

North Hinksey Parish Council Leisure Working Group

Interim report to Recreation & Amenities Committee, 21st April 2016

Contents of this report

Progress since last report.....	1
Assessment of youth leisure options against agreed criteria.....	1
Consultation on leisure needs for elderly / mobility impaired.....	3
Consultation on youth leisure provision.....	3
Conclusions and next steps.....	4
Appendix: Summary of preferred youth options against agreed criteria.....	5

Progress since last report

Since January the Leisure Working Group has continued its work within two agreed areas: exploring the feasibility of new leisure provision for older children and teenagers within the parish, and identifying the leisure needs and potential barriers to access for elderly and mobility-impaired parishioners.

Since last reported the Leisure Working Group has met on 11th February and 14th April. The work during this period has focused on applying the previously agreed criteria to identified preferred options for youth provision (adventure playground, skatepark, youth club for ages 13+), and on initiating consultation with both elderly parishioners and youth.

Assessment of youth leisure options against agreed criteria

At the 11th February meeting, each sub-groups working on the three preferred youth options presented its research to date with reference to 13 agreed criteria (detailed in the interim report of 28th January 2016):

1. Evidence of demand / projected use
2. Impact on other users / residents
3. Environmental impact
4. Impact on neighbouring facilities:
5. Land provision / space needed
6. Access
7. Availability of equivalent facilities in neighbouring areas
8. Capital costs
9. Potential funding available
10. Maintenance costs
11. Security
12. Risk management
13. Accessibility (costs to users)

Discussion points raised for each option are summarized below:

a) Adventure Playground

- Evidence of demand needed in more detail
- Need to tap into expertise of Cumnor Parish Council (recent experience of providing the Glebe and Pinnock's Way play parks) as well as to liaise with district council on procedures for this type of leisure provision.
- Some types of equipment (e.g. outdoor gym equipment) has proved popular elsewhere such as Oxford City parks and caters to a wide age range.
- Huge variation in costs depending on specific type and amount of equipment selected – would need a way of identifying preferred equipment to get realistic cost estimates for funding applications.

b) Skatepark

- Size would be in the range of 300-500 square meters (same size or somewhat smaller than the MUGA).
- Construction costs estimated £80k-£100k depending on size and features (minimum £60k for the smallest, simplest option).
- Maintenance costs estimated at £1k per year.
- Tilbury fields site would be 30-40 meters to nearest housing. This plus the fact that the land is not currently owned by NHPC would probably rule it out.
- Louie Memorial Upper field site would be 180m to nearest housing. However it is green belt land and would very likely require planning permission to build a skatepark there. Specific information (costs, impacts, detailed design) would need to be provided before a formal planning process could be initiated.
- Noise would be a key issue and would need formal assessment through the planning process.
- Environmental impact would also need professional assessment.
- Need to develop a full consultation plan and involve specific groups, e.g. near neighbours.
- Past surveys and petition are suggestive of demand, but consultation would need to assess current demand/projected usage levels. (Collect direct feedback from potential users)
- Need to consider potential impacts such as anti-social behaviour and involve local police in consultation process.

c) Youth Club

- Current usage of North Hinksey youth club is approximately 30-35 kids per week, but can get as high as 60 per week in the summer. Currently only caters for children ages 10-12; new provision would cater for ages 13+.
- There have been discussions with Mace about potential space in the proposed community building for West Way, but currently it is uncertain if this will be provided and if so it would not be available for another 2 years.
- Biggest costs for a youth club are set-up of facilities and staff costs for trained youth workers. It was noted that with older youth professional support is essential since this user group has more complex needs.
- Need to consider impacts on neighbouring facilities, e.g. other local cafés if a youth café model were followed. But it was noted that a youth café would

only be open to youth members rather than competing directly with other cafés for business from members of the public.

- Need to assess if there are other nearby youth clubs (e.g. at Dean Court) that would be affected.
- Could consider using youth club space for other community purposes (e.g. selling books) during school hours.
- Health & safety and safeguarding would be key issues.

