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Introduction and Scope

1.1 Mansfield District Council is working in partnership with Sport England and the National Governing Bodies of Sport to produce a Playing Pitch Strategy for the ten year period 2015 to 2025.

1.2 The strategy covers the sports of football, cricket, rugby (league and union) hockey, tennis, bowls and athletics.

1.3 This document is the assessment report for Mansfield District. It summarises the key issues arising from the assessment of facilities and informs the preparation of the strategy document (under separate cover). For each of the sports covered, it aims to:

- summarise the current supply of playing pitches and outdoor sports facilities;
- outline current demand for facilities and evaluate projected demand up to 2025;
- evaluate the overall adequacy of provision to meet current and projected future demand; and
- identify the key issues for the Mansfield District Council Playing Pitch Strategy to address.

Key Drivers

1.4 To help achieve its planning aims Sport England has three planning objectives, which are to seek to protect sports facilities from loss as a result of redevelopment, to enhance existing facilities through improving their quality, accessibility and management and to provide new facilities that are fit for purpose to meet demands for participation now and in the future.

1.5 The key drivers for the production of this playing pitch strategy for Mansfield District Council can be related to these three tenets, as follows:

- **Protect**: to provide evidence to inform policy in the emerging Mansfield Local Plan, and specifically to support Site Allocations and Development Management policies which will protect playing fields and their use by the community, irrespective of ownership.

- **Enhance**: to ensure that sports facilities are effectively managed and maintained and that best uses are made of existing resources - whether facilities, expertise and/or personnel to improve and enhance existing provision – particularly in the light of pressure on local authority budgets.

- **Provide**: to provide evidence to inform investment decisions and to help secure external funding for new facilities and enhancements through grant aid and also through Section 106 agreements.
1.6 Figure 1.1 illustrates how these components link together.

![Diagram illustrating the components and their interrelation.]

**Vision and Objectives**

1.7 The strategy (and this assessment report, which supports the strategy document) seeks to support Mansfield District and its partners in attaining its vision for outdoor sports.

1.8 Mansfield will be an area where;

- accessible, affordable and high quality opportunities are provided for all ages and abilities to experience and adopt a sporting habit for life;
- outdoor sport is recognised and makes its contribution to addressing health inequalities;
- outdoor sport contributes positively to the image and economy of the area, raising the profile as a sports friendly district; and
- sports facilities are well maintained and managed and are viable and sustainable.

1.9 To achieve the strategic vision, the strategy therefore seeks to deliver the following objectives;

- to ensure that the amount of pitches is sufficient to meet current and projected future need;
- to provide facilities of appropriate quality;
- to support increasing participation in the pitch sports and sustainable club development; and
- to consider the rationalisation of sports pitches where appropriate to facilitate higher quality, viable and accessible facilities.

1.10 To do this, it is essential that provision for each sport continues to evolve and improve to meet with changing needs and aspirations. This assessment and strategy will guide the delivery of facilities for the relevant sports across Mansfield for the next ten years.
As part of this strategy work, a wider stakeholder group made up of relevant council representatives and sports consulting bodies informed the assessment work and actions in the strategy. These can be found in Appendix A.
Introduction

2.1 This section summarises the methodology that has been used in the preparation of this assessment report and the strategy document (i.e. action and implementation plan) that is under separate cover. The documents have been produced in line with guidance by Sport England:

- Assessing Needs and Opportunities Guide for Indoor and Outdoor Sports Facilities (Consultation Draft; December 2013) and

2.2 Several steps of the process are common to all sports and these are detailed below. The methodology for analysis is however varying for each sport (in line with the guidance documents) and this is explored in the sport specific sections.

Consultation Process

2.3 As part of this process, relevant schools, sports bodies and clubs were consulted to inform views on quality, quantity, demand and other needs. Details of who has been involved in informing this assessment and strategy are provided in Appendix A. Consultation took place between April and December 2015.

2.4 A high proportion of teams in Mansfield District successfully engaged with the process as set out in Table 2.1.

Table 2.1: Club Survey Response Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sport</th>
<th>Response Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Athletics</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cricket</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rugby League</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rugby Union</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hockey</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowls</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix A lists those who have been consulted to help inform this playing pitch assessment and strategy.

Site Assessments

2.5 Sites assessments, surveys, and questionnaires were used to evaluate the existing quality and future needs of pitches and other sports provision. These took place during the playing season for each sport as required by the guidance. Site visits were therefore carried out as follows:

- Summer sports - cricket, rugby league, tennis and bowls - April to August 2015
- Winter Sports - Football, hockey, rugby union - October and November 2015
For each site an assessment matrix was completed. These matrices are different for each sport. The methodology to inform the quality scoring of sites is based upon that set out in the guidance documents and is available in Appendix D.

**Sports England Active People Surveys and Market Research**

Sport England produce theoretical tools which have been used to inform this assessment and to build up a picture of the potential sporting activity in Mansfield District. These include:

**Market Segmentation** - Sports Market Segmentation is a web-based tool developed by Sport England to help all those delivering sport to better understand their local markets and target them more effectively. Sport England have split the adult population into 19 segments or types based on their age, gender, socio-demographic information, and overlaid sporting activity and preferences to show the sporting habits of each segment, their motivations to play sport, satisfaction with the sporting experience, top sports they currently play and would like to play, and factors that could encourage them to do more sport.

