figure 5b Pedestrian Access to Local Parks

Legend
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It need not be necessary to acquire new land for new parks. It may also be possible to reduce the effects of poor distribution by upgrading the roles and range of functions provided at other publicly accessible open spaces, as described above. It may also be possible to negotiate better community use of non-public open spaces. In many areas, there are open spaces whose primary function is playing fields. Enabling diversification of use within these spaces would help meet the current deficiency of provision.
5.6.7 Improvements to surrounding urban fabric / public realm close to parks would be conducive to parks access, for example providing clear routes into parks with traffic calming, home zones etc.

5.7 RECOMMENDATIONS: PUBLIC PARK PROVISION

Quantitative Recommendations

Standards

- District Park provision in Newham is currently 0.28ha per 1000 population
- Local Park Provision is currently 0.43ha per 1000 population
- Pocket Park provision is currently 0.006ha per 1000 population.

Demand Assessment

5.7.1 Currently all of Newham’s public parks offer an average of 0.78ha per 1000 population.

5.7.2 Although this figure falls below the NPFA standards of 2.4ha per 1000 population from an assessment of the parks survey it is considered that the current standard is sufficient due to the level of satisfaction demonstrated by respondents with regards to their parks in terms of the quality and range of facilities.

5.7.3 In addition to the current standards of park space in the Borough it is important to consider the amount of future park space which will be required to deal with the future population increases for the Borough.

5.7.4 GLA figures for future population growth have been utilised in this instance however it has been noted that there are a number of different projections for the Borough with a high instance of variance in the figure numbers.

5.7.5 Using the GLA projections an additional 87ha public park provision would be required to fulfil the predicted population growth which is expected to rise to 356,000 by 2026. This does not include the 102 hectare proposed Olympic Park at Stratford. The provision of a new Metropolitan Park will address quantitative requirements but not qualitative and access requirements in other parts of the borough, particularly at the local level.

Accessibility Recommendations

5.7.6 The following access targets are recommended for adoption by the Council:
6 Children’s Play Areas

- All residents in the Borough should have access to a District Park within 1.2km of their homes.
- All residents in the Borough should have access to a Local Park within 400m of their homes.
- All residents in the Borough should have access to a Pocket Park no less than 400m from their homes.

5.8 CONCLUSIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS

5.8.1 This chapter has set out a summary of the existing open space provision in the Borough and breaks them down according to typology and size. Local Parks form the second largest space in the Borough after Cemeteries & Churchyards of which there are many in the Borough.

5.8.2 The chapter also looks at access to open space and by considering the population outside Park catchment areas it was possible to get an indication of the number of people not well served by public park provision. This is illustrated in Figure 5. Figures 6 to 14 demonstrate the areas of deficient according to the 9 Community Forum Areas in order to consider specific shortfalls in access to all parks.

5.8.3 It is recommended that these shortages are considered in the context of the character, density and other needs in Borough and investment in a number of strategically selected areas will aid in meeting the needs of local people in these areas.

6. CHILDREN’S PLAY AREAS

6.1 GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS

6.1.1 Open space provides an important role in serving children’s play needs. It is widely acknowledged that the importance of children’s play extends far beyond the activity itself and contributes directly towards child development through developing a wide range of physical, social and
emotional skills and abilities. The key issues relating to children’s play provision are the nature and location of play, the influence of age and gender, safety and risk issues and the condition of play environments.

**Location of play**

6.1.2 The outdoor environment is a key element for children, particularly during summer months. Play takes place in a range of environments, many of which are not planned play environments. Studies of children’s play have emphasised the appeal and use of unofficial play areas, which can include the street, back gardens and natural/wild areas such as woods, areas of wasteland, disused buildings, garages and back alleys. All of these spaces afford opportunities for a range of different experiences which are likely to appeal to particular groups of children.

**Age and gender**

6.1.3 Young children make up the most physically active group in society. Physical play is the first and most frequently occurring expression of play in young children (Hutt and others 1989).

6.1.4 Age and gender strongly influence the nature and type of play. Coffin and Williams (1989) suggest a fivefold evolution of play over the course of childhood. The qualities of play differ by gender. Boys’ play tends to be rougher than girls’ play and involves more active and forceful physical contact, fighting and taunting (Maccoby 1990). Boys showed greater rates of active forceful play than girls, particularly when in same-sex groups (Fabes and others 2003). Boys are more likely than girls to be in same-sex play but girls are more likely to be in same sex dyadic or play in pairs (Fabes and others 2003). The two types of play provide different forms of interaction. Larger groups show more conflict and competition, dyadic play shows more sensitivity to others’ needs.

6.1.5 Toddlers aged 1-3 tend to play alongside rather than with other children. Activity focuses upon experimentation with new found abilities and role play;

- Pre-school children show higher levels of inquisitiveness, practice new physical skills, enjoy constructional play and begin to acquire skills in social play;

---

Primary school children (aged 5-10) commonly develop interests in the environment (animals and plants in particular) and explore environments more widely. They continue to enjoy constructional play and play involving movement, ball play and wheeled objects. This age group is highly sociable;

Older children (aged 10-13) are more competitive, show wider incidence of sexes playing apart and roam further from home. Playing games and organised activities is important for this group and more time may be spent in conversational and social activity. Constructional and movement play continues to be important; and

Adolescents (aged 14-16) display more focused patterns of activity, including interests in hobbies, music and dance; greater independence which may be reflected in informal street based groups, and some return to mixed group activity. It is debatable whether this group actually recognise their actions as ‘play’.

**Safety and risk**

6.1.6 Parental perceptions of risk and safety influence patterns of play including when and where children may play and with whom, although parental influences decreases with age. The need for parental supervision (perceived or actual) is particularly strong in relation to toddlers and pre-school children although supervision of primary and older is increasingly common. Behaviour patterns of parents with children have altered significantly in response to growing fears over safety of children particularly relating to car and cycle accidents, assaults, abductions, accidents whilst at play, drug taking and substance abuse and anti-social behaviour. Despite the fact that the risk of accidents is relatively small, parents seek to place restrictions on their children’s mobility and independence in response to these concerns and anxieties which leads to more localised patterns of play or a greater degree of supervised play including parents transporting children from a to b.

6.1.7 Within the context of the issues identified above traditional forms of children’s play provision have been criticised. Some forms of equipped play areas can be almost valueless in meeting the developmental needs of children. The design of play areas has also been criticised for taking the needs and concerns of adults such as noise and disturbance more seriously than children’s play needs.. Common issues are:

- An over-emphasis on unsupervised play areas containing fixed equipment rather than informal play opportunities;

- The preoccupation with safety surfaces resulting in the creation of unchallenging environments directed primarily at younger children; and
A strong emphasis on the ‘containment’ of children within dedicated ‘play’ areas to discourage young people congregating in other areas.

6.1.8 To overcome these problems Williams identifies the need to engage children and young people in the identification and design of play opportunities as part of the planning process in order that play environments meet local needs and priorities.

6.2 LEVEL OF PROVISION

6.2.1 Table 6.1 sets out current levels of children’s play provision within the Borough. This excludes consideration of school sites which do not have general public access, but includes Council and non-Council provision.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Children's Play Provision (excl. Schools)</th>
<th>No. Open Spaces with provision</th>
<th>% Open Spaces</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Children’s Play Provision</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>32.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of these:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Sites (LEAP’s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 of these sites meet both LEAP &amp; NEAP standards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No children’s play provision</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>67.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6-1 Formal Children’s Play Provision

6.2.2 Of the open spaces surveyed, 61 were assessed as providing dedicated, informal and other children’s play provision, of which only 10 sites meet the national NPFA LEAP/NEAP standards. However, potentially relatively minor improvements could be made to play spaces to enable a number of the open spaces with “Other children’s play provision” to fulfil the criteria for a LEAP.

6.3 STANDARDS OF PLAY PROVISION

Current NPFA and UDP standards
6.3.1 There are currently no adopted national standards relating to children’s play provision. However, a structured approach to the planning and provision of children’s play areas has been developed by the National Playing Fields Association (NPFA). The standards of provision recommended by the NPFA were revised in 2001 and reflect changing views towards children’s play provision, emphasising the need to provide both designated areas and casual play opportunities. The standards also suggest that areas need to respond to the needs of different age groups and recognise their value to the development of children and young people.

6.3.2 Overall, the NPFA recommends a minimum standard of outdoor space for children’s play of 0.8 hectares per 1000 people.

6.3.3 Newham’s UDP states that it is important that children and their carers should be within easy reach of play areas and that play provision should be safe and exciting. Policy OS12 states that developers of housing sites containing a minimum of 25 family dwellings will be required to make appropriate provision for children’s playspace.

6.3.4 Newham’s SPG “Residential Planning Guidelines” sets out standards for this provision and require developers to provide 0.1ha per 40 children’s bedspace with a minimum of 500m2. Where existing children’s play areas exist within 200m and 400m of the development site respectively, commuted sums may be accepted by the Council instead of on-site provision.

**Recommended Dedicated Children’s Play Provision**

**Existing Provision**

6.3.5 Local effective catchment areas for children’s play provision were derived from the findings of a residents’ survey. In the absence of a direct question relating to time distance from children’s playspace the survey found that of those open spaces with play space surveyed, the majority of persons walked to their local space. This is indicative of the small catchment area likely to exist for these types of spaces.