At the 14th April meeting a summary of the issues identified above was reviewed. Each criterion for each option was colour-coded to aid in assessing the overall feasibility of pursuing each option: green (no significant issues requiring detailed investigation or likely to impede implementation), yellow (significant further investigation / action required), red (serious issue which quite probably could stop implementation). With the exception of outdoor facilities at the Tilbury Fields site, all criteria for all options were coded as either green or yellow – see Appendix for detailed breakdown.

On this basis the Leisure Working Group agreed that all three options would continue to go forward for further fact finding, investigation and consultation with parishioners.

Consultation on leisure needs for elderly / mobility impaired

At the 11th February meeting the sub-group investigating leisure needs for elderly and mobility-impaired parishioners proposed doing targeted research through known individual contacts and community facilities / organizations that include elderly users (e.g. lunch club, doctors' surgery, library). A four-question survey was presented and discussed. This survey would prompt open-ended responses on:

- Regular events, clubs or social groups currently attended
- Interest level for regular drop-in coffee or chat sessions
- Events, clubs or societies they would like to see started
- Support needed for getting out of the house or accessing leisure opportunities

It was noted that a phone number should be provided on the survey so that it could be collected from people who aren't mobile.

The Leisure Working Group agreed to go forward with this targeted consultation.

At the 14th April meeting the sub-group reported back that this consultation is now underway, with 20 surveys received back so far and plans to distribute the survey more widely through councillor's individual networks.

Consultation on youth leisure provision

At the 11th February meeting the Leisure Working Group agreed in principle to pursue a targeted youth consultation, but the timing and scope of this consultation was as yet unclear.

At the 14th April meeting the consultation process was revisited, and the Leisure Working Group agreed to pursue a three-stage consultation:

- 1) Consultation with youth (focused on assessing current levels of demand for each of the preferred options, and involving youth in their specific designs)
- 2) Consultation with targeted groups of parishioners who might be affected most by new leisure provision, e.g. neighbours near to proposed sites (focused on impacts to residents and what might be done to mitigate them)
- 3) Parish-wide consultation

A first consultation with youth was deemed a priority. After discussion of potential consultation models the Leisure Working Group agreed that the formation of a youth forum (expert user group) to work with Councillors on the design of preferred options and strategies for wider youth consultation is a good way forward. It was agreed to hold a first youth forum event in May, open to any young people (ages 10-18) within the parish who might be interested in taking part. It was agreed to advertise the event through the Sprout, school newsletters, and local youth organisations. Young people could express their interest in advance via email or the NHPC Facebook page, and/or they could simply drop in to the first event.

Conclusions and next steps

The Leisure Working Group will continue to explore all three preferred options for youth leisure provision (adventure playground, skatepark, youth club for ages 13+) through further fact finding, investigation and consultation with parishioners.

The consultation with elderly and mobility-impaired parishioners to identify their leisure needs is ongoing.

The first youth forum event has been set for **Sunday 15th May, at 4pm in Seacourt Hall**. Members of the Leisure Working Group will gather some open-ended feedback on potential demand for different types of youth leisure facilities, as well as present the three preferred options for more specific feedback.

Cllr Caroline Potter

Chair, NHPC Leisure Working Group

19th April 2016

Appendix: Summary of preferred youth options against agreed criteria

Adventure playground

Criterion	Site *	Major points	Further actions required
1. Evidence of demand / projected use	Both	Limited data from Neighbourhood Plan public event suggests some interest, but more data needed to gauge wider interest	Consultation on general demand / projected usage levels and options for specific equipment. Liaise with CPC on their usage levels of play parks with similar equipment.
2. Impact on other users / residents	Both	Noise consistent with people gathering in open spaces. No light impacts per se but would be if floodlit. Security issues (access, potential for damage)	Noise associated with specific equipment would need to be assessed. Consider if fencing would be desirable.
3. Environmental Impact	Both (1) (2)	Potential impact on wildlife and drainage Need to consider potential impacts on the fen Location unlikely to result in significant impacts	Hydrological & wildlife surveys as required
4. Impact on neighbouring facilities	Both	Potential overlap with equipment at the Glebe, Fogwell Road, Oatlands Road. Not seen as problematic since these are open-access facilities and cater mainly for near neighbours.	Check that any proposed equipment would not compete directly with provision at Brooks Sport Botley (not anticipated).
5. Land provision / space needed	Both (1)	Variable, from 35 sq m for single equipment up to 500 sq m (size of MUGA) for a full play park. Already NHPC owned, space available	Confirm if planning application required
	(2)	Not yet owned by NHPC, could take until 2017, restrictions?	Negotiations with Persimmon on transfer of land
6. Access	Both (1) (2)	Generally accessible Accessible on foot for majority of parish, accessible by bus and car Accessible on foot for northern part of parish, fairly accessible by bus, limited access by car	