**Active People Surveys** - The Active People Survey (APS) measures the number of adults taking part in sport across England and in each local authority area and provides a breakdown of participation in each sport. It can be used to evaluate how active the population are and to identify areas to improve participation.

**Geographical Analysis**

2.6 The assessment covers the area within the local authority boundaries of Mansfield District. Research however identified some cross boundary movement (in particular with Ashfield District and Newark and Sherwood District). The impact of this is taken into account by considering the facilities outside of the district that are used by residents of Mansfield and the level of use of sites in Mansfield by non residents. The reasons for the cross boundary movement are also evaluated. This assessment is undertaken within sport specific sections.

2.7 To provide a further understanding of the spatial distribution of both supply and demand, as well as to add a geographical dimension to analysis, the district has been divided into two sub areas. These are illustrated on Map 2.1. The first covers the area of Mansfield urban area which includes all urban areas outside Warsop parish (e.g. Forest Town, Mansfield Woodhouse, Pleasley, etc.). The second focuses on Warsop parish, the more rural northern part of the district, including Market Warsop, Church Warsop, Spion Kop, Meden Vale and Warsop Vale. The boundary for the two areas is the southern edge of the Warsop Parish Council boundary.
Map 2.1: Sub Areas of Mansfield District
Playing Pitches for Football, Cricket, Rugby and Hockey

2.8 Figure 2.1 summarises the stages of the methodology for Football, Cricket Rugby and Hockey (the Playing Pitch Strategy Guidance). This assessment report represents steps 1–6 while the strategy document will include recommendations and an action plan. This figure is extracted directly from the Playing Pitch Strategy Guidance Document.

Figure 2.1: Developing and Delivering a Playing Pitch Strategy – The 10 Step Approach
Steps 2 and 3 – Gather Supply and Demand Information and Views

Supply

2.9 The data collection process included a full audit of pitches across Mansfield District. For each site, the following information was collected:

- Site name, location, ownership and management type
- Number and type of pitches and outdoor sports facilities
- Accessibility of pitches to the community
- Overall quality of pitches and ancillary facilities (including maintenance regimes)
- Level of protection and security of tenure
- Views of users and providers.

Accessibility for Community Use

2.10 Information is gathered on the accessibility of pitches for community use as follows:

- The availability of all pitches;
- The cost of hiring available pitches/leasing sites;
- Physical access to available sites;
- The hours AGPs are available to the local community.

2.11 In line with the guidance, community access to playing pitches is classified as follows:

- Available for community use and used - Pitches in any ownership which are available for hire by, or leased to the community (e.g. leased to a sports club) and currently in use by community teams
- Available for community use but unused - Pitches that are available for hire to the community but are not currently used by community teams; this may apply to some school sites and sites which are available but unused as they are expensive to hire.
- Not available for community use - Pitches which as a matter of policy or practice are not available for use by community teams. This should include professional club pitches
- Not available as disused - Any sites which remain undeveloped and where pitches were once, but are no longer, marked out.

2.12 The PPS guidance does not require detailed catchment mapping of sites and accessibility standards are not set. Information is however collected on the distance that teams are travelling to venues and analysis is undertaken of cross boundary movement where this is evident. This analysis informs the issues identified for consideration in each sport and this is discussed in sport specific sections.

Demand

2.13 To evaluate the demand for playing pitches, the following information was collated:

- Number of sports clubs and teams and their match and training requirements
- Casual and other demand
- Educational demand (i.e. schools and colleges)
- Displaced demand (i.e. teams wishing to play within the district but unable to)
- Latent demand (i.e. an unexpressed demand for taking up sport by those currently inactive in a particular sport for various reasons)
- Future demand (including club and team aspirations for development as well as National Governing Body priorities and targets)
- User views and experiences, including trends and changes in demand.

2.14 The following tasks were undertaken to compile the above supply and demand data:

- Analysing the existing audit of playing fields and outdoor sports facilities (updated by the Council during 2014) and the Sport England Active Places tool
- Reviewing National Governing Bodies (NGB) data on pitches, outdoor sports facilities and local participation (e.g. Football Association, National Athletics, etc.)
- Full review of local league websites, fixture lists and pitch booking records
- Use of available technical quality assessment reports
- Undertaking non-technical site visits
- Consultation with local schools
- A full programme of consultation with sports clubs and league secretaries
- Face to face and telephone discussions with NGBs to discuss key issues and priorities.

Steps 4, 5 and 6 – Assessing the Supply and Demand Information and Views

2.15 The supply and demand information collated has been used, in line with the Sport England methodology, to:

- understand the situation at individual sites;
- develop the current and projected future pictures for each sport; and
- identify the key findings and issues that need to be addressed.

2.16 Figure 2.2 overleaf, extracted directly from the guidance (Sport England 2013), provides further detail of the issues explored during the analysis of the adequacy of provision.

Steps 6 - 10 Develop the Strategy and Deliver the Strategy and Keep it Up to Date and Robust

2.17 The strategy document will use the issues identified to set out a strategic framework for the provision of pitches. Recommendations and priorities will be developed following extensive scenario testing and in conjunction with key stakeholders (both internal to the Council and external).