**Condition of Children’s Play Areas**

6.3.6 The condition of the children’s play provision in Newham was assessed according to its range and type of play equipment and associated facilities, including provision of seating, skateboarding facilities, rebound walls, hard playing surfaces, informal games areas, safety surfaces and play area boundaries. This score was used to classify the condition of children’s play as shown in Table 6.2.
6.3.7 The table relates to those open spaces whose primary function is Provision for Children and other open spaces which have provision for children within them.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality Of Children’s Play Provision</th>
<th>No. Children’s Play Areas</th>
<th>% Total Children’s Play Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>54.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>31.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.2 Condition of Children’s Play Provision

6.3.8 The table indicates that just over 85% of children’s play spaces or areas with play space in Newham are considered to be in good or fair condition. Just over 14% are considered to be in poor condition indicating scope for improvement. These sites are listed in Table 6.3 below. Upgrade works to these sites is recommended to bring them up to LEAP/NEAP standards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Wards</th>
<th>Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LBN_OS_016</td>
<td>Priory Park</td>
<td>Boleyn</td>
<td>3.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBN_OS_145</td>
<td>Openspace</td>
<td>Canning Town North</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBN_OS_151</td>
<td>Recreation Ground</td>
<td>Wall End</td>
<td>9.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBN_OS_184</td>
<td>Amenity Space</td>
<td>Canning Town North</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBN_OS_220</td>
<td>North of Alnwick Road (1)</td>
<td>Custom House</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBN_OS_221</td>
<td>North of Alnwick Road (2)</td>
<td>Custom House</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBN_OS_032</td>
<td>Albert Road Amenity Area</td>
<td>Royal Docks</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBN_OS_107</td>
<td>Upper Road Amenity Areas</td>
<td>Plaistow North</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6-3 Children’s Play Sites

6.3.9 To improve the quality of individual play spaces therefore existing spaces should aim to fulfil the criteria set out by the NPFA to qualify as a LEAP. It should be noted that improvement works are already underway since the open space assessment was undertaken in Spring 2010, for example at Priory Park.

**Access Standards**

6.3.10 Distance is a key barrier to children’s play. All children and young people should have access to play space within reasonable and safe walking distance of their homes. Distance should be measured as actual walking distance taking into account barriers to movement. The following benchmark standards are recommended in respect of different age bands, and are consistent with the emerging standards in the Children’s Play Council (Play England) Performance Indicators.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Maximum Actual Walking distance from</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 5s (LAPs)</td>
<td>100m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-11 year olds (LEAPs)</td>
<td>400m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12+ (NEAPs)</td>
<td>800m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6-4 Walking Distances to Play Space

6.3.11 It is suggested that these catchment areas be applied for children’s play areas within the London Borough of Newham. Figure 17 shows the distribution of children playspace within the borough both as standalone facilities and within other areas of open space. The figure also includes the LAP, LEAP and NEAP catchment areas set out in table 6.4 above.
6.3.12 Overall, the NPFA recommends a minimum standard of outdoor space for children’s play of 0.8 hectares per 1000 people i.e. approximately 195 ha in total.

6.3.13 These existing suggested national standards are however too high for application in London and do not take into account the potential for other areas of open space to be used as play spaces.

6.3.14 The Mayors SPG “Providing for Children and Young People’s Play and Informal Recreation” noted that consultation with London boroughs indicates that limited practical use is currently being made of existing standards because they do not accurately assess local needs or reflect local characteristics in terms of population profile and existing provision.
6.3.15 A more realistic benchmark standard of a minimum of 10 sq m of dedicated playspace per child is recommended as a basis for assessing existing provision.

6.3.16 There are 63,841 under 16 year olds in the entire Borough of Newham and using this methodology a total of 63.84ha of dedicated children’s play space. Surveys of all children’s play areas have not been undertaken at this stage given the very large number of smaller, estate based play areas.

6.3.17 It will be important to continue to examine and survey these play spaces to assess the need for improvements in quality and access, and to rationalise existing spaces and make best use of existing assets.

6.3.18 **Recommended Dedicated Children’s Play Provision**

6.3.19 The standard for play provision is in addition to other quantitative standards for open space provision applied in the preparation of the open space strategy, although opportunities for the multifunctional use of open space should be optimised.

- A benchmark standard of a minimum of 10 sq m of dedicated playspace per child is recommended as a basis for assessing existing provision; and

- All residents in the Borough should have access to the following children’s play provision
  - LAPs – within 100 metres
  - LEAPs – within 400 metres
  - NEAPs – within 800 metres

6.3.20 This was considered to be a realistic standard to aspire to and is intended to offer a basis for assessing existing provision within an area and to benchmark provision against other areas.

6.4 **Conclusions and Recommendations**

6.4.1 This chapter sets out the important role open space has in serving children’s play needs. The chapter sets out current levels of children’s play provision in the Borough and rates the condition of play areas according to its range, type of play equipment and associated facilities. Over 80% of children’s play areas were rated as good or fair in the Borough.

6.4.2 Although there are no adopted national standards for children’s play the NPFA recommends a minimum standard of outdoor space for children’s play of 0.8 hectares per 1000 people.
6.4.3 In terms of access and walking distances to play spaces, benchmark standards are recommended according to age bands and it is recommended that these catchment areas area applied for children’s play spaces in Borough. These catchment areas (including LAP/LEAP’s and NEAP’s) are illustrated in Figure 17.

6.4.4 Only 10 sites of the 61 surveyed meet the national NPFA LEAP/NEAP standards and it is recommended that with minor improvements to these spaces a number of these spaces could fulfil the criteria for a LEAP.
7. **NATURAL AND SEMI-NATURAL GREENSPACE PROVISION**

7.1.1 The focus of this type of open space is on wildlife conservation, biodiversity, and environmental education and awareness.

7.1.2 Natural England has produced standards relating to natural greenspace provision known as the Accessible Natural Greenspace Standard (ANGSt). The recommended standards are:

- an accessible natural greenspace of at least 2 hectares in size, no more than 300 metres (5 minutes walk) from home;
- at least one accessible 20 hectare site within two kilometres of home;
- one accessible 100 hectare site within five kilometres of home;
- one accessible 500 hectare site within ten kilometres of home; and
- one hectare of statutory Local Nature Reserves per thousand populations.

7.1.3 The distribution of natural greenspace provision has been assessed using the findings of the open space site appraisals. A definition of natural greenspace used within this study includes the following:

- Open spaces where at least 5% of the site is comprised of natural heath land, down land, common or natural woodland; and
- Open spaces which are wholly or partly designated with National, or Local nature conservation designations (including SSSIs, SNCVs, LNRs); or wasteland/derelict areas, water area, or informal grassland.

7.1.4 There were a total of 13 Natural and Semi Natural sites assessed as part of the study. The sites varied in size with the largest site in Beckton totalling some 18ha.

7.1.5 There are two Nature Reserves in the Borough, Cuckolds Haven Nature Reserve and East Ham Nature Reserve, both in East Ham. Their combined size totals almost 8ha which equates to a figure of 0.0079 per 1000 population which falls well below the ANGSt standards of 1ha per thousand population.

7.1.6 Many of the areas surveyed consisted of areas of open scrubland where accessibility is generally limited. The majority of Natural and Semi natural greenspaces fall under the 2ha size so using the ANGSt standard these spaces should be no more than 300m from homes. One of the sites in Beckton, is considered within the 20ha standard and therefore has an ANGSt standard of 2km.
7.1.7 Figure 15 shows the distribution across the Borough and provides catchment areas according to the ANGst standards. There is a sharp concentration of natural/semi natural greenspace in the east of the Borough in Beckton and Wall End. These areas are generally areas of open scrub land. There are two smaller areas of greenspace in Forest Gate North and Custom House.

7.1.8 From the figure it can be seen that the remainder of the Borough can be considered to be suffering from a severe lack of this type of open space. However it is worth noting that Newham is a high density inner London borough which does not benefit from large areas of natural or semi natural open space. PPG17 defines this type of open space as including woodlands, urban forestry, scrub, grasslands (for example, downlands,
commons and meadows), wetlands, open and running water, wastelands, and derelict open land and rock areas (for example, cliffs, quarries and pits). Generally due to the urban fabric of the Borough it can be difficult for this type of space to be meaningfully provided for in the levels required by Natural England.

7.1.9 In addition to this the ANGST model was reviewed by Natural England in 2003 (Accessible Natural Greenspace Standards in Towns and Cities: A Review and Toolkit) which highlighted a number of problems with the model.

7.1.10 The definition of natural greenspace used within the model “Areas naturally colonised by plants and animals” was considered to be unclear and impractical. The definition appears to exclude man made types of vegetation which predominate within urban areas like Newham and which are known to have a high biodiversity value.

7.1.11 The review also identified the need for more flexibility regarding the distance and size criteria and role within the hierarchy to reflect local circumstances. Natural England has yet to adopt revised natural greenspace standards following the review.

7.1.12 However, the review does recommend that the ecological value of greenspace should be determined through undertaking a Phase 1 Habitat survey. PPG17 also recommends that local authorities derive locally based standards of provision rather than adopt nationally derived standards wholesale. However, the ANGST standards reflect the distribution of natural and semi-natural sites required within urban areas to support high levels of biodiversity and flora and fauna communities.

7.1.13 It is worth noting that there are a number of areas in the Borough which have not been surveyed including the River Thames and the Royal Docks. These areas contribute to Natural Greenspace and have the potential to significantly add to the amount of natural or semi natural open space in the Borough. This has been taken into account in the recommendations.

7.1.14 The Mayor’s East London Green Grid Framework (SPG) outlines the strategic components of the Green Grid in London Riverside. A number of strategic open space opportunities are identified for the whole area which also includes the boroughs of Barking and Dagenham and Havering.