7. Availability of equivalent facilities in neighbouring areas	Both	Some overlapping facilities at Oatlands Road (600m from parish boundary), Fogwell Road (800m), the Glebe (3km)	Aim to provide at least some different equipment to that available at nearby facilities.
8. Capital costs	Both	Highly variable, from £10k to £100 depending on scale and specific equipment. Capital costs to include planning costs (surveys, application, etc.)	Identify preferred equipment and get firm quotes
9. Potential funding	Both	£106 money from recent development (~£30k); grant applications to VOWH, Big Lottery and sports focused bodies	Identify specific funding bodies / schemes to approach. Initiate fundraising if demand is demonstrated and project is approved. Need descriptions of specific equipment/design to present to potential funders.
10. Maintenance costs	Both	Estimated as similar for children's playground (around £1k per year including safety inspections and repairs)	Would need to be incorporated into NHPC budget for financial year following completion
11. Security	Both	Potential to include fencing and lighting	Investigate pros and cons of including fencing and lighting and get quotes
12. Risk management	Both	Similar risk management programme as for childrens' playground (e.g. weekly inspections, annual ROSPA inspections). Need to assess inherent risks of equipment when selecting design.	As above, risk management costs (caretaking, inspections, repair works) would need to be incorporated into NHPC budget. Gather information on ROSPA risk scores for specific equipment.
13. Accessibility (cost to users)	Both	No cost to users as on NHPC land	

Sites considered for adventure playground:

- (1) Louie Memorial upper field
- (2) Tilbury Fields amenity land

- Green highlight = no significant issues requiring detailed investigation or likely to impede implementation
- Orange highlight = significant further investigation required as detailed under 'further actions'
- Red highlight = serious issue which quite probably could stop implementation (NB these only occur for site (2) on two criteria)

Skate park

Criterion	Site *	Major points	Further actions required
1. Evidence of demand / projected use	Both	Significant - see 2011 questionnaire & 2012 petition data	Targeted consultation to provide up to date info
2. Impact on other users / residents	Both (1)	Main perceived issues are noise and anti-social behaviour Nearest housing 180m but history of some ASB on site	Possible noise reduction features, consult police, consult residents
	(2)	Nearest housing 30 to 40m so likely to be unsuitable site	Establish accurate amenity land location / boundaries
3. Environmental Impact	Both (1) (2)	Potential impact on wildlife and drainage Need to consider potential impacts on the fen Location unlikely to result in significant impacts	Hydrological & wildlife surveys as required
4. Impact on neighbouring facilities	Both	Minimal	
5. Land provision / space needed	Both (1)	Approximately 500 sq. m, on NHPC land Already NHPC owned, space available	Planning application required
	(2)	Not yet owned by NHPC, could take until 2017, restrictions?	Negotiations with Persimmon on transfer of land
6. Access	Both (1) (2)	Generally access issues likely to be minimal No specific issues Potential issue of some users parking in nearby streets	
7. Availability of equivalent facilities in neighbouring areas	Both	Major site in Oxford, others in region but none nearby	
8. Capital costs	Both	Min. £60k, likely costs £80 to £100k. Capital costs to include planning costs (surveys, application, etc.)	Produce firmer costings later based on agreed design




