

Appendix A

Evaluation of recreation and leisure deficits and needs

Amenity Greenspace	4.2 hectares (including likely future need for an extra 0.7 ha)
Accessible Natural Greenspace	Nil
Parks and Gardens	Nil
Green Corridors	Wildlife access required. (Not fixed by standards)
Allotments	0.6 Ha.
Children's Play areas	Nil (but note 11+ group. Skatepark and MUGA)
M.U.G.A.	1 (0.2 Ha.)
Tennis courts	2 courts (0.2 Ha. but ideally with changing facilities)
Bowling greens	Nil, but changing facilities needed
Squash courts	Nil
Adult football	1 pitch (1.4 Ha. per standard. Note FA recommended 106m x 70m being 0.74 Ha including run-off.)
Junior (say up to U14)	2 pitches (Recommended 88m x 56m, two = 0.99 Ha.). (But links to CE school, and SON 3 changing facilities)
Mini-soccer (say up to U10)	2 pitches (Recommended 60m x 42m, two = 0.50 Ha.) (But links to CE school, and SON 3 changing facilities)
Rugby pitch	1 pitch (notional, but covered from Reading Abbey)
Synthetic football pitch	Potential 1 pitch (60m x 42m, 0.25 Ha.)
Hockey pitch	Nil
Cricket pitch	1 pitch (112m x 116m, 9 wickets = 1.3 Ha. (But ideally plus changing facilities)
Athletics track	Nil
Swimming pool	Nil
Golf courses	Nil
Community (sports + civic) hall	2 (i.e. doubled) twin hall (less existing single civic)
(Sports Hall (SODC level)	1 extra for Henley & District indicated by 2031)

Derivations of the above are detailed below from page 3 onwards :-

APPENDIX A – Evaluation of Recreation and Leisure Deficits and Needs

It should be noted that the assessments below are based on the “Larger Village” of Sonning Common – as defined by SODC Planning.

Nortoft also suggested that it may be appropriate to include ALL of the parish of Rotherfield Peppard (though strangely none of the nearby Kidmore End parish) in the overall assessment of population numbers. This view was based partly on the idea that this combination was formerly the relevant SODC electoral ward. Based on the new dwellings expected in the SC NDP plan period to 2027 this might yield the following numbers of dwellings and population by 2027:-

Dwellings :

Sonning Common @ Census 2011	1595
Rotherfield Peppard @ Census 2011	678
Allocations with SC NDP to 2027	195
Windfalls and infills expected in SC to 2027	96
Windfalls and infills expected in RP to 2027	35
Combined sum of dwellings at 2027 (*)	2599

(* That is 2273 dwellings as at Census 2011 plus 326 new dwellings)

If the period considered was to 2031 there would probably be some 33 extra new dwellings from 4 more years of windfalls and infills. This would give total **dwellings at 2031 of 2632**.

Population :-

Sonning Common @ Census 2011	3784
Rotherfield Peppard @ Census 2011	1649
SUM @ Census 2011	5433
Plus 326 new dwellings at 2.39 each to 2027	779
FORECAST population SUM at 2027	6212
Plus 33 new windfall dwellings at 2.39 each 2028-2031	79
FORECAST population SUM at 2031 6291	6291

Due to serious errors of underestimation the Nortoft population analysis did not show anything like the above. It should also be noted that the allocations in the SC NDP have increased to 195 from the 138 required for the Core Strategy alone.

APPENDIX A – Evaluation of Recreation and Leisure Deficits and Needs

Background

SODC produced a Leisure and Sports Facilities Strategy in March 2011. However, this was a strategy review and its seminal source was the South Oxfordshire Open Space, Sport and Recreation Facility Assessment – April 2008 (which was PPG17 compliant). There was also a summary consultation document. There was a full review of standards and assessment methodology. There was a summary of the then current provision and the standards to guide future provision, supported with highly detailed audits of every facility by type - including quantitative and qualitative assessments. The actual audit work leading to the 2008 document was done before 2008. It was this work and standards upon which the SODC Core Strategy 2011-2027 was based.

Unfortunately, neither of these documents recognised, nor took account of the **sale** by SODC of the Bishopswood Sports Ground. That sale was approved in 2007 with promises of support for existing sports and facilities development; the sale included the benefit of the (then) £13k per annum net income from the radio and telecommunications masts on site. In practice development did not proceed and thereby the potential sale value to SODC was constrained.

The site was originally a camp for displaced families during WW2. Its ownership had been granted to SODC and it had previously been leased to Sonning Common Parish Council for many years, with an individual franchised to fulfil the care and maintenance but to benefit from the incomes - including from the bar operations at the previous pavilion. Villagers had spent a great deal of voluntary manpower in improving the site, levelling it and removing stones from the earth under the pitches. For a long, long period it continued to run very successfully. However, by the early 2000s the pavilion was in need of major refurbishment and was suffering from wood rot. At the time the local council was dominated by people without sympathy for this facility and its aims. Relationships with the franchisee broke down and the responsibility for the operation reverted to the parish council. Staffing proved difficult, incomes from the pavilion declined and (with less staffing) vandalism also took a toll on this somewhat isolated site. By 2005 the lease was terminated by SCPC, the pavilion fell into serious disrepair and was ultimately removed. In 2007 SODC sold off the site accepting the prospect of what then seemed the highest bid.

Having been sold, the site lacked changing or other facilities and sports use declined with lower levels of maintenance and attention than had applied in the past.