7.1.15 Opportunities identified include the creation of a to create a Metropolitan Park from Ilford to the Thames (including Cross River Park), linking the River Roding from Ilford to the Beckton Park Link, the proposed Thames Gateway Bridge and on to the south side of the river, maximising pedestrian and cycle connectivity and improving ecological value.
7.2 NATURAL AND SEMI-NATURAL GREENSPACE PROVISION: RECOMMENDATIONS

Quantitative Component

7.2.1 Newham currently has 0.01ha per 1000 population. This falls below the ANGst standard of 1ha per 1000 population.

7.2.2 Neighbouring Borough Hackney proposes a standard of 1 ha of natural greenspace per 1,000 population for Nature Reserves rather than the English Nature ANGst target of 1ha of Nature Reserve per 1000 population. In terms of natural greenspace due to their vast amount of this type of space (the Borough has over 350ha) they comfortably meet the standard.

Biodiversity Action Plan

7.2.3 Newham has a Biodiversity Action Plan. The plan outlines the aspirations and priorities for biodiversity in Newham. It summarises the priorities for biodiversity management and investment in Newham, the targets for what will be achieved, and an action plan to achieve these targets.

7.2.4 The Plan recognises that although Newham is a very urban borough, it has several important green spaces and green corridors, which provide important wildlife habitats, such as West Ham Park, City of London Cemetery and Beckton District Park. The Borough is also surrounded by several important wildlife areas including the River Thames, River Lea, River Roding and Epping Forest and Wansted Flats.

7.2.5 It also recognises that 17.6% of the total land area of Newham consists of green space with the potential to support wildlife.

7.2.6 Newham’s Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) includes Habitat Action Plans (HAPs), including one for Public Open Spaces and Green Corridors. These range from large public parks such as Beckton District Park, to small pocket-parks such as St. Mary’s Churchyard in Little Ilford. It also includes linear open spaces which span the Borough such as The Greenway.

7.2.7 Newham’s BAP sets out 11 targets for Public Open Space and Green Corridors in the borough:

- POS1 To identify existing wildlife habitats within Newham’s public open space and green corridors and maintain;
- POS2 To ensure that 50% of Newham’s churchyards and cemeteries are in positive management for biodiversity by 2015;
- POS3 To ensure that at least 50% of Newham’s parks, squares and amenity grassland incorporate features to support biodiversity by 2015;
7.2.8 There are 41 Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs), many of which are also public open spaces such as East Ham Nature Reserve. There are also several waterbodies which are designated as SINCs and represent valuable wildlife habitats.

7.2.9 The private gardens, grounds and allotments HAP recognises that flower beds, mature trees and ponds all offer opportunities for wildlife such as mammals, amphibians, birds and insects and need to be protected and enhanced. The BAP recognises that many grounds surrounding housing estates, schools and businesses are poor in terms of their quality of wildlife and many areas could benefit from improvements in the range of wildlife in these areas.

7.2.10 A key issue to emerge from the Newham Biodiversity evidence base is that, whilst distribution data is available for UK and London BAP Priority Habitats, there is little information available on the condition of habitats in Newham.

7.2.11 A priority for the BAP to take forward is better information gathering on habitats. A number of UK BAP and London BAP Priority Habitats are aiming to be restored, created and enhanced under the HAP.

7.2.12 The BAP sets out a suite of actions and corresponding objectives which will ensure the targets for the London Priority Habitats are met. The action plan also includes timescale for delivery and the relevant delivery partners where appropriate.
Enhancing Nature Conservation

7.2.13 Open spaces where multiple uses remain a key requirement, or where multiple uses are to be encouraged, may be enhanced for wildlife through a variety of well established landscaping and habitat creation methods. For example, land with core areas under intensive use such as sports pitches, may have peripheral areas by the boundaries or between pitches where changes in land management may be accommodated.

7.2.14 Enhancement strategies include:

- Tree planting, which should include a high proportion of or complete stock of native species depending on the site;
- Management of existing trees by pollarding or coppicing as appropriate;
- Allowing development of dead-wood habitats, retaining standing, fallen or stacked dead timber where safe to do so;
- Resisting linear plantations where space allows, and adding graded and scalloped edges of smaller trees and shrub species, preferably with native species of local provenance;
- Providing groupings of appropriate native shrubs, particularly where a lack of space or other considerations constrain the planting of large trees;
- Replacing fences with hedgerows where appropriate;
- Allowing development of tall-grass/tall herb communities along the edges of shrub formations, and varying and maintaining these by appropriate mowing regimes adopting late-summer/early autumn cuts over a 2-3 year cycle;
- Encouraging where appropriate a turf of medium height rich in native grass species and native wildflowers, managed by one or two annual cuts;
- Wildflower seeding to enhance areas of species-poor amenity grassland. It is appreciated however that enhancement of species poor amenity grassland is sometimes difficult due to the high nutrient status and rich topsoil. Soil stripping may be a necessary alternative, with subsequent application of appropriate wildflower seed mix in an effort to increase biodiversity therefore;
- Varying landforms to induce variation in drainage and aspect, thereby encouraging natural diversity to develop;
Continuing to seek improvements to river corridors and encouraging natural river banks with geomorphologic diversity such as cut cliffs, shallow-water margins and ledges, depositional bars;

- Restoring connectivity through green links beyond immediate river channels where continuity of river corridors cannot be achieved;
- Using landscaping and habitat creation schemes to improve connectivity for wildlife across sites of low diversity such as amenity grassland; and
- Considering lowering ground levels in river flood plains. This has the potential to assist in improving flood storage, helping to encourage marshland plants and new water features. These would be significant projects and should be undertaken in conjunction with the Environment Agency as it would involve major earthworks in a floodplain.

**Accessibility Standards**

7.2.15 The most relevant ANGst standards are recommended for the Borough including:

- an accessible natural greenspace of at least 2 hectares in size, no more than 300 metres (5 minutes walk) from home;
- at least one accessible 20 hectare site within two kilometres of home; and
- one hectare of statutory Local Nature Reserves per thousand population.

**Qualitative Component**

7.2.16 Enhancements identified within the BAP should be prioritised to ensure areas of natural and semi-natural greenspace are of adequate quality and support local biodiversity.

7.2.17 A number of key actions have been set out in the BAP including:

- Designation of five new Local Nature Reserves;
- Adaptation of site management to complement existing areas of London Priority Habitat, and create new areas;
- Work with the Environment Agency, Lea Valley Regional Park Authority and Olympic Delivery Authority to prioritise biodiversity enhancement along Newham's waterways;
- Designate sites as SINCs where they meet the criteria (e.g. Proposed SINCs);
Undertake study to highlight areas of the Borough where different types of habitat creation would be appropriate;

Promote retention of green space in works to the existing built environment through the development management process;

Draft developer guidelines on biodiversity including a requirement for any habitat lost to development to be replaced;

Review grounds maintenance at housing estates and hospitals, and ensure wildlife-friendly techniques are employed; and

Produce and circulate information promoting the importance of gardens for wildlife and providing advice on how to manage gardens to benefit wildlife.

7.3 CONCLUSIONS

7.3.1 This chapter sets out the recommended Accessible Natural Greenspace Standard (ANGSt) for Natural and Semi Natural Greenspace. The chapter also sets out various types of natural and semi natural greenspace in the Borough including Two Nature Reserves in East Ham.

7.3.2 The assessment of this space typology found that many of the areas consisted of areas of open scrubland with limited accessibility. The distribution across the Borough is illustrated in Figure 15 and demonstrates that in general there is a significant lack of this type of open space in the Borough. It is noted however that as a high density inner London Borough these areas do not typically benefit from large areas of natural or semi natural open space.

7.3.3 It is recommended that enhancements identified in Newham’s Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) are prioritised to ensure areas of natural and semi natural greenspace are of high quality.
8. Allotment Needs

8.1 Introduction

8.1.1 The role of allotments is in a period of transition and their value is undergoing reappraisal. Traditionally allotments were developed within urban areas from the latter half of the C19th onwards to provide the urban poor access to land to grow their own fruit and vegetables. The spread of allotments was linked to development of high density housing without gardens. Growth of allotments intensified once again during the first and second world wars when they were used to supplement national food production. Following a near-steady post-war decline, more recently interest in allotments has increased due to public awareness of ‘green’ issues and concerns over links between food and health.

8.1.2 Allotments have a number of wider benefits for communities including:

- providing a sustainable source of food;
- wider health benefits including exercise, improving mental and physical health;
- bringing together communities; and
- increased biodiversity.

8.1.3 Modern trends of house building which have led to an increased focus on flats and apartments and more high density development have contributed to an increased demand for allotments.

8.2 Policy

National Context

Planning Policy Guidance Note 17 – Sport Open Space and Recreation

8.2.1 The national planning framework relating to allotments is set out in PPG17, where it is another form of open space performing strategic recreational functions.

8.2.2 PPG17 also identifies the issues which Local Planning Authorities should take into account in considering allotment provision and circumstances when disposal may be appropriate.

Local Context

8.2.3 Newham’s UDP recognises that the cultivation of allotments is a popular activity enjoyed by many residents of the Borough. The Plan also recognises the concentration of plots in the south of the borough but states
that opportunities for provision in the Olympic Park and Central areas are limited.

8.2.4 Policy OS13 states that the Council will protect the level of existing allotment provision and secure opportunities to increase supply, particularly in areas of the Borough which are deficient. The policy aims to encourage the development of sites by utilising poorly used open spaces and suitable vacant sites.

8.3 **ALLOTMENT SUPPLY IN LB NEWHAM**

**Quantity of Provision**

8.3.1 There are a total of 12 sites in the Borough totalling an area of 18.34ha. This equates to an average site size of 1.53ha and a current provision level of 0.07 per 1000 population.