9. Potential funding	Both	£16k insurance money plus potential funding organisations	Identify specific funding bodies / schemes to approach. Initiate fundraising if project is approved. Need descriptions of specific design to present to potential funders.
10. Maintenance costs	Both	Around £1k p.a. for inspections, repair etc. at NHPC costs	
11. Security	Both	No locks, gates, fencing etc.	Possible lighting issues to be considered later in design process
12. Risk management	Both	Insurance and signage, well known risks, ROSPA advice. Need to consider managing risk of competition between users (e.g. skateboarders versus scooters). Consider if first aid should be available on site.	Seek information on how risk is minimized between user groups. Risk management implemented post-construction
13. Accessibility (cost to users)	Both	No cost to users as on NHPC land	

* The four considered potential sites were:

- (1) Louie Memorial Upper Playing Field
- (2) Tilbury Fields amenity land
- (3) Oxford Rugby Club, North Hinksey
- (4) Brookes Campus, Harcourt Hill

After site visits and discussions options (3) and (4) were deemed unsuitable and not considered further against the criteria.

Where there are significant differences when compared against the criteria between the remaining two sites (or vs. the general position) these are shown separately in the above table.

-  Green highlight = no significant issues requiring detailed investigation or likely to impede implementation
-  Orange highlight = significant further investigation required as detailed under 'further actions'
-  Red highlight = serious issue which quite probably could stop implementation (NB these only occur for site (2) on two criteria)

Youth club for ages 13+

Criterion	Site *	Major points	Further actions required
1. Evidence of demand / projected use	Both	High demand for current youth club for ages 11-13, suggesting continued demand as they age.	Consultation on general demand / projected usage levels.
2. Impact on other users / residents	Both (1) (2)	Noise consistent with young people gathering. Could impact near neighbours if outdoor space is used Could disturb other users of the centre when arriving and leaving	Clarify opening times and space to be used, to accurately assess likely impacts
3. Environmental Impact	Both	No direct impact	Hydrological & wildlife surveys if required (via planning process)
	(1) (2)	Possible impact if Pavilion is renovated Minimal impact (part of existing centre)	
4. Impact on neighbouring facilities	Both	None. Brooks have summer programmes for youth but not competing as these are held at different times and purely for sports.	
5. Land provision / space needed	Both (1) (2)	Room large enough for 20-30 children. Flexible space e.g. for computers, large TV for games, sofas. Access to kitchen preferred. Current space insufficient, would require Pavilion renovations No current youth space on site; would need to be acquired	Negotiations with Vale to secure a unit in West Way (short-term). Negotiations with Mace for dedicated youth space in new community building (long-term).

6. Access	Both	Accessible on foot for majority of parish, accessible by bus and car	
	(1)	not currently wheelchair accessible	Would require Pavilion renovations
	(2)	New community centre would have disability access as a requirement, but use of current centre could limit disabled access (e.g. use of upstairs of current empty unit)	Identify how disabled youth could access a youth club in the current centre
7. Availability of equivalent facilities in neighbouring areas	Both	St Andrews Church runs an afterschool club from 3pm - 5pm; not clear the extent to which it would compete for facilities or activities. No youth club in Cumnor or Dean Court known, but needs to be confirmed.	Liaise with St Andrews to identify any areas of overlap; confirm whether or not there are any other youth clubs in Cumnor parish
8. Capital costs	Both	Dependent on scale of facility and associated costs (site acquisition, planning, construction).	Liaise with Pavilion Trust and Mace to discuss potential scale of facility and associated costs.
9. Potential funding	Both	Oxfordshire Youth, Lottery, VOWH, OCVA, community fundraising, member subs	Identify specific funding bodies / schemes to approach. Initiate fundraising if demand is demonstrated and project is approved.
10. Maintenance costs	Both	Costs for paid youth workers (estimated 2 nights/week). Ongoing equipment costs (computers, cooking facilities, etc.)	Would need to be raised externally or incorporated into NHPC budget (no current equivalent budget). Obtain accurate cost estimates for youth workers and equipment.
11. Security	Both	Dependent on space, but should fall under remit of either Pavilion Trust or community hall management	
12. Risk management	Both	Similar risk management programme as for current youth club. Youth workers need to be DBS checked and have all training (safeguarding, health & safety, first aid, etc.)	
13. Accessibility (cost to users)	Both	Option of membership costs.	

Sites considered for youth club: (1) Pavilion (2) Botley centre