Finally, the land excluding that for the masts was purchased by a private football club (Rotherfield United) which operates under an FA Charter accreditation and focuses on the 5-18 age group of boys and girls, the sale having been made excluding that part of the land attaching to the mast income. The latest owners thus face all the site costs - but without the benefit of any mast income. This land is thus used differently from in the past and subscriptions and access for sports use are subject to private fees or subscription. Subscriptions for children are necessarily significant, and, although a “bursary” scheme is now being considered for 2015-16, it is not yet known how widely this might apply. Provision now focuses on a young age group and RUFC have grown membership very significantly since moving to Sonning Common; it now stands at some 250 and it is understood that in excess of 50% of that membership is now represented from SC parish. In an area where provision for children and particularly those of 11+ has been sorely lacking, this is a very positive evolution.

APPENDIX A – Evaluation of Recreation and Leisure Deficits and Needs

RUFC operate to FA Charter standards with clear mentoring and standards of respect and behaviour for their players; a further positive.

As noted above, the seminal source for standards of provision and detailed audit of facilities is the 2008 work and this is used in the following, **together with Census 2011 population data and known changes in the availability of facilities**. Account is also taken of expected population growth arising from development of additional dwellings. The principle focus here is about quantitative deficits, but the 2008 audit was also critical in its thorough assessment of the poor **qualitative** condition of most of those resources that did exist in this locality!

Sonning Common is largely a development that grew up during the 20th century – with a particular boom during the 1960s and early 1970s. Its Common lands were enclosed and lost in 1820 and subsequent development has failed to provide the degree of amenity space and sports/recreation provision that one would expect for a settlement of this size to be sustainable. This is a strategic issue to address for the future.

APPENDIX A – Evaluation of Recreation and Leisure Deficits and Needs

AMENITY GREENSPACE (Ideally within 10 min 600m walk.)

- At 2008 audit, Amenity Greenspace (AG) deficiency (in the ward) showed a shortfall of 3.5 hectares, based on the standard of 1 hectare per 1,000 people - giving a need of 5.3 hectares, and an existing provision of 1.8 hectares (being Millennium Green 0.8, Widmore Pond 0.2 and Carling's Orchard, Peppard 0.84).
- Amenity Greenspace (AG) deficiency (in the Larger Village) shows a current shortfall of 3.5 hectares
SC parish:- Census 2011 population = 3784
SC parish Census 2011 dwellings number = 1595
SODC assessed the "Larger Village" as having 1916 dwellings @ Census 2011.
Therefore population of the "Larger Village" settlement of SC estimated to be $1916/1595 \times 3784$, so population = 4545
- The standard of provision is 1 hectare per 1,000 population
Requirement is therefore 4.5 hectares
Audited provision is MG (picnic area) 0.8 hectare and
Widmore Pond 0.2 hectare (with Carling's Orchard which forms part of Kingwood Common being considered outside the "Larger Village" and not applicable).
- **Existing shortfall is 3.5 hectares**, based on 2011 population.
- Extra housing. Allocation 195 plus windfall units to 2027 (say) 96, thus...
Total = 291 new dwellings $\times 4546/1916 = 690$ extra population (based on current household size (H/h size)).
- **This implies a population in the "Larger Village" of Sonning Common of 5,235 by 2027**
- This will generate an **extra shortfall of 0.7 hectares; giving a total future shortfall of 4.2 hectares.**
- It should be noted that as a matter of FACT the average population by dwelling in the Sonning Common and Rotherfield Peppard combined increased slightly between the 2001 Census and that of 2011 (from 2.37 to 2.39). In addition the strict average non-communal population per occupied household remained stable at 2.47 per household. Thus factual historical data suggests that the ratio of people to dwellings has stabilised – even with the increasing longevity between 2001 and 2011. It makes sense to forecast on this factual pattern.
- It is fair to note that SODC are seeking to mitigate future shortfalls by requiring some amenity space within developments (10% of gross area in larger ones).
- It should also be noted that Sonning Common does not have a village green or indeed any grassed area that can be used for a village fete or other charitable and community activities. There is no public space where marquees etc could be erected for the community to come together in an event. This is absolutely extraordinary for a community of this scale!

ANG (Accessible Natural Greenspace)

- At least one with 2 ha within 2km of all people
- Provision includes Old Copse 12.94 Ha (Peppard Cmn 5.98)
- OK

APPENDIX A – Evaluation of Recreation and Leisure Deficits and Needs

Parks and Gardens

- Std 1 Ha per 1,000 population. Ideally within 15 min. (1,000m) walk.
- So based on forecast population of 5,235 need is 5.2 Ha.
- Audited provision claimed as being 1.5 Ha from the Herb Farm (but the Saxon Maze is only 0.5 Ha and is the only true provision). The total site is c1.8 Ha and much is commercial polytunnels or racks of potted plants - much like the outside-back yard at B+Q!!
- The Millennium Green is counted in its entirety as 5.87 Ha, but the MG has limited access re the large restricted nature reserve required by the trustees and is also at the far southern end of Sonning Common
- So overall, based on the highly questionable inclusion of the Herb Farm and the entirety of the Millennium Green above, this provision is OK.

Green Corridors

- No fixed std
- Needed AONB to AONB connections from West to East – given elongated nature of SC's built form (+ note Hagpits Wood and other woodland such as Bur Wood/Rudging's plantation as habitats).
-

Allotments (Ideally within 10 min 600m walk.)