Non Pitch Sports

2.18 Sports England’s ‘Assessing Needs and Opportunities Guide (ANOG) for Indoor and Outdoor Sports Facilities Consultation Draft (December 2013)’ was used to assess the needs for non-pitch sports. In this assessment, bowls, tennis and athletics were included. This approach is summarised in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part A: Undertaking an Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stage 1 – Prepare and tailor your assessment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Part A: Undertaking an Assessment

#### Stage 2 – Gather Information on supply and demand

To gather information on supply, visits were made to all tennis courts, bowling greens and athletics tracks within the district, and assessments made of their quality, condition and maintenance and ‘fit for purpose’ rating. These assessments took place between April and August 2015.

Discussions were held with operators, manager and users over the course of the development of the assessment (between April and December 2015).

To gather information on demand, questionnaires were sent (many with follow up phone calls and/or visits) to all known sports clubs. Consultation took place with national and regional governing body of sport representatives. Surveys and consultation took place between April and December 2015.

#### Stage 3 – Conduct an assessment and bring the information together

The analysis sought to bring together the evidence gathered to gain an understanding of the relationships between supply and demand. Key findings and issues to be addressed were then set out for each of the sports / facilities covered.

### Part B: Application of Assessment and Strategy Development

Recommendations and strategy priorities were developed to address the issues identified through the data collection and analysis undertaken in Step A. These are actioned in the Playing Pitch Strategy document.

2.19 The remainder of this assessment provides an overview of each sport in Mansfield District and provides the evidence behind the issues presented in the strategy document.

2.20 To inform the analysis of the current and projected future picture for each sport, Section 3 summarises the strategic context, as well as demographic profile (both current and future).
Understand the situation at individual sites

Develop the current picture of provision

Develop the future picture of provision

Identify the key findings and issues

An overview for each site available to the community should be developed consisting of:

1. A comparison between the amount of play a site can accommodate with how much play takes place there;
2. Whether there is any spare capacity during the peak period for relevant pitch types (i.e. period of greatest demand);
3. The key issues with, and views of, the provision at the site.

Site overviews should be used to help understand:

1. The situation across all sites available to the community;
2. The situation across only those sites with secured community use;
3. The nature and extent of play taking place at sites with unsecured community use;
4. The nature and extent of any displaced, unmet and latent demand;
5. Key issues raised with the adequacy of provision;
6. The situation at any priority sites.

The current picture of provision and the future demand information from Stage B should be used to help understand:

1. How population change will affect the demand for provision;
2. How participation targets and current/future trends may affect the demand for provision;
3. Whether there are any particular sports clubs or sites where demand is likely to increase;
4. How any forthcoming changes in supply may affect the adequacy of provision to meet demand.

The current and future pictures of provision, along with the site overviews, should be used to answer the following questions:

1. What are the main characteristics of the current and future supply of and demand for provision?
2. Is there enough accessible and secured community use provision to meet current and future demand?
3. Is the provision that is accessible of sufficient quality and appropriately managed?
Introduction

3.1 This section briefly summarises the key policies that impact upon the preparation of this assessment and strategy. It also provides an overview of the demographics of the district and the impact of this on demand for pitch sports and outdoor sports facilities. It provides an overview only - sport specific issues are discussed in Sections 4 –9.

Strategic Context

National Level

3.2 At a national level, the key policies that impact upon the preparation of this playing pitch and outdoor sports facilities assessment are summarised below.

3.3 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) clearly establishes the requirement that local plans need to ensure that there is proper provision of community and cultural facilities to meet local needs. The NPPF’s expectations for the development of local planning policy for sport and physical activity/recreation is set out in paragraphs 73 and 74 which require there to be a sound (i.e. up-to-date and verifiable) evidence base underpinning policy and its application.

3.4 Paragraph 73 states that:

‘Access to high quality open spaces and opportunities for sport and recreation can make an important contribution to the health and well-being of communities. Planning policies should be based on robust and up to date assessments of the needs for open space, sports and recreation facilities and opportunities for new provision. The assessments should identify specific needs and quantitative or qualitative deficits or surpluses of open space, sports and recreational facilities in the local area. Information gained from the assessments should be used to determine what open space, sports and recreational provision is required.’

3.5 Paragraph 74 states that:

‘Existing open space, sports and recreational buildings and land, including playing fields, should not be built on unless:

- an assessment has been undertaken which has clearly shown the open space, buildings or land to be surplus to requirements; or
- the loss resulting from the proposed development would be replaced by equivalent or better provision in terms of quantity and quality in a suitable location; or
- the development is for alternative sports and recreational provision, the needs for which clearly outweigh the loss.

3.6 The preparation of this playing pitch assessment and strategy will help to ensure that Mansfield District Council is able to deliver upon the requirements of this national policy.

3.7 Sport England has been a statutory consultee on planning applications affecting playing pitches since 1996 and has a long established policy of retention, which is the precursor to the National Planning Policy Framework guidance above. Sport England also advises that informed decisions on playing pitch matters require all local authorities to have an up to
date assessment of need and a strategy based on this. Sport England recommends that a strategy is monitored and updated annually and refreshed every three years. This assessment will support the Council in implementing a robust strategic approach to the delivery, including the protection and enhancement, of pitches. Sport England’s National Strategy – (2011/12 – 2014/15) and Youth and Community Strategy (2012 – 2017) both underpin this playing pitch assessment.