8.3.2 Table 8-1 below summarises the provision of allotments in the Borough.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>Number of sites</th>
<th>Total (ha)</th>
<th>Average Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>West Ham</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Ham South</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.62</td>
<td>6.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Custom House</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.23</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beckton</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Ilford</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stratford &amp; New Town</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plaistow North</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>1.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td><strong>18.34</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.74</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8-1 Allotment sites in Newham

8.3.3 The National Society of Allotment and Leisure Gardeners suggest a national standard of 20 allotments per 1,000 households (i.e. 20 allotments per 2,000 people based on 2 people per house) or 1 allotment per 200 people. This equates to 0.125ha per 1,000 population based on an average plot size of 250 metres squared. The 1969 Thorpe Report suggests 0.2 ha per 1,000 population.
8.3.4 The Thorpe Report was commissioned by the Ministry of Natural Resources and reviewed the reasons for the declined in allotment numbers which took place since the 2nd World War. Although it had been argued that the decline was caused by allotment land being taken over for other purposes the inquiry suggested that other factors such as increased prosperity and popularity of other activities was relevant.

8.3.5 Current provision levels of 0.07 per 1000 population fall well below the national standards set by the National Society of Allotment and Leisure Gardeners and historic standard set by the Thorpe Report. This is indicative of the lack of this type of open space in the borough.

8.3.6 This is further emphasised when the demand for allotments in the borough are considered in the accessibility section of this report.

Quality of Provision

8.3.7 There are no definitive national or local quality standards for the provision of allotments and community gardens.

8.3.8 An assessment of all the allotment sites in the Borough was undertaken. This determined that the majority of sites were either publicly owned and privately managed or were the responsibility of the London Borough of Newham. One of the sites assessed was voluntarily owned and managed. Access to the site was generally restricted. The sites were in use for both gardening and food growing.

8.3.9 A number of the sites benefited from facilities such as bins, seating areas etc.

8.3.10 In many cases the sites offer ecological benefits to the areas and mitigate the visual impact of unsightly land.

8.3.11 Although the condition of the allotments in general appeared to be good from the assessments there were a number of the allotments which were not considered to be of good quality and were considered unwelcoming with barriers to access and high levels of untidiness. Opportunities to improve the quality of the allotments were identified for a number of the sites at sites principally;

- Reynolds Avenue Allotments;
- South Beckton Allotments; and
- Other allotments located in Beckton and Plaistow.

8.3.12 The 12 allotment sites were assessed using scoring criteria method derived from the Civic Trust Green Flag standard assessment. More information on this is contained in Chapter 9. The standard is based partly on a site appraisal of a number of criteria relating to the range, quality and
condition of park facilities and park management arrangements, which accounts for 70% of the overall score and a desk research element which makes up the remaining 30% of the score.

8.3.13 Table 8-2 below sets out the results of the assessment for the 12 allotment sites.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Poor</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Welcoming</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good safe access</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signage</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal access</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe equip &amp; facilities</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal security</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog fouling</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of facilities</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate provision of facilities</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Litter &amp; waste mgt.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grounds maintenance &amp; horticulture</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building &amp; Infrastructure maintenance</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equip maintenance</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8-2 Quality Assessment of Allotments
8.3.14 The table indicates that the majority of sites scored poorly in terms of all the criteria ranging from whether or not the space was welcoming to the standards of equipment maintenance.

8.3.15 A number of the sites overall scored badly with all scores equalling “Very Poor”. These included Bridle Path Allotments and Leyes Road Allotments. Newham City Farm scored well in the assessment with an almost “Excellent” score for each criterion.

8.3.16 This table indicates a critical need for improvement in the quality of existing allotments and quantity of allotments in the wider borough.

**Accessibility of Provision**

8.3.17 With regards to accessibility there are no definitive national or local standards for this type of open space.

8.3.18 The overall distribution of allotment sites in the borough is outlined in Figure 16. The figure indicates that the majority of sites are spread across the borough most noticeably towards the boundaries with other boroughs and with the main concentration of sites being in the south of the borough in the Beckton and Custom House areas. There is a noticeable lack of provision of this open space type in the north of the borough.

8.3.19 Results of the allotment survey indicate the distance people are prepared to travel to an allotment and it can be seen that there generally people are prepared to travel a significant distance indicating some use of cars to access sites. Nonetheless this is more likely an indication of a lack of supply within the borough as a whole. Figure 16 below illustrates the results of a survey of persons (over 500) currently on the allotment waiting list and a range of potential catchment areas that may apply to allotments. It can be seen that even with a 15 minute walking distance, not all people currently seeking allotment provision would be served by existing provision. The most significant areas not currently served in terms of accessibility are to the north west of the borough and south west within Forest Gate, Green Street, Stratford and Canning Town.
8.3.20 In terms of accessibility to the sites themselves access was considered good with the majority of the sites benefitting from public access. There were a number of sites which have restricted access which usually involved plot holders holding individual keys to the site. This is the standard arrangement for allotments to ensure site security.

8.4 DEMAND ASSESSMENT

8.4.1 Allotments are a demand-led open space type and in addition to manifest demand (i.e. the number of occupied allotments) there are also two forms of latent demand:
**Latent Suppressed Demand**

8.4.2 Latent suppressed demand includes individuals who want to rent an allotment but none are available. They are defined by existing allotment waiting lists. Demand fluctuates throughout the year with summer peaks.

8.4.3 Results of allotment waiting list surveys indicate a significant latent suppressed demand with over 500 persons applying for an allotment within the Borough suggesting a total under provision of 12.5 ha for the existing population.

**Latent Potential Demand**

8.4.4 People who might rent an allotment now or in the future. Demand is influenced by age, accessibility and availability of allotments, quality and standard of allotment management, public awareness and extent of allotment promotion.

8.4.5 Population growth to 2026 is likely to be expected to present the most significant impact upon allotment demand over this period.

8.4.6 The extent of unfulfilled demand needs to be considered in conjunction with the size and distribution of the sites. The accessibility of allotment sites and allotment catchments areas are considered above.

8.4.7 Before any future demand is taken into account the present situation indicates that there is currently a high level of unfulfilled demand in the Borough as is evident from the Allotment survey data plotted on Figure 16. The total amount of allotment space needed to serve the borough up until 2026 will therefore not only need to take into account current demand but future demand likely to arise.

8.4.8 Using GLA population projections it is likely that a total of 14ha of additional allotment provision will be needed to serve the Borough up until 2026.

8.4.9 It is considered that the majority of this provision would be met through extension and alteration alongside more intensive use of existing sites or the creation of new sites. It is expected that 2.1ha (or 85 plots) are expected to come forward as part of the Olympic Legacy Plans (albeit this provision is to be shared across the host boroughs). These allotments were recently approved at the ODA Planning Committee as part of the Olympic Parks and Public Realm Post-Games Transformation planning application.

8.4.10 Therefore a readjusted figure of 12ha (latent potential demand) and 12.5 hectares (latent suppressed demand) would be required in meeting future needs in the Borough up to 2026.
8.5 **RECOMMENDATIONS**

Quantitative Component

8.5.1 In order to meet the needs of the Borough up until 2026 (including current unfulfilled demand) it is recommended that a standard of 0.125ha per 1,000 population are recommended within the Borough. This standard is based on use of half plots and more intensive use of existing sites.

8.5.2 Proposals for new housing development should be accompanied by proposals to improve Allotment provision.

Accessibility Component

8.5.3 All households within the Borough should have access to an allotment within 1200m of home.

Qualitative component

8.5.4 Allotment sites should be of adequate quality and support the needs of the local community. There should be a focus on underperforming sites in order to raise the quality of existing sites.

8.5.5 Generally minor improvements to the infrastructure of allotment sites would make significant differences. Tidy perimeters, including appropriate security measures such as gates and fencing improvements, signage and notice boards and waste management would all change the overall impression.

8.5.6 Alongside the potential for re-use of existing underused open spaces including amenity areas, innovative options for community gardening may need to be examined. Capital Growth is a London wide project to identify 2,012 new spaces for food growing by 2012. There are 20 projects within Newham, within Primary Schools, Community Centres and vacant land. Other recent examples within London include:

- Shoreditch Trust, working with residents of the Kingsland Basin and British Waterways which has brought a disused 1930s hopper barge back into use – as a floating allotment;
- Garden Partners Scheme (Wandsworth) where people on the waiting list are being matched up with people over 60 who are unable to tend their own gardens. The scheme is a partnership between the council’s allotment department, age concern and NHS Wandsworth; and
- Working with private landowners to make better use of the estimated 3,500 hectares of unused brownfield land.
8.6 **CONCLUSIONS**

8.6.1 This chapter sets out the role of allotments and the benefits they offer communities. Allotment provision in the Borough is identified and although there are no official standards for allotments the National Society of Allotment and Leisure Gardeners standards are provided as a guide.

8.6.2 The quality of allotments in the Borough was assessed and although generally the condition of the allotments was good there were a number which were considered unwelcoming. It is recommended that the quality of a number of allotment sites identified in the chapter is improved through general tidying up and removal of barriers.

8.6.3 Using the Civic Trust Green Flag standard assessment however indicates that the majority of sites are of poor quality in terms of appearance, facilities etc.

8.6.4 It is recommended that a programme of improvement works across critical allotment sites is drawn up and implemented.

8.6.5 A demand assessment was undertaken for allotment space in the Borough and indicated that a total of 12ha (latent potential demand) and 12.5ha (latent suppressed demand) would be required in meeting future needs in the Borough up to 2026.
9. QUALITY OF SUPPLY

9.1 INTRODUCTION

9.1.1 Research into Open Space Planning highlights the importance that users of open spaces place on the quality of facilities and condition of landscape.