- 0.3 Ha per 1,000 population
- SC shown as needing more
- In parish is about 1 Ha
- (Some in Kidmore End parish but all are remote from homes)
- Likely future population 5,235, requiring 1.57 Ha. of provision.
- So **deficiency of 0.6 Ha** – ideally in the south of Sonning Common

Children's Play areas

Needs for these are met (with an extra one planned in Rotherfield Peppard) except that provision for children above age 11 is absent. There is a proposal to build a skate-park on land purchased from the RUFC football ground at Bishopswood and delivery of this project has recently been achieved.

Multi-Use Games Area

- A deficiency of one 40m x 25m MUGA was recognised at 2008.
- The requirement standard is 1 per 5,000 people.
- So with the forecast population of the Larger Village of 5,235 this is correct.
- **Deficiency of 1.**

Tennis courts

- The standard for tennis is 1 court per 1,250 population.
- Based on the proven 2011 overall population of 4,545 this would yield a need for 3.6 courts.
- The forecast overall population is projected to increase to 5,235 and this would suggest 4.2 courts.
- Existing provision at Bishopswood is of 2 courts.
- **Deficiency 2 courts**

APPENDIX A – Evaluation of Recreation and Leisure Deficits and Needs

Bowling greens

- The standard is for one six-rink outdoor bowling green per 13,000 people.
- There is good rink provision at the Peppard Bowls club on the Gallowstree road. The 2008 audit recognised its good playing surface but noted the poor quality of changing facilities, disabled access and parking/access generally. This could be supported by future changing facilities on SON 3?

Squash Courts

- The standard is for one per 5,000 people.
- This is met through facilities on the Chiltern Edge school site which have always had club funding and participation for the community.

PITCHES

Adult football₂

- The standard for adult football is 1 pitch per 525 population aged 16-45.
- Based on the proven 2011 overall population of 4,545 and 1,415 of 16-45 yr olds this would yield 2.7 pitches.
- The forecast overall population is projected to increase to 5,235 and this would suggest 3.1 pitches. It is also likely that this age group may benefit from future changes in the age mix due to new dwellings and an extra level of existing dwellings coming onto the market and bringing in younger people, thus underlining the result.
- Bishopswood has until recently had 1 adult pitch plus a graduated range of other pitches by age. More recently RUFC have withdrawn their larger youth pitch in favour of an extra adult sized pitch - to gain lettings income. There is frustrated demand locally for pitches and adult pitches can generate most revenue.
- Nortoft have suggested that overall in the Henley/S.E. sub-area of the district that there may be an adequacy of pitches. However there has been a lot of research to show that the time-pressured people of the modern age will most readily engage in healthy sport and activity only if there is convenient and readily accessed facilities close at hand. The extent of frustrated demand locally is clear. Having rather under-utilised pitches in remote villages away from key settlements and concentrations of population is surely not a real-world solution?
- A full adult pitch with surrounds is defined by standards as an area of 1.4 Ha.
- **Deficiency 1 pitch**

APPENDIX A – Evaluation of Recreation and Leisure Deficits and Needs

Junior and Mini-soccer football

Junior football

- (The 2008 and 2011 material suggested that Bishopswood could perhaps support in part provision for a deficiency of some 9 pitches from Henley and its wider S.E. sub-district. It noted the then public availability of it noted the then public availability of the Bishopswood Sports Ground, but did not adequately recognise the poor quality of the lower ground area (away from the Gallowstree road and closer to SON 1.)
- Use of the adult pitches on the prime upper ground at Bishopswood can carry risks for younger players – even for training. Adult pitches can be badly cut-up in wet weather and then dry or freeze in that condition; a potential hazard for junior and mini players with legs that are smaller and weaker.
- The standard of provision is 1 pitch (0.5 Ha.) per 150 10-15 yr olds
- Based on the proven 2011 overall population of 4,545, 338 would be 10-15 yr olds thus yielding a need for 2.3 pitches.
- The forecast overall population is projected to increase to 5,235 and this would suggest 2.6 pitches. It is also likely that this age group may benefit from future changes in the age mix, thus suggesting a need for 3 pitches.
- If the combined forecast (see above 6,291) overall population of the parishes of Sonning Common and Rotherfield Peppard, out to 2031, were used this would suggest a need for 3.1 pitches – even without benefiting from a lower age mix.
- It is unclear what proper and dedicated pitches RUFC may be able to offer to this age-group, given their switch of provision towards an extra adult pitch. But a deficiency of 2 pitches would seem reasonable? According to Nortoft (with errors in underestimating population numbers) there will be an overall deficiency in the S.E, sub-area of the district of 7 before any new provision.
- **Deficiency 2 pitches**

Mini-soccer football

- The standard is 1 pitch (0.3 Ha.) per 150 6-9 yr olds
- Based on the proven 2011 overall population of 4,545, 204 would be 6-9 yr olds thus yielding a need for 1.4 pitches.
- The forecast overall population is projected to increase to 5,235 and this would suggest 1.6 pitches. It is also likely that this age group may benefit from future changes in the age mix, thus suggesting a need for 2.
- If the combined forecast (see above 6,291) overall population of the parishes of Sonning Common and Rotherfield Peppard together, out to 2031, were used this would suggest a need for 1.9 pitches – even without benefiting from a lower age mix.
- It is important for the quality of the surface/sport and particularly for reasons of safeguarding that adults do not use and cut-up pitches intended for much younger players. After a pitch is cut-up and dries or freezes. it can become unsafe.
- Even with underestimated population figures, and recognising that mini-players face the greatest limitation for distant access, Nortoft recommended new provision of 2.
- **Deficiency 2 pitches**

It should also be noted that there are no changing or toilet facilities at Bishopswood Sports Ground; a major limitation. Access there is also, necessarily, subject to significant subscriptions (“bursaries” being considered going forwards). Positively RUFC reach out to players from outside this village.