3.8 Focusing specifically on sport, National Governing Body Facility Strategies prepared by the Football Association (FA), England and Wales Cricket Board (ECB), Rugby Football Union (RFU), Rugby Football League (RFL) and England Hockey, all guide the standard of provision of facilities for their specific sport as follows;

- Community Rugby League Facilities Strategy

3.9 The key principles of each of these strategic documents are summarised in each of corresponding sports pitch sections.

Local Policy Context

3.10 More locally in Mansfield District, the preparation of this Playing Pitch and Outdoor Sports Facility Strategy impacts upon, or is informed by, a number of key documents. These are briefly summarised in Table 3.1.
### Table 3.1: Local Policy Context

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Document</th>
<th>Context and Key Issues Arising</th>
<th>Link to this Assessment and Strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emerging Mansfield District Local Plan (2013 – 2033)</td>
<td>Mansfield District Council are preparing a Local Plan to provide an up-to-date strategy for the delivery of new homes, employment, commercial and community facilities. It will also ensure the protection of the historic and natural environment and will set out a spatial strategy for the district. The new Local Plan will, when adopted, replace the current Mansfield District Local Plan 1998 and be in place until 2033.</td>
<td>This assessment and strategy will form part of the evidence base for the local plan. It will inform both strategic and site specific policies, particularly site allocations and development management policies. The playing pitch assessment and strategy is in addition to a separate community open space assessment (2015-16), green infrastructure background evidence (2015-16) and allotment strategy (2014). Together these three evidence documents help to inform open space and green infrastructure policies and their implementation, such as identifying sites for protection and enhancement and those surplus to requirement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Mansfield District Corporate Plan (2015 - 2019) | The Corporate Plan sets out the vision for the district and the values which guide the Council and corporate priorities for addressing the needs of residents, businesses and visitors.  

**Vision:** Maintaining a district where everybody can succeed.  

This vision will be realised through a set of priority areas around economic prosperity, quality of life and community safety. These three priorities to 2019 are:  

- A thriving, vibrant and sustainable district  
  - Creating a thriving market and vibrant town centres – ‘Destination Mansfield’.  
  - Celebrating and promoting Mansfield’s retail, leisure and heritage | The provision of an effective network of outdoor sports facilities will contribute to the achievement these priorities within the Corporate Plan. |
- Facilitating and encouraging regeneration of key sites for the provision of good quality housing schemes, retail and commercial developments
- Supporting our businesses to thrive and grow and encouraging new business
- Creating and enabling a spatial vision for the district through a new Local Plan
- Helping people to achieve their potential, enhancing and developing skills through our apprenticeship and graduate programmes

➢ Key priority: Strong, safe and resilient communities
  - Maintaining safe communities where people are able to enjoy their home and neighbourhoods
  - Enabling people to live independent lives through provision of good quality affordable housing, and developing homes for life
  - Engaging with our communities, listening, talking to and involving people in developing a cohesive tolerant community
  - Ensuring our housing provision including private sector HMOs is safe and appropriate to the needs of the community.
  - Supporting people to live longer through healthier lifestyles, encouraging active lifestyles through increased participation in sport, promoting tobacco cessation and tackling obesity
  - Working in partnership to tackle homelessness

➢ Clean and welcoming environment
  - Providing a clean attractive district, using direct actions to tackle environmental crime, poor housing, eyesore properties, and derelict land
  - Providing and maintaining high quality green spaces which enhance
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Document</th>
<th>Context and Key Issues Arising</th>
<th>Link to this Assessment and Strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mansfield as a destination through our leisure facilities and parks and open spaces</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Encouraging community pride in our green spaces by working in partnership with friends groups, the voluntary sector and community group.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- To tackle climate change and improve the district’s environment by reducing our own carbon footprint, increasing recycling rates and encouraging ‘green industries’ and alternative energy sources.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Parks and Green Spaces Strategy (in-progress as of 2016)**

This emerging Parks strategy sets out the priorities for Mansfield District Council’s parks and green spaces service. Draft objectives include:

- to create high quality and well maintained parks, green spaces and local nature reserves
- to ensure safe and easy access to nearby parks and green space
- to encourage greater use of green spaces for supporting healthy lifestyles
- to improve green linkages between our green spaces, town centres and neighbourhoods
- to engage with our communities in order to promote awareness and facilitate greater participation with our green spaces and nature conservation
- to improve the biodiversity value of our green spaces and access to natural areas and
- to support implementation of the Mansfield District Local Plan and establish appropriate standards for the provision of new parks and green spaces through development.

Many parks and recreation grounds contain outdoor sports facilities. This PPS assessment and strategy provides evidence on the value and role of outdoor sports facilities and playing pitches in the district for supporting the delivery of the MDC Parks and Green Spaces Strategy. In doing so, it provides a guide for required improvements to playing fields within public open space.
Context and Demographic Profile

3.11 In addition to the strategic context, an understanding of the character, population trends and overall participation in sport in the district underpins this assessment. These provide an important context for understanding the overall demand (amount and type) for playing pitches and other outdoor sports provision and the challenges associated with providing an adequate supply.

Geographical Context

3.12 The main urban areas in the district are the wider Mansfield built-up area and Market Warsop to the north. There are also a series of more isolated smaller villages associated with Warsop Parish. The wider Mansfield urban area, where the majority of the population lives, includes various neighbourhoods/estates and outlying urban areas such as Pleasley, Rainworth and Clipstone. Many of these have their own local centres. These outlying areas also share urban areas within Bolsover District Council and Newark and Sherwood District Council, respectively; thus, they are divided between two districts. Access to community sports facilities is generally good and consultation suggests that the majority of players travel no further than 5 miles to reach their home ground. Facilities are located within a mixture of public parks, school, college and academy playing fields, and private sports complexes or premises.