9.1.2 As qualitative factors are often difficult to assess objectively, it is important to establish a methodology to enable the consistent scoring and ranking of the condition and quality of spaces. Many aspects of open space quality raise detailed issues of management and maintenance which are beyond the scope of this study.

9.2 QUALITY ASSESSMENT

Methodology

9.2.1 The range and condition of facilities within each open space were assessed using scoring criteria derived from the Civic Trust Green Flag standard assessment. The standard is based partly on a physical site appraisal of 27 criteria relating to the range, quality and condition of park facilities and park management arrangements, which accounts for 70% of the overall score and a desk research element which makes up the remaining 30% of the score.

9.2.2 The open space assessment included consideration of 13 green flag criteria which could be assessed through a visual appraisal of the site. The dimensions of quality considered were:

- Whether the space was welcoming;
- Good safe access to the site;
- How well signposted the space is;
- Whether there is equality of access to and within the space;
- The safety of equipment and facilities;
- Levels of personal security within the space;
- Evidence of dog fouling and availability of appropriate provision (dog walks);
- The appropriate provision of facilities for the type of space;
- The quality of facilities;
- The cleanliness of the site including litter and waste management arrangements;
- Standards of grounds maintenance and horticulture;
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- Standards of building and infrastructure maintenance; and
- Standards of equipment maintenance.

9.2.3 The criteria which were not assessed related to the sustainability of management and maintenance practices (4 criteria), arboriculture standards (1 criterion), the level of community involvement (2 criteria), marketing and promotion (2 criteria) and implementation of the park management plan (1 criterion).

9.2.4 Each of the 13 criteria was attributed a score between 0 and 5, where 0 is considered to be very poor and 5 is considered to be excellent. The score for each of the criterion was evaluated against a range of issues relating to each factor. These are described fully in the guide to the site survey pro-forma (Appendix C). The simplified scoring system used to assess each criterion within the standard was as follows:

- 0 - Very Poor;
- 1 - Poor;
- 2 - Fair;
- 3 - Good;
- 4 - Very Good; and
- 5 – Excellent.

9.2.5 Not all of the criteria were applicable to each type of open space (e.g. conservation of buildings, equipment maintenance). Therefore an average score was derived for each open space based upon those aspects of quality considered. However a percentage score was also calculated which assumed all 13 quality variables.

9.2.6 The minimum quality standard required for an open space to reach the Green Flag standard is 66% (taking account of the desktop and site based aspects of the assessment). The open space must achieve an overall score of more than 60% on the site based assessment.

Quality ratings

9.2.7 Table 9-1 below outlines how each type of open space performs against the 13 Green Flag criteria which the sites were assessed against. The average score shows the average of those variables scored at each site, whilst the Average % Score provides an indication of how each site fares against all 17 criteria, an indication of the overall quality of each open space type.
### 9 Quality of Supply

#### Open Space Type Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Open Space Type</th>
<th>Average Score</th>
<th>Average % Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District Park</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>74.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Park/small open space/Neighbourhood Greens</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>58.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pocket Parks</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>38.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear open space / Green Corridors</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>32.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allotments, Community Gardens and Urban Farms</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amenity Greenspace</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cemeteries and Church Yards</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>36.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural or semi-natural Urban Greenspaces</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision for Children</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>47.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Sports Facilities</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**9-1 Quality Assessment by Space Type (Overall Average Score)**

**Analysis**

9.2.8 The findings of this assessment indicate that in terms of the quality of parks and open spaces in the Borough, District Park’s have performed well with a score of almost 75%. The quality of Local Parks scored almost 60%. These figures are slightly lower than those ascertained from the 2005 Residents Survey which found that high percentages of those surveyed were happy with certain features in their parks including 87% with the cleanliness of the parks and 86% with the general appearance of the parks. However this is just a broad assessment as like for like questions were not used in this instance.

9.2.9 All but one of the sites fails to meet the quality standard for Green Flag. Natural and Semi Natural Space performed very poorly with a score of just 12%. This is backed by supporting comments made by assessors which included “does not appear to be well used or easy to access”, “lacks any connections to neighbourhoods owing to distance from them" and “not maintained”.

9.2.10 Local Parks and Open spaces performed just above average with an overall score of 58.9%. Supporting comments made by the assessors found that many of the parks were of good quality with adequate facilities but needed some form of maintenance.
9.2.11 The highest indicator across all types of open space was the welcoming factor of open spaces. Lowest of those indicators is the standards of maintenance of equipment. This included equipment such as children’s play equipment, sports facilities, benches etc. This demonstrates the need for improvements across a number of sites particularly within allotments, amenity greenspace and natural and semi natural greenspaces which performed poorly against the criterion. This is particularly important for amenity greenspace which is a type of space frequented by a variety of users and usually forms the closest area of open space to a resident’s home and often suffers from having no defined or distinct function.

9.2.12 In terms of the space’s performance against Green Flag scoring it is worth noting that although they recommend a scoring range from 0-10 an actual range from 0-5 was used. When compared to the Green Flag scoring line the resulting scores would be skewed and slightly inaccurate therefore it is assumed that the actual scores should be doubled to accurately reflect their position against the Green Flag standards for this purpose.

9.2.13 Using this assumption the majority of sites site scored average across the range of criteria. A good proportion of the site fall between the “Good” and “Very Good” standard for open space with District Parks being rated “Excellent” for their sense of welcoming.

9.2.14 A number of the open spaces however fall within the poor and very poor categories as set by the Green Flag Standards. This is particularly noticeable across the following space types:

- Linear Open spaces;
- Allotments;
- Amenity Greenspace; and
- Natural and Semi Natural Greenspaces.

9.2.15 Improvements to the quality of these spaces should be particularly directed towards these open space typologies, particularly amenity greenspace.

9.2.16 Qualitative assessments need to be integrated with the assessment of the quantity and accessibility of provision. In areas deficient in public open space and where there are limited opportunities to increase supply, either by the creation of new spaces, or by increasing public access to private spaces, the only way of addressing deficiencies is to ensure that the potential of existing spaces is fully realised and there is improved access to them.
### 9.2 Quality Assessment of Open Spaces - Average Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>District Park</th>
<th>Local Park</th>
<th>Pocket Park</th>
<th>Linear open space / Green Corridors</th>
<th>Allotments, Community Gardens and Urban Farms</th>
<th>Amenity Greenspace</th>
<th>Cemeteries and Church Yards</th>
<th>Natural or semi-natural Urban Greenspaces</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Welcoming</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Access</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well Sign posted</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal Accessibility</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety of Facilities</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog Foul</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Facilities</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate Provision of facilities</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clean Litter</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grounds Maintenance</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Maintenance</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment Maintenance</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9.3 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

9.3.1 This chapter sets out an assessment of the quality of supply of open space in the Borough.

9.3.2 The analysis undertaken in this Chapter illustrates that overall the quality of open spaces within the Borough is generally good. Although some spaces such as District Parks and Local Parks performed well when assessed against the Green Flag Standards, some of the spaces such as allotments and natural and semi natural greenspace performed poorly. It is recommended that improvements to their quality of open spaces is directed to these typologies in particular.

9.3.3 The main open space types and larger spaces seem to be well catered for and maintained in Newham however when compared against the other typologies the difference in quality is evident. It is worth noting however that although spaces such as allotments and natural and semi natural greenspace appear to score poorly against for example parks, it may be due to the nature of criteria used as part of the Green Flag Assessment. Some of the questions focus on the provision and quality of certain provisions which may not be wholly appropriate for some natural and semi natural green spaces which may be less formal in their nature and not possess the same type of facilities a park would.
10. **VALUE OF OPEN SPACE**

10.1 **INTRODUCTION**

10.1.1 Value relates to:

- **Context:** Value varies according to the context of the open space. For example, where there is a high level of open space provision in an area, some of it may be of relatively little value. Conversely, where there is very little provision of open space, even a space of mediocre quality may be valuable. From another perspective, space which is inaccessible may be of little value, irrespective of its quality;
- **Level and type of use:** Value should also be interpreted in relation to its use by people and wildlife;
- **Wider benefits:** The value of the open space depends on the benefits generated for people, biodiversity and the wider environment.

10.1.2 Value is therefore a different concept to quality. The benefits and value of open spaces to local communities extends beyond their active recreational role. Both public and private open spaces perform recreational and non-recreational roles contributing to community and quality of life. These roles are examined under the following headings:

- Recreational;
- Structural;
- Amenity;
- Historical / Heritage;
- Ecological;
- Educational;
- Cultural; and
- Social.

**Recreational Value**

10.1.3 The recreational value of open spaces in Newham has been assessed by considering the recreational roles performed at each site and the indications of informal use. While active recreational roles include sports and other active recreational activities such as allotment gardening, informal recreational activities include walking and dog walking, children’s play, teenagers ‘hanging out’, relaxation and other pastimes such as remembrance at memorial gardens and cemeteries.

10.1.4 A recreation score was derived for each open space based upon the number of active and informal recreational roles each space performed, whether they represented a major or minor role within the open space and
whether there was dedicated provision or the activity was supported informally. Indications of informal use were also included within the score.