APPENDIX A – Evaluation of Recreation and Leisure Deficits and Needs

SON 3, including in due course extra changing and toilet facilities, and in conjunction with Chiltern Edge School could make a major contribution to addressing these pitch deficiencies in future.

FA Recommended pitch sizes – with safety run-off areas are as follows :-

FA Recommended Football Pitch & Goal Sizes (Metric)

FA Recommended Football Pitch & Goal Sizes (Metric Measurements)							
		Without a runoff / safety area		With runoff / safety area around the pitch		Recommended size of goal posts	
Age Group	Type	Length x Width (metres)		Length x Width (metres)		Height x Width (metres)	
Mini Soccer U7 / U8	5 v 5	36.57	27.43	42.06	32.91	1.83	3.66
Mini Soccer U9 / U10	7 v 7	54.86	36.57	60.35	42.06	1.83	3.66
Youth U11 / U12	9 v 9	73.15	45.72	78.63	51.20	2.13	4.88
Youth U13 / U14	11 v 11	82.29	50.29	87.78	55.77	2.13	6.40 *
Youth U15 / U16	11 v 11	91.44	54.86	96.92	60.35	2.44	7.32
Youth U17 / U18	11 v 11	100.58	64.00	106.07	69.49	2.44	7.32
Senior 18+	11 v 11	100.58	64.00	106.07	69.49	2.44	7.32

Rugby pitches

- The standard is 1 pitch (1.2 Ha.) per 2800 8-45 yr olds.
- Based on the proven 2011 overall population of 4,545, 1840 would be 8-45 yr olds thus yielding a need for 0.7 pitches.
- The forecast overall population is projected to increase to 5,235 and this would still suggest 0.7 pitches. It is also likely that this age group may benefit from future changes in the age mix, thus suggesting a need for 1.

There is currently no provision within the village, although there is provision at the Reading Abbey ground just to the south of Sonning Common (with changing facilities).

Synthetic “all-weather” pitches

- The standard is 1 pitch per 15,000 11-45 yr olds.
- Based on the proven 2011 overall population of 4,545, 1696 would be 11-45 yr olds thus yielding a need for 0.1 pitches. Even at projected population - ignore.
- Chiltern Edge School have an ambition to provide one for pupils to use and may be prepared to consider wider access for community young people, subject to security conditions. RUFC have ambitions for an all-weather pitch, but Nortoft advise that the most likely grant source – the F.A. would be likely to require good changing facilities as the priority above an all-weather pitch.
- Despite the above standards, and given the lack of provision at Chiltern Edge School, Nortoft suggest that both the school and wider mutual interests might benefit from provision of a youth/training all-weather Artificial Grass Pitch of 60m x 40m with high quality “football” grade artificial turf and (suitably subtle) floodlights. Any use of floodlights will need to plan in careful consideration for neighbours and the wider AONB, which Nortoft imply is possible

APPENDIX A – Evaluation of Recreation and Leisure Deficits and Needs

in an appropriate position on SON 3. As Nortoft note with regards to RUFC the more immediate priority will be for built changing and toilet facilities.

- **Potential 1 AGP pitch of c. 60m x 40m with high “football” grade turf.**

Hockey pitches

- Std 1 (0.6 ha) synthetic pitch per 15,000 11-45 yr olds
- As for synthetic pitches above the standard re will not require new provision

Cricket pitches

- The standard is 1 pitch per 1,400 11-55 yr olds – IF THEY ARE MALE.
- The current SODC standards of provision are gender-loaded towards males in that by exception, cricket standards are written for males only. It also appears that no compensating provision or standard exists specifically for females? (NB This nuance was missed in the first draft of the Sonning common NDP assessments).
- At the current (2011) overall population of 4,545, 2,317 would be 11-45 yr olds thus yielding a need for 1.7 pitches (if all genders counted).
- The forecast overall population is projected to increase to 5,235 and this would still suggest 1.9 pitches (if all genders counted). It is also likely that this age group may benefit from future changes in the age mix, thus suggesting a need for 2 (if all genders counted). Clearly, *for the specified 11-55 age group*, if males only are to count then the requirement will be only some 50% of 2 and thus be 1.
- Presently the provision of pitches in Sonning Common is nil and the local team can only play at away venues – which inhibits participation.
- Despite underestimating population numbers, Nortoft acknowledge the need for the provision of a 9 wicket cricket pitch in Sonning Common.
- Whilst we agree that football use should not be made of the 9-wicket central cricket green itself, it is not clear that no football use in the winter, for minis, juniors or adults, could be made of the outfield area.)
- **Deficiency 1 pitch**

OTHER

Athletics

There is no deficiency of athletics track (std 1 per 120k population) or swimming pool (std 1 per 30k population) due to the high requirement of standards.

Golf

There is equally no deficit in golf courses (std 1 per 12,500 people) in the surrounding area.