3.13 The district centre at Market Warsop serves the town and acts as the local service centre for its neighbouring communities including Church Warsop, Warsop Vale, Meden Vale and Spion Kop.

3.14 The close proximity to neighbouring areas of Sutton-in-Ashfield, Newark and surrounding areas, Worksop and Chesterfield mean that there is a degree of travel between these areas and some player movement between neighbouring districts. This is explored in the individual sports sections in this assessment. There are strong infrastructure links (e.g. roads, bus, cycle routes) between these communities and it is therefore important to take account of activity within these neighbouring areas and the impact that this may have on demand for facilities in Mansfield.

3.15 The district is has been heavily influenced by its industrial past, with coal mining and textiles thriving until their decline in the 1980’s. Residents are proud of the district’s industrial and textile past but also share a need to look positively to the future. Most former mining sites (e.g. collieries, quarries) have been restored to informal public open space for walking and cycling, developed for housing or have been identified for regeneration in the emerging Mansfield District Local Plan. Sport has played an important role in the district’s industrial past and has the potential to contribute to the districts regeneration, including improving health and well-being. The presence of Miners welfare sports grounds (former and existing) is an example of this relationship. The district has also produced Olympic and other top athletes demonstrating a high legacy of sport.

3.16 Generally, most people in the district have good access to a range of public open spaces, public and private sports provision and green corridors. There are seven green flag quality parks which offer a range of leisure provision, including sport. These serve as a good resource for keeping active and healthy. The Mansfield District Community Open Space Assessment (2016) findings conclude that, on a whole, residents appear to have relatively good access to green and open spaces close to where they live (within a 5-minute walk). But there are clear localised gaps in access for residents living in specific areas where they don’t have access to any form of green space within a 5-minute walk. There are also some
residents who only have access to small incidental open spaces (less than 0.4 hectares) or only access to areas supporting informal recreation (e.g. walking, relaxing). This may impact more significantly on people without cars having access to sports provision.

3.17 Deprivation, as measured by the Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD) is a major indicator for determining the overall of health of a population. Despite overall good access to green and open spaces and the countryside, deprivation in the district is higher than the national average. This is most likely due to a number of factors but is outside the remit of this paper to explore but actions within the playing pitch strategy aim to address improving participation in sports. The most up-to-date Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD 2010) ranked Mansfield District 38 out of 353 authorities (with 1 being the most deprived). In addition, twelve out of 36 Lower Super Output areas in the district fall within the top 10% of deprived areas in the country. Overall, long term unemployment (10) is also higher than national (7.1) and regional averages (crude rate per 1,000 population aged 16-64, 2014).

3.18 In nearly all instances; people living in the most deprived areas generally score worse in terms of health indicators than those in the most affluent areas within the district. Reflecting this, the health of people in Mansfield is also generally worse than the England average. Public Health England’s 2015 published health profile for the district provides the most up-to-date health indicator figures and highlights the following key issues summarised in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Health indicator</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Overall comparison with national averages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Life expectancy (from birth)</strong></td>
<td>There is evidence of significant variation across Mansfield district in life expectancy. This depends on levels of deprivation. The greater the area of deprivation, the lower the life expectancy. The gap in men is 8.9 years and for women is 9.3 years.</td>
<td>Slightly higher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local value (78.5 for men and 81.9 for women)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>National value (79.4 for men and 83.1 for women)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Early deaths from all causes</strong></td>
<td>Over the past 10 years, all-cause mortality rates have fallen. For those in the most deprived areas in the district, averages are higher than national averages and lower or equal to national averages for those in the least deprived areas.</td>
<td>Slightly higher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No specific figures available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deaths from heart disease and stroke</strong></td>
<td>The early death rate from heart disease and stroke has also fallen but remains slightly worse than the England average. Rates are based on per 100,000 population aged under 75.</td>
<td>Higher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local value (90.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>National value (78.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Obesity</strong></td>
<td>The obesity rates for both children (percentage of year 6 children) and adults (adults classified as obese) are higher than national averages with adults showing more significantly higher values.</td>
<td>Local value (90.1 for adults, 20.6 for children)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>National value (78.2 for adults, 19.1 for children)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health indicator</td>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Overall comparison with national averages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recorded diabetes</td>
<td>Diabetes can often be linked to obesity and low levels of physical activity. Levels of diabetes are lower than the national averages as measured by people on GP registers with a recorded diagnosis of diabetes.</td>
<td>Slightly higher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local value (6.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>National value (6.2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.19 Other health indicators suggest that levels of teenage pregnancy, GCSE attainment, healthy eating, smoking are worse than the England average. The district’s health profile can be found on Public Health’s website: www.healthprofiles.info/.

3.20 In summary, access to opportunities to undertake sport and physical activity will be a key means of delivering improvement and in enhancing the health of the population and the creation of an effective network of sports facilities will be central to this. Therefore, local provision within walkable distances (i.e. 5-minutes) and targeted sports programmes are likely to be particularly important in areas of higher deprivation and where health issues are more prevalent and where there may be greater evidence of affordability concerns.