10.1.5 From this exercise, a standardised % score for each space was derived.

10.1.6 Table 10.1 below identifies the recreation role of open spaces. The table also sets out where a dedicated provision or informal provision of each recreation type is provided for.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recreation Type Pitch Sports</th>
<th>Sites With Each Sport Type</th>
<th>Dedicated provision of facilities</th>
<th>Informal provision of facilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACTIVE RECREATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pitch Sports</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12.903</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court Sports</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13.978</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf/ Putting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5376</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equestrian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water sports</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Activity (Active)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.4516</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INFORMAL RECREATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking/ Dog Walking</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>52.688</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children’s Play</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>27.419</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teenagers Hanging Out</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>26.344</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sitting Out/Relaxation</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>36.559</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycling</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>26.882</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Activity/ Pastime</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11.29</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10-1 Recreational Role of Open Spaces

10.1.7 The table indicates that the most common role that spaces perform is for dog walking and sitting out and relaxing. Over 50% of sites were used for
dog walking with 36% using spaces for sitting out and relaxing. Using spaces for children’s play and cycling was also common.

10.1.8 49 of the Children’s play spaces assessed benefitting from a dedicated provision of facilities which is an indicator of the type of facilities which would be present at such sites.

10.1.9 The survey also recorded use of open spaces for informal uses which do not require the provision of dedicated or specialist facilities. The results are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Informal Use</th>
<th>No. Open Spaces</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Skateboarding</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycling</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball practice areas</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kick-about areas</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog Walking</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10-2 Indications of Informal Use of Open Space

**Structural Role**

10.1.10 The structural role of open spaces can be described as the value of the space on the physical landscape of an area. Identified by site surveys, these areas are shown in Table 10.3. Please refer to Appendix D for the full survey of each area of open space.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structural Role</th>
<th>No. Open Spaces</th>
<th>% Total Area of all Open Space</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clearly distinguishable from the built up area providing separation between different communities</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>54.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributes to Newham’s special identity</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>36.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creates a positive and significant open space experience when passed or crossed while travelling</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>52.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
on adjacent main road networks and railway

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contributes to ‘sense of place’ of the local area</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helps to separate / define districts / parts of districts</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodates recognised and recognisable features</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of local importance (e.g. buildings / structures, landscape, events / activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total open spaces with structural role</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total open spaces with no structural role</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10-3 Structural Role of Open Spaces

10.1.11 Table 10.3 shows that over 76% of all sites fulfil at least one of the structural roles identified above. The most common structural role is where spaces are clearly distinguishable from the built up area providing separation between different communities.

10.1.12 Open spaces, such as public parks and gardens, cemeteries, green spaces within grounds of institutions, and allotments often provide a physical and visual break between residential areas, and help to ensure that the Borough can continue to offer a high quality environment and landscape quality. This is especially important in a high density, inner Borough like Newham. Open spaces are therefore a vital component of the Borough’s overall physical structure.

Amenity Value

10.1.13 The manner in which open space contributes to the visual amenity of its surroundings is influenced by the amount of open space in the area, the visual envelope of the open space and the contribution it makes to the street scene.

10.1.14 The following criteria were used to assess the amenity value of open spaces in LB Newham (See guide to pro-forma Appendix C for more specific criteria definitions):

- Is it visible from parts of the surrounding area?
- Is it visually attractive?
- Does it have a clearly definable townscape value?
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- Does it provide relief from the built up area?
- Does the site mitigate visual impact of unsightly land uses (through buffering or screening for example)?

10.1.15 If the open space meets one or more of the above criteria it is considered to offer ‘significant amenity value’- the more criteria the space meets the greater the amenity value of the space. The overall amenity value of open spaces within the District is summarised within Table 10-4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amenity Value</th>
<th>No. Open Spaces</th>
<th>% Total Area of all Open Spaces</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Visible from parts of the surrounding area</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>48.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visually attractive</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearly definable townscape value</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides relief from the built up area</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>57.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigates visual impact of unsightly land uses</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefit to business through visual beauty</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amenity to people working within walking dist</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total open space with amenity value</strong></td>
<td><strong>142</strong></td>
<td><strong>76.3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No amenity role</strong></td>
<td><strong>44</strong></td>
<td><strong>23.7</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10-4 Amenity Role of Open Spaces

10.1.16 Just over 76% of sites in Newham provide an amenity value based on one or more of the criteria identified above.
10.1.17 Two sites have been identified in the Borough which are present on the English Heritage Register for Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest. They are:

- City of London Cemetery
- West Ham Park

10.1.18 The Borough also has two Scheduled Ancient Monuments:

- Remains of Stratford Langthorne Abbey and;
- World War Two Gun Emplacements below Beckton Park.

10.1.19 The English Heritage Register for Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest identifies nine phases of park and garden development criteria which any site must meet to warrant inclusion on the register:

- Sites with a main phase of development before 1750 where any layout of this date is still evident;
- Sites with a main phase of development laid out between 1750 and 1820 where enough of the landscaping survives to reflect the original design;
- Sites with a main phase of development between 1820 and 1880 which is of importance and survives intact or relatively intact;
- Sites with a main phase of development between 1880 and 1939 where this is of importance and survives intact;
- Sites with a main phase of development laid out post-war, but more than 30 years ago, where the work is of exceptional importance;
- Sites which were influential in the development of taste whether through reputation or references in literature;
- Sites which are early or representative examples of a style of layout, or a type of site, or the work of a designer (amateur or professional) of national importance;
- Sites having an association with significant persons or historical events;
- Sites with strong value.

10.1.20 These criteria, set by English Heritage, make specific reference to ‘Parks and Gardens’ only. Many of the open spaces assessed as part of this study do not qualify as either a Park or Garden. However, cemeteries
do fall within the scope of the Register criteria and should be assessed for inclusion.

10.1.21 Newham has nine conservation areas varying in age, character and size. These include residential neighbourhoods with a distinctive character such as the Woodgrange Estate, town centres including Stratford and part of East Ham, and former industrial areas such as 3 Mills and Sugarhouse Lane.

Education

10.1.22 Open spaces can represent an educational resource for both children and adults either on an organised basis, such as schools using open spaces for activities linked to the curriculum, or on a more informal basis such as nature walks. Educational roles should be assessed in terms of the potential benefit to the wider community (not just schools) and include:

- Sport / Organised Games – Sites should be assessed for signs of existing use by schools for active recreation;
- Nature / Environmental Study – Sites should have a range of ecological/ environmental features. For the sites to have an existing role there should be some form of interpretation provision (e.g. boards, leaflets, programme of events); and
- Historical Interpretation / understanding – Open spaces which form part of the setting for any of the heritage designations including English Heritage Registered Historic Parks and Gardens, conservation areas, listed buildings, Scheduled Ancient Monuments, or sites located within the extent of the proposed World Heritage Site boundary and buffer zone. For the sites to have an existing role there should be some form of interpretation provision (boards, leaflets part of trail).

10.1.23 Open spaces were assessed on site for signs of use by schools such as for environmental education. In order to enhance use for environmental education and to fully establish the educational role that open spaces play a separate survey was sent out to all schools in the Borough with questions relating to the provision of sports pitches and indoor sports facilities in schools.

10.1.24 Questions included:
- Number of pitches and their use;
- Quality of pitches; and
10.1.25 This survey provided an overview of school facilities in the Borough and allowed opportunities for the possibility of dual usage of facilities. Of the respondents (18 in total) just two indicated that they currently have a community use/dual agreement for their pitches. 6 of the respondents indicated that they would be responsive to opening up their pitch facilities for community use in the future. These schools were:

- St James Church of England Junior School;
- Gallions Primary School;
- Elmhurst Primary School;
- Kaizen Primary School;
- Gainsborough Primary School; and
- Selwyn Primary.

10.1.26 It is worth noting that in a number of cases this question was not applicable rather than negative as they did not have the appropriate facilities.

10.1.27 The dual usage of schools facilities has the potential to supply additional capacity of open space for the Borough, particularly sports pitches. The 2002 Playing Pitches report (see Chapter 11) reported on the demand for sports pitches in the Borough and found that a variety of clubs were seeking better quality pitches with a range of facilities with Rugby clubs in the Borough citing a lack of training facilities as a major constraint.

10.1.28 Further exploration with those schools who indicated the possibility of dual usage is recommended.

**Ecological Role**

10.1.29 The Government has set out the need to promote biodiversity through the preparation of Local Biodiversity Action Plans (LBAPs) which include the provision of natural and semi-natural green space.

10.1.30 Whilst the site appraisals did not include an ecological appraisal of open space sites, the study has considered the extent to which open spaces represent accessible natural or semi-natural greenspace consistent with the English Nature definition. Suggested standards of access to natural greenspace have also been recommended.

10.1.31 Although no sites of national importance are present in the Borough the non-designated network of copses, hedgerows, small woodlands, ponds and watercourses form the ecological fabric of the Borough.
10.2 CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

10.2.1 This chapter sets out the value afforded to open space in the Borough in relation to context, level and type of use and the wider benefits. The chapter distinguishes between the value and quality of open space.

10.2.2 The recreational value of open spaces in Newham was assessed by considering the roles performed at each site and any indications of informal use. The assessment indicated that the most common role for open spaces is for dog walking and sitting and relaxing. A number of informal uses were also identified including skateboarding and cycling.

10.2.3 In terms of a structural role the assessment found that 76% of sites fulfil many of the structural roles identified with the most common being where spaces are clearly distinguishable from the built up area.

10.2.4 In terms of amenity value 76% of spaces provided an amenity value based on criteria such as visually attractive, mitigates visual impact of unsightly land uses etc.

10.2.5 The heritage value of spaces was recognized with two site in the Borough being present on the English Heritage Register for Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest (City of London Cemetery and West Ham Park) and two Scheduled Ancient Monuments.

10.2.6 The educational role open spaces play is also recognised. A survey of schools in the Borough was undertaken seeking information such as number of sports pitches, quality of pitches and other sports facilities. A number of schools with the appropriate facilities indicated that they may be responsive to the dual usage of their facilities with the wider community offer scope to dealing with identified deficiencies in the Borough. Further exploration with those schools who indicated the possibility of dual usage is recommended.