Halls

– see below

APPENDIX A – Evaluation of Recreation and Leisure Deficits and Needs

Community (sports) Hall

- A community hall complex including a larger hall (dimensioned as above largely for sports needs) **and** a smaller hall (largely for meetings and civic needs) is required **per 2,500 population** in the towns and larger villages.
- The standard is for this provision to be ADDITIONAL to any sports Hall provision.
- The larger (sports) hall should have internal dimensions of 18m x 10m x 6.1 clear internal height across the whole area).
- The smaller (civic) hall (internal dimensions minimum of 10m x 10m x 3.5m height).
- Ideally this should be within a 10-15 min walk (600-1,000m) walk for residents.
- The 2008 audit acknowledged that the existing Sonning Common village hall was inadequate to support sports usage (and indeed it does not support any) and that it was oversubscribed by a factor of 4 to meet the needs of its population.
- Given the existing population of 4,545 and the projected population of 5,235 it is perfectly clear that Sonning Common would qualify for **two** full community hall complexes! (Less the existing single civic hall.)
- It is clear that a community sports hall is clearly required and a good case can be made to suggest that the dimensions of that should comply to those of a full four badminton-court sized Sports hall of 36m x 18m x 7.5 m continuous internal height.
- Unlike other “Larger Villages”, Sonning Common has other settlements with large populations in the close surrounding area. Thus future provision would not only benefit the residents of this village but those of the wider district.
- New provision ought to be compliant to Sports England standards – including for surrounding land and pitches. Funding can be obtained from grant-awarding bodies, but one of their conditions is usually that the overall proposal will comply to Sports England standards of provision.
- Nortoft fully acknowledge the lack of Community hall provision with sports capacity in Sonning Common. They underestimated the future population figures and also failed to apply the SODC standard for community halls to this village. They therefore propose only one internal area of Community Hall where in fact 2 are indicated by standards.
- **Deficiency 2 Community (sports) halls**

Sports Hall

- A full Sports hall has internal dimensions of 36m x 18m x 7.5 continuous internal height.
- The standard is for one per 14,000 population. The standard is for this provision to be ADDITIONAL to any Community Hall provision.
- Policy currently suggests that provision should be focused on district towns.
- This works in a meaningful way where a district town like Thame acts as a central Rome to its surrounding hinterland.
- However it works very poorly in the case of the S.E sub-area – where the Henley is on the far edge of The S. Oxfordshire district, is nestled against the Thames and its floodplain and has poor communication and transport links with that part of its hinterland that is within SODC! Furthermore it supports only a small population outside the district on the eastern side of the Thames.
- The road and bus links from Sonning Common are oriented towards Reading – not Henley. There are poor and infrequent bus links between Sonning Common and Henley – which have now had all their subsidy removed and are about to cease altogether. Their commercial viability would also have been reduced by the change in policy concerning charging parents for pupils travel if they do not choose the most local school. (The death of

APPENDIX A – Evaluation of Recreation and Leisure Deficits and Needs

this previously thin bus service will also remove links between Sonning Common and Woodcote.)

- Road connections from Sonning Common to Henley are not conducive to safe travel by bicycle.
- At 2008 the audit confirmed the high utilisation of the Henley Leisure centre.
- The 2008 audit suggested that Henley “& district” had a population of 23,230.
- The 2011 Census confirmed a higher number 24,629 – approaching 25k.
- New housing to 2031 is likely to be significant, taking both allocations and windfall infills together. From the core Strategy alone this is likely to increase the population by around 2k. Further development from LP 2031 could easily add a further 1k of population.
- Thus by 2031 it is highly likely that at the present standard “Henley & district” will require a 2nd Sports Hall. Yet by that time Henley’s own population will not exceed 14,000.
- The bulk of the other half of the Henley & district population will then be centred on Sonning Common! (By 2011 9,897 was already the total surrounding population (excluding Henley, Bix & Assendon, Harpsden and Shiplake). It should be noted that the Sonning Common Health Centre currently has 8,500 registered patients.) At that stage there will be a strong case for a second sports Hall to be provided in Sonning Common to maximise access for all.
- Again compliance to Sports England standards - by having surrounding land and pitches - will be important.
- As has been illustrated in detail, Nortoft under-estimated future population numbers by using the wrong methodology regarding new dwellings and average occupancy. As noted in the main document since the Nortoft report the commercial LA fitness facility in Henley has closed – not due to lack of members or subscriptions – but in order to benefit from a large land profit in developing that site for housing. The result is that the previously fully-subscribed Henley Sports Centre – which was running at 85% capacity is now grossly over-subscribed.
- Nortoft also made some incorrect inferences about capacity and access to Woodcote.
- It is sensible and reasonable to build provision steadily over time to meet capacity. It is not sensible to be in denial that there is clearly a need for more provision in future. A key whole point about sustainable development is that community facilities must expand appropriately to meet standards as housing increases. In the Sonning Common area the provision is not even adequate for the existing housing – even before planned future growth!
- **Deficiency 1 Sports Hall**

APPENDIX A – Evaluation of Recreation and Leisure Deficits and Needs

Notes on Population

SODC defined the “**Larger Village**” of **Sonning Common**, based on its “built form”, as representing **1916 dwellings**, based on Census 2011 data and output areas. This included some **321 dwellings** from the parish of Rotherfield Peppard in addition to those **1,595 dwellings in the Sonning Common parish**. In forming this view SODC carefully excluded dwellings within the Census output areas not considered to be part of the “built form” of the “Larger Village”. This was deemed to be the appropriate basis for assessing housing allocations and the relevant dwellings and population basis for the “Larger Village” entity for planning purposes.

The population of the parish of Sonning Common at **Census 2011** was 3,784. This (*pro-rated for dwellings*) gives a total population for the relevant “Larger Village” entity of **4,545**.

Sub-sets by age profile are equally pro-rated up from the Census data for SC parish only to indicate the basis for the whole village. Given that occupancy from Census 2001 to Census 2011 remained flat, it is reasonable to project the existing ratio of population to dwellings in a flat way into the future. On this assumption, an **extra 291 dwellings** (195 allocation + (say) 96 windfalls) from the Core Strategy to **2027** would give an **extra 690 population**. The population in the Larger Village will thus become 5,235 by 2027. Any further development requirements from the LP 2031 could, including the obligations of the Rotherfield Peppard part of the “Larger Village” has been met, increase this further.