**Demographic Profile**

3.21 The 2011 census, which is the most recent fully comprehensive data set revealed the total population of Mansfield District to be 104,466, which represented a small increase since 1991.

3.22 The census however revealed a noticeably lower proportion of people aged 0-19 in the district than nationally and regionally while the proportion of people in the higher age groups is greater. Sport England research (Market Segmentation and Active People surveys) and National Governing Body research reveal that older residents have a lower propensity to participate in pitch sports, and the reduced proportions of residents in younger age groups (below aged 44) may therefore reduce demand for playing fields and different types of outdoor sports facilities.

3.23 Despite the overall ageing population, Mid-Year Population Estimates (2009 / 2013 and 2015) indicate that the total number of people aged over 16 in the district experienced a small decline but is now increasing again. This is illustrated in Figure 3.1 (extracted directly from Sport England local Sport Profile)
3.24 The 2016 population projections demonstrate that the proportion of people of pensionable age has increased at the highest rate. This has implications for the type of facilities required, with Sport England Market Segmentation demonstrating that these sectors of the population are less likely to participate in pitch sports. These groups may however still have relatively high participation profiles in bowls and tennis, which often appeal to older residents. There are also growing programmes for lower impact sports including walking football. Sports pitches are also used for other non-formalised sport such as adult rounders, that aim to get people active and engage socially.

3.25 Sub National population projections (2012 based) indicate that the population of the district will have risen to 105,500 by 2015, suggesting a slight increase in the total number of people from 104,466 in 2011. The trends in the population profile however remain relatively the same.

Health and Sporting profile

3.26 Analysis of the demographics of Mansfield District reveals that the propensity for residents to participate in pitch sports may be lower than average due to the skew of the population profile towards older residents but it is important to relate these population figures to actual participation in the uptake of sports. The Sport England Active People Survey and Local Profile tool provides a further understanding of patterns of participation local to Mansfield. The most up-to-date figures (all 2015 / 2016 Sport England Active People) reveal the following:

- Despite lower propensity to participate overall, as of March 2015, 31.9% of the adult (16+) population in Mansfield took part in sport at least once per week. This is below both the East Midlands (34.8%) and England averages (36.1%). Participation in Mansfield has fluctuated over the course of the Active People survey (2005 - 2016) but the most recent figures available (2015 / 2016) demonstrate lower participation than the high in 2012 / 2013.
• Participation is higher amongst males than females, but overall participation in sport has risen in all demographic groups. The total proportion of residents participating in at least 3 sessions of activity per week has also increased.

• 22.6% of the adult population are members of a sports club. This is above the East Midlands (21.2%) and England (22%) average and suggests that there are strong foundations for ongoing participation growth within Mansfield District; and

• 48.4% of adults would like to do more sport. This is a lower proportion than the East Midlands (55.9%) and the England average (58%). Further breakdown is not available and the reasons for these differences are unknown but may be attributed to an ageing population profile, as well as issues experienced with deprivation.

3.27 This profile therefore suggests that residents of Mansfield District are slightly less active than the national and regional averages, potentially influenced by the ageing population profile. Of the sports included within this assessment however, only football features within the top five most popular sports based on findings from Active People 2015. It should be noted however that participation has historically fluctuated significantly, and the Sport England local profile tool used represents only a point in time.

Future Population profile (based on 2012 Sub National Population Projections)

3.28 As well as determining the demand for existing provision, analysis of projected changes to the population profile (and therefore future demand) form a key component of an assessment of the facility requirements for outdoor sports facilities and playing pitches. In addition to this information, this playing pitch assessment looks more closely at the local need for sports provision in relation to use and demand.

3.29 There are several different sources of population figures available, and a Strategic Housing Market Assessment was also recently completed (2015), which evaluated a range of growth scenarios. All result in similar projections for population growth and due to the availability of a breakdown in the projected population profile, as well as the total population, ONS 2012 based subnational population projections for the district have been used. These figures were the most up to date available in the level of detail required to accurately forecast changes in playing pitch demand.

3.30 ONS 2012 subnational population projections indicate that the population will increase from 105,500 (2015) to 109,100 by 2025. This represents an increase of 3,600 people, (an increase of 3.41%).

3.31 Analysis of the likely population profile by 2025 however reveals subtle changes and suggests that while the overall population of the district will increase by 3.41%, participation in outdoor sports may not increase in the same manner. While the overall proportion of people aged up to 19 will remain the same, the proportion of people aged between 20 and 44 will decline marginally (31% currently to 29.4%). Population growth will see the number of people in these combined age groups increase slightly, by just 300 people (equivalent to just 0.5%).

3.32 In contrast, the proportion of residents falling in the older age group (65+) will increase and they will make up 22.1% of the population by 2025 compared to 18.6% now. This means that there will be 24,100 people aged over 65 by 2025 compared to 19,600 now. This suggests that demands for outdoor sports facilities may change, and that increases in participation will not be uniform across the different sports (with demand for pitch sports
typically starting to decline at 44, while participation in bowls increases at pensionable age. Equally, it suggests that demand for sports facilities will not increase directly in line with population growth, although the need to address health inequalities in the district shows the need to increase participation. The recent availability of modified versions of pitch sports (such as walking football and Last Man Stands) are aimed at increasing participation from both younger and older age groups, offering greater choice and to help fit into people’s increasingly busy lives.