10.2.7 Although the ecological role of the spaces was not assessed the study has identified the non designated network of hedgerows, woodlands etc. as contributing towards the ecological value of the Borough.
11. OPEN SPACE STANDARDS

11.1 INTRODUCTION

11.1.1 A series of locally based open space standards have been recommended based upon the findings of the assessment of local open space needs within the Borough, and are summarised in Table 11.1. The assessment, summarised within the preceding chapters of this document, has considered the supply, quality and value of all types of open space provision within Newham and levels of demand for playing pitch and allotment provision. The analysis of local needs has also informed an open space hierarchy for Public Park and natural and semi-natural greenspace provision within the Borough.

11.1.2 Assessing Needs and Opportunities, the companion guide to PPG17, recommends that local authorities set local provision standards which incorporate a quantitative, qualitative and accessibility component.

11.1.3 The purpose of these standards is to afford adequate levels of provision for each type of open space within the Borough based upon existing needs and the future needs of the Borough up to 2026. The standards identified at the end of the relevant chapters and summarised in Table 11.1 will enable the formulation of planning policies to protect existing open spaces where appropriate and to identify areas where additional open space provision is required.

11.1.4 Whilst planning policies are an effective mechanism to deliver an appropriate level of open space provision and to improve access to open space within the Borough, it is also necessary to prepare an open space strategy to secure improvements to the quality and value of open spaces. Such a strategy will be based upon the qualitative requirements which have been highlighted within this assessment. The study has identified areas of the Borough and individual spaces which should be prioritised for enhancement within such a strategy.

11.1.5 We do not recommend that a quantitative standard is adopted for the provision of amenity greenspace. However, it is expected that a design led approach would be used to identify the level of provision appropriate to the context (i.e. levels of overall open space needs, whether the site is located within a conservation area) and the scale and type of the individual residential, employment or mixed use development.

11.1.6 Supplementary planning guidance should be prepared identifying the design criteria to be used to incorporate amenity greenspace appropriate to particular types of development.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Open Space Type</th>
<th>Quantity Standard</th>
<th>Area required to meet needs up to 2026</th>
<th>Accessibility Standard</th>
<th>Quality Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Parks</td>
<td>0.78ha per 1000 population</td>
<td>An additional 87ha would be required to meet projected demand.</td>
<td>All residents within the Borough should have access to an area of public park within 400m of home.</td>
<td>Public parks within the District should meet the Green Flag ‘good’ quality standard. Open spaces identified within Chapter 10 for improvement should be prioritised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Park</td>
<td>0.28ha per 1000 population</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>All residents within the Borough should have access to a District Park within 1.2km of home (extended by 400m close to transport corridors)</td>
<td>Public parks within the District should meet the Green Flag ‘good’ quality standard. Open spaces identified within Chapter 10 for improvement should be prioritised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Park</td>
<td>0.44ha per 1000 population</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>All residents within the Borough should have access to an area of public park within 400m of home.</td>
<td>Public parks within the District should meet the Green Flag ‘good’ quality standard. Open spaces identified within Chapter 10 for improvement should be prioritised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pocket park</td>
<td>0.006ha per 1000 population</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>All residents within the Borough should have access to an area of public park less than 400m from</td>
<td>Public parks within the District should meet the Green Flag ‘good’ quality standard. Open spaces identified within Chapter 10 for improvement should be prioritised.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 11 Open Space Standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Specification</th>
<th>Provision Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Children's Play</strong></td>
<td>10 sq m of dedicated playspace per child</td>
<td>All residents within the Borough should have access to areas of formal and informal play provision for children and teenagers within 400m of home.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>63 heactres in total (to be reviewed following full assessment of quantum of children’s play sites)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Natural and Semi-Natural Greenspace</strong></td>
<td>1ha per 1000 population</td>
<td>Areas of natural and semi-natural greenspace should be of adequate quality and support local biodiversity and meet the requirements set out in the BAP..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>an accessible natural greenspace of at least 2 hectares in size, no more than 300 metres (5 minutes walk) from home</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>at least one accessible 20 hectare site within two kilometres of home</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>one hectare of statutory Local Nature Reserves per thousand population.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Allotments</strong></td>
<td>0.125ha per 1000 population</td>
<td>Allotment sites should be of adequate quality and support the needs of the local community. This includes ensuring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26.5 hectares</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All residents within the Borough should be of adequate quality and provide the range of facilities associated with the size of the facility.
11.2 PLAYING PITCH PROVISION

Quantitative Component

11.2.1 A Playing Pitch Assessment and Strategy for the London Borough of Newham was undertaken by PMP Consultancy in May 2002. The strategy was further updated by a report by Continuum Consultants in 2007.

11.2.2 The strategy:

- analysed the current level of pitch provision within the Borough;
- provided information to inform decisions and determine future development proposals in the Borough; and
- assisted the Council in meeting the demand for playing pitches in accordance with the methodology developed by Sport England in conjunction with the National Playing Fields Association (NPFA) and the Central Council for Physical Recreation (CCPR).

11.2.3 The report outlined the key findings arising from the consultation and analysis undertaken, highlighting major areas of deficiency, problems and areas of opportunity.

11.2.4 At the time there were 91 playing pitches in the Borough which included public, private, school, MoD and other pitches whether or not they are in secured public use. They comprised:

- 50 adult football pitches;
- 24 junior football pitches;
- 13 cricket pitches;
- 3 adult rugby pitches; and
- full size adult hockey pitch (synthetic turf pitch).

11.2.5 Of these pitches 67 (74%) are full-size adult football, cricket, rugby and hockey pitches. This equates to circa one pitch for every 2,637 adults (16+ estimated at 176,712) in the Borough. This ratio compares very poorly with the estimated equivalent national figure of one pitch for every 989
people and the majority of other local authorities for which the data is currently available as shown in Table 4.1.

11.2.6 The report found that the majority of playing pitches (66%) are located in three CFAs (East Ham, Beckton and West Ham) with the remaining seven CFAs have, on average, 3.8 hectares of playing pitches each. All CFAs have at least one pitch but Stratford has no pitches with secured community use.

Accessibility Component

11.2.7 No accessibility standards were set out in the report.

Qualitative Component

11.2.8 Postal Questionnaires were dispatched to all known clubs and schools and colleges in the borough and a review of all facility listing was undertaken as part of the study.

11.2.9 The clubs and schools were asked about their perceptions of pitch quality via the postal questionnaire and through telephone calls. Sports Development Officers, Sports Governing Bodies, other local authority representatives and league secretaries were also asked their views on the quality of provision in the Borough. The following provides a summary of these responses.

11.2.10 The key quality issues raised by clubs include:

- football clubs indicated that they were most dissatisfied with showers/toilets at facilities;
- satisfaction levels for changing facilities, facilities for the disabled and value for money were also low for football clubs;
- the quality of pitches and standard of ancillary facilities were considered high priorities for improvement by football clubs;
- cricket facilities were generally rated as good. This results from the fact that all clubs using facilities within the Borough use West Ham Park and therefore their ratings related to this facility which is considered to provide good quality provision;
- maintenance and general quality of cricket facilities provided by the Council is considered to be poor. As a result many clubs choose to use facilities outside of the Borough or West Ham Park. In particular the provision at Gooseley Playing Fields was considered to be dangerous due to poor maintenance;
- drainage of the main rugby pitch at Memorial Ground was reported to be poor. It was highlighted that pitches at Memorial Recreation Ground are currently the only usable rugby pitches available; and
there is a lack of parking at pitch sport facilities throughout the Borough.

11.2.11 The quality of pitches in Newham was determined through site visits. Overall the quality of pitches was seen to be good to average. The main factors taken into consideration when rating the pitches were:

- is the pitch level?
- is the pitch well drained?
- does the pitch appear to be well maintained?
- are the pitches well marked?

11.2.12 The ratings can be interpreted as follows:

- good – no/ very little repair required;
- average – some repairs/ improvements needed; and
- poor – in need of serious improvement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site visited</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>West Ham Park</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Excellent quality pitches.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flanders Playing Field</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Flat, well maintained pitches.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barking Road Recreation Ground</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Flat, well maintained pitches.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gooseley Playing Fields</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Pitches generally good but dressing rooms considered to be poor quality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kier Hardie Recreation Ground</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>No goals on site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrence McMillan Stadium</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good quality pitch.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyle Park</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Improved drainage required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Ilford Park</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Uneven. Not waterlogged.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brampton Park</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Pitches uneven. Poor drainage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Players Club</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>One pitch very good. Some pitches uneven with poor markings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beckton District Park</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Some pitches uneven. Poor drainage on some pitches. Changing facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site visited</td>
<td>Rating</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Beckton Park</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Pitches appear well used. Muddy/worn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canning Town Recreation Ground</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Poor drainage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memorial Recreation Ground</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Posts old and rusty. Issues with waterlogging of rugby pitch. Overall drainage poor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Star Park</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Poor drainage and uneven surface.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


DEMAND

11.2.13 A variety of clubs were assessed for potential demand and many of the comments indicated a high demand for better quality facilities. The main priorities for improvement for football clubs identified (in order of importance) were:

- quality and maintenance of the pitches (ten respondents);
- changing rooms/shower/toilets (five respondents);
- parking (one respondent); and
- floodlighting (one respondent).

11.2.14 Cricket Clubs states that constraints they faced included:

- inadequate maintenance resulting in a poor standard of provision within the Borough;
- relationships with schools (facility usage/exit routes etc); and
- lack of appropriately qualified coaches.