Population at 2011 Census

Overall	Basis 1916/1595 dwellings x 3,784 population	= 4,545
Adult	1 per 525 16-45 yr olds 1178 x 4545/3784	= 1,415
Junior	1 per 150 10-15 yr olds 281 x 4545/3784	= 338
Mini-soccer	1per 150 6-9 yr olds 170 x 4545/3784	= 204
Cricket	1 per 1400 11-55 yr olds 1929 x 4545/3784	= 2,317
Rugby	1 per 2800 8-45 yr olds 1532 x 4545/3784	= 1,840
Synthetic	1 per 15,000 11-45 1412 X 4545/3784	= 1,696

Summary of SC parish only at Census 2011 (see attached)

6-9	=	170
8-9	=	73 (being 35+38)
10-15	=	281
16-45	=	1178
46-55	=	516
8-45	=	1532 (being 73+281+1178)
8-10	=	120 (being 35+38+47)
11-45	=	1412 (Being 1532-120)
11-55	=	1929 (being 1412 + 516)

APPENDIX A – Evaluation of Recreation and Leisure Deficits and Needs

Census 2011 data (Population by year in Sonning Common parish. Note not all of Larger Village!)

Age by Single Year (QS109EW)		Sonning Common		SODC	South East	England	SC	SODC	SC	SODC	CUM	CUM	Age	Hash		
Count	Persons	Mar-11	Parish Non-Metro	Region	Country	SUM	SUM	SC	SODC	SC	SODC	SC	SODC			
All Usual Residents	Count	Persons	Mar-11	3784	134257	8634750	53012456									
Age Under 1	Count	Persons	Mar-11	41	1703	107555	675065	41	1703	1.1%	1.3%	1.1%	1.3%	0.5	20.5	
Age 1	Count	Persons	Mar-11	36	1589	109119	68862	36	1589	1.0%	1.2%	1.0%	1.2%	1.5	54	
Age 2	Count	Persons	Mar-11	40	1541	106423	663119	117	4833	1.1%	1.1%	1.1%	3.6%	2.5	100	
Age 3	Count	Persons	Mar-11	41	1718	107546	663574	158	6551	1.1%	1.3%	1.2%	4.9%	3.5	143.5	
Age 4	Count	Persons	Mar-11	49	1662	105798	648029	207	8213	1.3%	1.2%	1.2%	6.1%	4.5	220.5	
Age 5	Count	Persons	Mar-11	36	1709	106264	633080	243	9922	1.0%	1.3%	1.2%	7.4%	5.5	198	
Age 6	Count	Persons	Mar-11	46	1527	97841	600847	289	11449	1.2%	1.1%	1.1%	7.6%	6.5	199	
Age 7	Count	Persons	Mar-11	51	1573	98622	594673	340	13022	1.3%	1.2%	1.2%	9.0%	7.5	382.5	
Age 8	Count	Persons	Mar-11	38	1526	94259	572874	378	14548	1.0%	1.1%	1.0%	10.8%	8.5	323	
Age 9	Count	Persons	Mar-11	35	1508	94472	572448	170	41	16056	0.9%	1.1%	10.9%	12.0%	9.5	332.5
Age 10	Count	Persons	Mar-11	47	1572	97854	570566	460	17628	1.2%	1.2%	1.2%	12.2%	10.5	493.5	
Age 11	Count	Persons	Mar-11	42	1653	101017	605569	502	19281	1.1%	1.2%	1.3%	14.4%	11.5	483	
Age 12	Count	Persons	Mar-11	53	1642	103788	618918	555	20923	1.4%	1.2%	1.4%	15.6%	12.5	662.5	
Age 13	Count	Persons	Mar-11	38	1666	105080	608858	593	22589	1.0%	1.2%	1.5%	16.8%	13.5	513	
Age 14	Count	Persons	Mar-11	45	1677	105986	605238	648	24066	1.2%	1.2%	1.6%	18.1%	14.5	652.5	
Age 15	Count	Persons	Mar-11	56	1759	106916	650826	281	694	2625	1.5%	1.3%	18.3%	19.4%	15.5	868
Age 16	Count	Persons	Mar-11	46	1625	108044	648677	740	27650	1.2%	1.2%	1.9%	20.6%	16.5	759	
Age 17	Count	Persons	Mar-11	48	1637	109568	665447	788	29037	1.3%	1.2%	2.0%	21.8%	17.5	840	
Age 18	Count	Persons	Mar-11	31	1455	108718	674980	819	30742	0.8%	1.1%	2.1%	22.9%	18.5	573.5	
Age 19	Count	Persons	Mar-11	22	1265	108478	700335	841	32007	0.6%	0.9%	2.2%	23.8%	19.5	429	
Age 20	Count	Persons	Mar-11	22	1069	110037	727389	863	33076	0.6%	0.8%	2.2%	24.6%	20.5	451	
Age 21	Count	Persons	Mar-11	28	1139	107245	711470	891	34215	0.7%	0.8%	2.3%	25.5%	21.5	602	
Age 22	Count	Persons	Mar-11	29	1202	102267	715130	920	35495	0.8%	1.0%	2.4%	26.4%	22.5	652.5	
Age 23	Count	Persons	Mar-11	29	1375	107366	728435	949	36870	0.8%	1.0%	2.5%	27.5%	23.5	681.5	
Age 24	Count	Persons	Mar-11	19	1351	103420	712887	968	38221	0.5%	1.0%	2.6%	28.5%	24.5	465.5	
Age 25	Count	Persons	Mar-11	29	1391	105446	731640	997	39612	0.8%	1.0%	2.6%	29.5%	25.5	739.5	
Age 26	Count	Persons	Mar-11	25	1480	105178	762338	1249	40597	0.8%	1.1%	2.7%	30.5%	26.5	802.5	
Age 27	Count	Persons	Mar-11	32	1491	104223	732023	1054	42533	0.8%	1.1%	2.9%	31.7%	27.5	780.5	
Age 28	Count	Persons	Mar-11	26	1437	105461	728376	1080	43970	0.7%	1.1%	2.8%	32.8%	28.5	741	
Age 29	Count	Persons	Mar-11	26	1406	108009	734792	1106	45376	0.7%	1.0%	2.9%	33.8%	29.5	767	
Age 30	Count	Persons	Mar-11	30	1502	111247	747536	1186	46738	0.8%	1.1%	3.0%	34.9%	30.5	815	
Age 31	Count	Persons	Mar-11	31	1578	111402	730809	1167	48456	0.8%	1.1%	3.0%	36.1%	31.5	976.5	
Age 32	Count	Persons	Mar-11	28	1511	107033	700814	1195	49967	0.7%	1.1%	3.1%	37.2%	32.5	910	
Age 33	Count	Persons	Mar-11	25	1490	108611	690464	1220	51457	0.7%	1.1%	3.2%	38.3%	33.5	837.5	
Age 34	Count	Persons	Mar-11	28	1480	105178	662338	1249	52937	0.8%	1.1%	3.3%	39.4%	34.5	900.5	
Age 35	Count	Persons	Mar-11	41	1630	106719	684803	1280	54567	1.1%	1.2%	3.4%	40.6%	35.5	1455.5	