**The Mansfield District Local Plan (2013 to 2033)**

3.33 At the time of writing this assessment, an emerging new Mansfield District Local Plan sets out the future vision for growth with sports and improvements to health being central to this vision. It addressed changes to the population that will occur naturally, as well as those that will arise as a result of policies (for example the creation of new employment areas) within the strategy. It considers the proposed location of new housing developments which will be developed to address the population growth.

3.34 The plan is still emerging and the location of new housing is therefore not confirmed. The most up to date version (Mansfield District Consultation Draft Jan 2016) however plans for an additional 7520 dwellings from 2013 to 2033, which will result in an overall increase of 6531 people (up to 2033). These figures may be subject to change as the council proceeds towards the final publication of the Local Plan.

3.35 As of 31st March 2015, 530 homes have already been built (393 in Mansfield and 137 in Warsop Parish) and a further 4153 have already been approved leaving 2837 for allocation in the local plan. It is likely that the majority of these will be focused in the urban area.

3.36 The location of new housing can impact on the requirement for outdoor sports facilities, particularly where developments are large as they may create concentrated demand in the new neighbourhood. Of the houses that have already been granted permission, the key sites are as follows;

- Lindhurst (southern extremity of Mansfield) – proposed 1,700 dwellings;
- Land at Penniment Farm (Abbott Road, north Western Mansfield) – proposed 430 dwellings; and
- Sandlands Way in Forest Town - 329 dwellings now built.

While other locations have not yet been finalised, land availability means that these are likely to be much smaller in scale. At the time of writing this assessment, these development areas included the largest areas for population growth in the district and were taken into account when projecting the future demand for sports facilities in the district later in these sections. Areas where there is a concentration of combined smaller sites may also equally impact on provision and this is taken into account in the relevant sport specific sections.
Summary

Context - Summary and Key issues

The key issues arising from analysis of the context and issues for this playing pitch assessment in Mansfield District are therefore:

- The preparation of the assessment will contribute directly to the national and local policy agenda, providing evidence for the emerging Mansfield District Local Development Plan (2013 to 2033), in particular site allocations and policies. The provision of an effective network of sports facilities contribute to the need to support healthy communities, as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework’s needs for local plans to plan for sustainable development.

- The majority of the population are within the Mansfield urban area which has a variety of available open space and sport facilities however there are localised areas where there is a greater need for formal public open space with sports provision.

- Since the decline of manufacturing and coal industries, regeneration within the district has improved its overall image but there is still need for further enhancements, specifically when considering higher than average levels of deprivation and health inequalities. Access to opportunities to undertake sport and physical activity will be a key means of delivering greater uptake in sports participation and also overall increases in physical activity. The creation of an effective and accessible network of sports facilities and opportunities for improved sport engagement for all ages and backgrounds will be central to delivering overall improvements in health.

- The district demonstrates an ageing population and lower than average deprivation levels. These factors may contribute to the comparatively low tendency of residents to participate in outdoor sports. There have been particular declines in the number of people in the district aged appropriately (below 44) to participate in adult pitch sports. This may influence the type of sports provision needed now and in the future.

- Despite this, Sports England’s Active People Survey suggests that there are strong foundations for participation in and the willingness to take up sport and recreation in the district. The provision of effective facilities will be key to promoting activity across the district and to subsequently improving health.

- Mansfield District is expected to see some population growth (3.41% up to 2025). The ageing population however means that growth in the number of people aged in age groups (below 44) most likely to participate in pitch sports will be lower (0.5%). Population growth in older age segments will however be higher, particularly those of pensionable age. While this means that the impact on demand for playing fields and outdoor sports facilities may not be as high as initially appears in the 20 - 44 age group, the increase in older residents may see changing demands for facilities. Population growth will therefore have ramifications for the number of pitches and other outdoor sports facilities that are needed.
Context - Summary and Key issues

- At the time of writing this assessment, the Mansfield District Local Plan (2013-2033) is still emerging and the location of new developments is not yet confirmed. Large areas of planned housing may however impact upon demand, with 1,700 houses to be provided, through at Lindhurst (southern extremity of Mansfield) and 430 near to Abbott Road (north western Mansfield). The remaining sites are yet to be determined but are likely to impact the urban area and the provision for sport.
Introduction

4.1 This section evaluates the adequacy of pitches for cricket and provides;

- An overview of the supply and demand for cricket pitches
- An understanding of activity at individual sites in the district
- A picture of the adequacy of current provision; and
- The future picture of provision for cricket.

Pitch Supply

4.2 There are five sites containing grass facilities for cricket and a total of 6 grass pitches provided. This figure includes all known pitches whether or not they offer community use and regardless of ownership. Pitches available are summarised in Table 4.1, which also contains details of former cricket pitches. The John Fretwell Sporting Complex is the only site to contain two grass pitches.