11.2.15 Rugby clubs states that their main constraints included The main constraints raised were:

- waterlogging of the main pitch at Memorial Recreation Ground; and
- a lack of training facilities (East London Rugby Club would like an STP at Memorial Recreation Ground for training).
11.3 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

11.3.1 This chapter provides details on a series of locally based open space standards which have been recommended based upon the findings of the assessment of local open space needs in the Borough. These are summarised in Table 11.1. These standards will enable the formulation of planning policies to protect existing open spaces where appropriate and to identify areas where additional open space provision is required.

11.3.2 Whilst these policies will aid in the delivery of appropriate levels of open space provision a wider Open Space Strategy is recommend which should be based on the qualitative requirements set out in this study as well as enhancing those spaces identified in this study.

11.3.3 This chapter also provides details on a Playing Pitch Assessment and Strategy undertaken for Newham which analysed the level and quality of pitch provision in the Borough as well as analysing future demand for the Borough. The Strategy concluded that the quality of pitches in the Borough was good to average whilst future demand sought the increase in facilities of a better quality.
12. A STRATEGY FOR ACTION

12.1 INTRODUCTION

12.1.1 This chapter considers how the open space needs identified within the study can potentially be addressed and prioritised. There are four different types of action:

- Consideration of the potential scope for change and improvement of individual open space sites;
- Addressing existing open space needs through the definition of a green network concept which provides a series of priorities to help guide the Council in preparing its open space strategy;
- Identification of how existing deficiencies in open space quantity, quality and access may be addressed to better meet local needs through enhancement of the existing green network; and
- Identification of an approach to areas where existing levels of provision have been met.

Action In Respect Of Individual Sites

12.1.2 The open space site assessments included identification of the physical potential for site to accommodate a range of possible changes. The evaluation of potential is intended to identify possible opportunities and not to assess the feasibility of improvements or identify particular projects.

12.1.3 Table 12.1 provides a summary of the overall number of open spaces with scope for each of the changes/improvements, and Appendix E lists those individual sites identified as having potential for improvement or change under each category.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scope for change/Improvement Categories</th>
<th>Number of Sites</th>
<th>% of all Open Spaces</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Potential for improved site utilisation (through site redesign / improvement)</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>38.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential opportunities for introducing other open space uses</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential for usage which could contribute</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>36.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table: Scope for Change/Improvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential for Change/Improvement</th>
<th>Sites</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Potential to improve landscaping</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>40.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential to improve accessibility within the park</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>29.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential for enhancing historic value</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical potential to intensify use of existing pitches</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical potential for changing rooms / social facilities</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical potential for additional pitches</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No real scope for improvement</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 12.2 Potential for Improved Utilisation

12.2.1 During the course of the open space site assessments some 72 sites (38% of open spaces) were identified as having potential for improved site utilisation.

12.2.2 Detailed study indicates that some of these are either areas within the site which have no particular role or purpose, or that there are facilities or parts of the site which may be under used perhaps due to the quality of the environment or the condition of existing provision.

#### 12.3 Potential Opportunities for Introducing Other Open Space Uses

12.3.1 23% of the sites were identified as having potential for the introduction of other open space uses. Generally this indicates that either all or part of the site does not currently fulfil the primary open space function suggested by its place within the open space hierarchy. There is potential for either re-defining the primary role of the space or the potential to diversify the range of open space functions currently performed by the space, in order to increase its value to the community.

#### 12.4 Potential for Usage Which Could Contribute to Social and Regeneration Objectives

12.4.1 The site assessment identified 67 sites (36%) where potential exists for the usage which could contribute towards delivering social or regeneration objectives.
benefits to the surrounding area. Improvements to facilities or other qualitative improvements could contribute towards the improvement of the local environment thus assisting in sustaining and enhancing the quality of life in the surrounding area. This is an important aspect for Newham given its strategic position within the overall Olympic area.

12.5 POTENTIAL TO IMPROVE LANDSCAPING

12.5.1 Some 76 sites (40% of all sites) were identified as having potential for improved landscaping and environmental quality. This is a significant proportion of all open spaces in the Borough and although this is not such an indicator that a certain site is in very poor condition it does emphasise the potential which may exist for the improvement of sites. Minor landscaping to the sites would improve their quality and offer to the community.

12.6 POTENTIAL TO IMPROVE ACCESSIBILITY WITHIN THE PARK

12.6.1 A total of 55 sites (almost 30% of all sites) were identified as having potential for improved internal accessibility. Such sites were identified because they have barriers to pedestrians, cyclists or those with mobility difficulties which preclude or discourage (poor paths and through-routes) potential users from the space.

12.7 POTENTIAL TO IMPROVE HISTORIC VALUE

12.7.1 The open spaces of cultural heritage value within the Borough should be seen as key interpretation assets for schools and lifelong learning programmes. A total of 23 sites were identified as having scope for improved cultural heritage value. Improved intelligibility of the open spaces can be achieved through enhancements such as planting and modern landscaping which reflects the original forms and also through the use of sensitive and appropriate interpretation facilities such as information boards, signposting and portable media e.g. pamphlets.

12.8 ROLE OF EXISTING OPEN SPACES

**Public Open Spaces**

12.8.1 There are a large number of public open spaces in the Borough. The Borough’s parks and gardens offer a wide range of facilities and are capable of providing space for a large number of activities and people as well as attracting people from outside the Borough. Many of the parks offer a variety of facilities for sport such as pitches, tennis and areas of play for children. The assessment has identified 32 public parks within the
borough. The resident’s survey has indicated an overall satisfaction with the Boroughs parks. An assessment of the range of facilities within the parks found that a large proportion of public parks provide a full range of facilities. In terms of the quality of parks in the Borough the assessment found that many of the parks were of high quality.

Outdoor sports provision

12.8.2 Outdoor sports provision in the Borough consists of specific site with a focus on sports and recreation including playing pitches etc. but also includes other site with outdoor sports provision within them. An assessment of standalone sites was undertaken as part of the assessment. Many of the spaces provided areas for dedicated pitches, court sports etc. a previous more detailed study was undertaken in 2002 which assessed the quality and demand of the Borough’s sports facilities. The survey indicated a lack of training facilities in the Borough and a demand for better quality facilities.

Amenity Greenspace

12.8.3 Amenity Greenspace in the Borough plays an important function in providing areas of space for relaxation and recreation close to residents home. There are 78 areas of amenity greenspace in the Borough, many of which fulfil the role of serving residential area. A full list of the sites in contained in Appendix B.

12.8.4 The quality of amenity space in the borough was not exceptional. Many of the sites were found to be badly maintained and of poor quality with a number of sites suffering from poorly maintained equipment. This highlights the need for an improvement and maintenance programme for the spaces. This is particularly important in the Borough as these spaces are often the first area of open space people will use.

Provision for children and young people

12.8.5 Provision for children and young people in Borough is catered for through a variety of stand-alone sites providing facilities for play and recreation as well as facilities within other areas of open space.

12.8.6 The provision of facilities for children and young people is important in facilitating opportunities for play and physical activity and the development of movement and social skills. A variety of types of open space can provide children and young people with these opportunities, but the audit uses the principle of ‘primary purpose’, so provision for children and young people focuses on equipped play areas. For young children an assessment of LAP’s, LEAP’s and NEAP’s was undertaken whilst for young persons and teenagers spaces providing facilities for skateboarding, cycling, basketball and kick about areas were assessed.
**Natural and Semi Natural Greenspace**

12.8.7 The Borough’s natural and semi-natural greenspaces provide a wide range of opportunities for people to relax in a natural environment whilst also providing valuable habitat for wildlife. Sites include natural areas and sites designated as local nature reserves. This type of space is important in an urban borough such as Newham which is typically high density and generally lacks large amounts of green open space. There are 13 sites within the Borough including 2 Local Nature Reserves. These Nature reserves are important for the borough in terms of bio diversity. As well as fulfilling an important role as an area of accessible greenspace they also have provide the opportunity to provide a role in education for the Borough’s primary schools. Although the quality of some of the spaces assessed was found to be generally good, especially at East Ham Nature Reserve, some of the sites were found to be inaccessible and isolated. This highlights the need for a strategy to address accessibility of this type of space.

**Allotments**

12.8.8 Allotments in Newham were seen to provide a wide variety of functions including promoting sustainability through growing your own food, recycling and composting as well as providing leisure, recreation and source of well being. The assessment considered both public and private allotments in the Borough. Accessibility of sites was generally limited to those holding keys to the sites. The quality of sites was also assessed which found that some of the sites benefitted from good quality facilities however number of the sites suffered from untidiness and unattractive appearances.

12.8.9 A programme for environmental improvement and maintenance should focus on allotments in the Borough.

12.8.10 Cemeteries and Churchyards provide a valuable contribution to open space but can sometime be overlooked. They offer a relaxing area for quiet contemplation for relatives of those whose final resting place lies within them and often contribute greatly to biodiversity. They also often a sanctuary for wildlife in urban areas and particularly in Newham, where there is over 131ha of cemetery and churchyard space. This contributes greatly to the provision of open space in the Borough as well as providing opportunity for wildlife. Although some of the sites in the Borough have restricted access many of them have general public access.

12.9 **Strategy for the Future**
The findings and recommendations of this study should inform the Local Development framework;

The Council should ensure that a high quality of open space is given appropriate weight so that it can be used to develop relevant management and maintenance regimes;

Design guidelines should be developed for implementation where new open spaces are proposed; and

Consideration should be given to a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) setting out standards of on-site open space provision or level of contribution towards off-site provision expected from developers.