Age 36	Count	Persons	Mar-11	41	1779	110993	685626	1331	56346	1.1%	1.3%	3.5%	42.0%	36.5	1496.5	
Age 37	Count	Persons	Mar-11	45	1833	114595	699168	1376	58179	1.2%	1.4%	3.6%	43.3%	37.5	1687.5	
Age 38	Count	Persons	Mar-11	63	1937	120792	731954	1439	60116	1.7%	1.4%	3.8%	44.8%	38.5	2425.5	
Age 39	Count	Persons	Mar-11	65	2033	124912	744005	1494	62049	1.5%	1.5%	3.9%	46.1%	39.5	2619.5	
Age 40	Count	Persons	Mar-11	59	2059	127721	754742	1553	64088	1.6%	1.5%	4.1%	47.8%	40.5	2389.5	
Age 41	Count	Persons	Mar-11	67	2102	125132	761698	1620	66310	1.8%	1.6%	4.2%	49.4%	41.5	2780.5	
Age 42	Count	Persons	Mar-11	58	2158	128909	780374	1678	68688	1.5%	1.6%	4.4%	51.0%	42.5	2465	
Age 43	Count	Persons	Mar-11	67	2221	130137	777884	1745	70949	1.8%	1.7%	4.5%	52.6%	43.5	2914.5	
Age 44	Count	Persons	Mar-11	61	2267	130897	790396	1806	72956	1.6%	1.7%	4.7%	54.3%	44.5	2714.5	
Age 45	Count	Persons	Mar-11	66	2220	133203	790748	1178	1872	75176	1.7%	1.7%	4.9%	56.0%	45.5	3003
Age 46	Count	Persons	Mar-11	66	2220	134270	795338	1938	77396	1.7%	1.7%	5.1%	57.6%	46.5	3069	
Age 47	Count	Persons	Mar-11	59	2202	132267	791259	1920	79598	1.6%	1.6%	5.2%	59.1%	47.5	3622.5	
Age 48	Count	Persons	Mar-11	63	2111	128834	767090	2060	81709	1.7%	1.6%	5.4%	60.9%	48.5	3055.5	
Age 49	Count	Persons	Mar-11	40	2010	124689	745430	2100	83719	1.1%	1.5%	5.5%	62.4%	49.5	1980	
Age 50	Count	Persons	Mar-11	60	2047	121102	723908	2160	85766	1.6%	1.5%	5.7%	63.9%	50.5	3030	
Age 51	Count	Persons	Mar-11	49	1924	115293	690649	2209	87690	1.3%	1.6%	5.8%	65.3%	51.5	3623.5	
Age 52	Count	Persons	Mar-11	47	1839	114255	680476	2256	89529	1.2%	1.4%	5.9%	66.7%	52.5	2467.5	
Age 53	Count	Persons	Mar-11	54	1833	110856	666006	2310	91362	1.4%	1.4%	6.1%	68.1%	53.5	2889	
Age 54	Count	Persons	Mar-11	39	1710	106288	639016	2349	93072	1.0%	1.3%	6.2%	69.3%	54.5	2125.5	
Age 55	Count	Persons	Mar-11	39	1665	101769	614577	516	2388	1.0%	1.2%	6.3%	70.6%	55.5	2164.5	
Age 56	Count	Persons	Mar-11	43	1649	105710	610302	2431	96386	1.1%	1.2%	6.4%	71.8%	56.5	2629.5	
Age 57	Count	Persons	Mar-11	47	1658	99344	605276	2478	98044	1.2%	1.2%	6.5%	73.0%	57.5	2702.5	
Age 58	Count	Persons	Mar-11	53	1588	97796	591365	2531	99632	1.4%	1.2%	6.6%	74.2%	58.5	3100.5	
Age 59	Count	Persons	Mar-11	42	1523	96386	583464	2573	101156	1.1%	1.1%	6.8%	75.3%	59.5	2499	
Age 60	Count	Persons	Mar-11	39	1665	97071	586619	2612	102920	1.0%	1.2%	6.9%	76.6%	60.5	2359.5	
Age 61	Count	Persons	Mar-11	43	1621	100661	605255	2655	104441	1.1%	1.2%	7.0%	77.8%	61.5	2644.5	
Age 62	Count	Persons	Mar-11	52	1694	104632	620903	2707	106135	1.4%	1.3%	7.1%	79.1%	62.5	3250	
Age 63	Count	Persons	Mar-11	63	1814	115328	676509	2770	107949	1.7%	1.4%	7.3%	80.4%	63.5	4000.5	
Age 64	Count	Persons	Mar-11	62	1927	117701	693711	2822	109877	1.4%	1.4%	7.4%	81.8%	64.5	3364	
Age 65	Count	Persons	Mar-11	46	1558	98321	532808	2868	111435	1.2%	1.2%	7.5%	83.0%	65.5	3013	
Age 66	Count	Persons	Mar-11	34	1607	94165	553369	2902	113042	0.9%	1.2%	7.6%	84.2%	66.5	2261	
Age 67	Count	Persons	Mar-11	52	1526	97266	516594	2954	114668	1.4%	1.1%	7.8%	85.3%	67.5	3510	
Age 68	Count	Persons	Mar-11	44	1395	82598	476200	2995	115594	1.2%	1.1%	7.9%	86.4%	68.5	3014	
Age 69	Count	Persons	Mar-11	42	1168	70948	454662	3040	117132	1.1%	0.9%	8.0%	87.2%	69.5	2919	
Age 70	Count	Persons	Mar-11	38	1177	67588	409195	3078	118309	1.0%	0.9%	8.1%	88.0%	70.5	2679	
Age 71	Count	Persons	Mar-11	46	1223	71073	426236	3124	119532	1.2%	0.9%	8.2%	89.1%	71.5	3289	
Age 72	Count	Persons	Mar-11	33	1183	69298	417216	3177	120715	1.4%	0.9%	8.4%	90.3%	72.5	3842.5	
Age 73	Count	Persons	Mar-11	57	1164	67225	403761	3234	121879	1.5%	0.9%	8.5%	90.8%	73.5	4189.5	
Age 74	Count	Persons	Mar-11	38	1038	64221	387121	3272	122917	1.0%	0.8%	8.6%	91.6%	74.5	2831	
Age 75	Count	Persons	Mar-11	52	1031	61658	367663	3324	123948	1.4%	0.8%	8.7%	92.3%	75.5	3926	
Age 76	Count	Persons	Mar-11	49	993	60778	350511	3373	124841	1.3%	0.7%	8.9%	93.1%	76.5	3745.5	
Age 77	Count	Persons	Mar-11	34	851	55086	336669	3407	125792	0.9%	0.6%	9.0%	93.7%	77.5	2635	
Age 78	Count	Persons	Mar-11	41	887	53976	318178	3448	126679	1.1%	0.7%	9.1%	94.4%	78.5	3218.5	
Age 79	Count	Persons	Mar-11	43	829	52893	306724	3491	127508	1.1%	0.6%	9.2%	95.0%	79.5	3418.5	
Age 80	Count	Persons	Mar-11	26	757	51280	297952	3518	128265	0.7%	0.6%	9.3%	95.5%	80.5	2173.5	
Age 81	Count	Persons	Mar-11	35	724	47232	273007	3553	128989	0.9%	0.5%	9.4%	96.1%	81.5	2852.5	
Age 82	Count	Persons	Mar-11	27	692	43577	250274	3580	129681	0.7%	0.5%	9.4%	96.6%	82.5	2227.5	
Age 83	Count	Persons	Mar-11	27	605	395										

APPENDIX A – Evaluation of Recreation and Leisure Deficits and Needs

SONNING COMMON NDP

Analysis of 2011 Census Population and AGE profile

AGES	POPULATION ex 2011 Census				AGE - % share of Population				SC vs SODC
	SonnCmn	SODC	SE England	ENGLAND	SC mix%	SODC	SE Eng	All Eng	
0-17	788	29287	1859696	11336960	20.8%	21.8%	21.5%	21.4%	-5%
18-34	461	23650	1817971	12130738	12.2%	17.6%	21.1%	22.9%	-31%
35-51	960	34753	2112460	12729462	25.4%	25.9%	24.5%	24.0%	-2%
52-65	659	23745	1451924	8678575	17.4%	17.7%	16.8%	16.4%	-2%
66-71	256	8097	473630	2820067	6.8%	6.0%	5.5%	5.3%	12%
72-85	533	11868	735565	4328207	14.1%	8.8%	8.5%	8.2%	59%
86+	127	2857	183504	988447	3.4%	2.1%	2.1%	1.9%	58%
ALL	3,784	134,257	8,634,750	53,012,456	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

LOW!

V. HIGH!

V. HIGH!

NOTES

LOW MIX in SC re 18-34 yr olds, going to higher education, first jobs, bright lights + problems of property access

HIGH MIX in SC of people 72+ age. Echo of 1960s/70s expansion here, some evidence of moving in from outside villages when older.

Mix affected by type and price of housing locally. But in 20 years time there could be a significant change as current 35-65 group not so big.

As the 35-65 group moves through and as homes for the 66+ age group come onto the market, it may generate rejuvenation of the mix.

By 2031, a 66 year old at Census 2011 will have become an 86 year old...

2011 Analysis of SC age profile