Table 4.1: Grass Cricket Pitches across Mansfield District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Sites available for community use (grass pitches)</th>
<th>Sites not available for community use (non-turf Wickets only)</th>
<th>Former Cricket Pitches (disused turf and non-turf)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mansfield urban area</td>
<td>Chesterfield Road Recreation Ground (1) \ Debdale Park Sports and Recreation Club (1) \ Clipstone Miners Welfare (Seventh Avenue Site (1) \ Queen Elizabeth's Academy (1)</td>
<td>The Brunts Academy \ All Saints Academy \ Samworth Church Academy (2)</td>
<td>Racecourse Park (grass and non-turf wicket that is still there but unusable) Forest Road Recreation Ground Manor Sport and Recreation Complex (non turf)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pitch sub total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warsop Parish</td>
<td>The John Fretwell Sporting Complex (2 pitches)</td>
<td>The Meden School (2, one of which still exists but is unusable)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pitch sub total</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total pitches</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• four of the six grass pitches are located within the greater Mansfield urban area. The John Fretwell Sporting Complex (2 pitches) is the only site with grass cricket pitches in Warsop Parish (Sookholme) and there are no sites with just non turf wickets; and

• there are also two disused grass pitches (Racecourse Park and Forest Road). These have not been maintained and used for several years. Both also contain old non turf wickets which are also no longer functional for cricket. The non-turf wicket at Manor Sports Complex is also unusable. These pitches were previously available for community use. There is an unusable non-turf pitch at Meden School which is not available for community use.

4.4 Based on the above information, the number of sites (available provision) for cricket in the district has decreased in recent years.

Ownership, Management and Maintenance of Cricket Pitches

4.5 Mansfield District Council is responsible only for the management of one cricket pitch in the district, at Chesterfield Road Recreation Ground.

4.6 The two pitches at the John Fretwell Sporting Complex are managed by the Trust, while the remaining pitches are managed by the clubs that use them. This includes the pitch at Queen Elizabeth’s Academy, which is maintained by the club as part of an ‘Adopt a Wicket’ partnership arrangement between the Nottinghamshire Cricket Board, The QE Trust and the Club.

4.7 The England and Wales Cricket Board (ECB) and Nottinghamshire Cricket Board highlight the maintenance of pitches as being a key component of the delivery of successful cricket facilities. It is also important to have a dedicated pitch advisor that supports cricket clubs in the improvement of their facilities. Consultation with clubs and the National Governing Body, leagues and clubs demonstrate consensus that there has been an overall recent improvement in the standard of community accessible facilities. Mansfield and District Cricket league attribute this to the time and effort taken to maintain the facilities provided to a sufficient standard.

4.8 The Bassetlaw and District Cricket League however highlight the pressures that clubs are under with regards finding volunteers and the time and dedication required to maintain cricket pitches. The league believes some pitches have declined as a result of the required time input and associated cost. It is essential therefore to ensure that management and maintenance of facilities in the district remains sustainable to ensure the longevity of cricket.

Pitch Quality

4.9 The importance of maintaining quality standards in cricket is reflected in league rules and regulations. The Nottinghamshire Cricket Board Premier League undertake an assessment of pitch quality after each match, ensuring that any issues with the overall pitch quality, the wicket, or the outfield are identified. If pitches and associated ancillary provision are not up to the required quality standards, this can lead to relegation and / or loss of promotion. A similar assessment is also undertaken by umpires in the Bassetlaw and District Cricket League.

4.10 In the Bassetlaw and District Cricket League (which is the league in which the majority of cricket clubs in Mansfield play), clubs reaching Division 1 and earning promotion must meet specific requirements relating to the condition and size of outfield, the availability of site screens, the appropriate provision of dressing rooms and umpires provision and
effective maintenance equipment including light and heavy rollers, wheel-on or sheet
pitch, covers, as well as correct marking of pitches. Requirements in the Mansfield and
District Cricket League are not as strict.

4.11 To understand the adequacy of provision within Mansfield, the quality of pitches was
therefore assessed through site visits undertaken using a non-technical assessment matrix
prepared by the ECB, as well as consultation and analysis of local league pitch ratings. A
copy of this matrix is provided in Appendix D. Recent (2014 / 2015) professional quality
assessments undertaken evaluating the quality of the pitches by the ECB pitch assessor
have also been taken into account in this playing pitch study.

4.12 Assessments indicate that the overall quality of current pitches available for community
use in Mansfield District is standard to good (see Appendix D for criteria). Reflecting this,
the ECB confirm that none of the pitches within the district have been the subject of
feedback relating to poor or unsuitable cricket pitches this year during the league season.
It should be noted however that with the exception of pitches at the John Fretwell Centre
(good) all facilities are of a standard, (i.e. functional) quality and relatively basic in
comparison to some other areas outside the district. The pitches belonging to some clubs
in neighbouring authorities are also reported to be (by clubs, the ECB and local leagues)
significantly higher quality than those in Mansfield. This may mean that players are
attracted to these clubs rather than facilities in Mansfield (as ECB research demonstrates
that facilities are a key consideration in club choice).

4.13 Table 4.2 summarises the sites containing cricket pitches available for community use
within the district alongside identified quality issues. It provides an indication of the quality
of existing grass pitch provision, non-turf wickets, and training and meeting/changing
facilities at each site. Issues regarding maintenance of facilities have been identified.
Areas that impact the degree to which a site is fit for purpose are highlighted in red and
are fed into the playing pitch strategy action plan.

4.14 Maintenance issues are only highlighted in red where these have been identified by the
club. All other highlighted issues have been based on professional observations recorded
at the time of site visits.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub Area</th>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Pitch Quality</th>
<th>Site Quality Comments</th>
<th>Ancillary Facilities and Comments</th>
<th>Nets</th>
<th>Non Turf Wicket</th>
<th>Maintenance Issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mansfield</td>
<td>Chesterfield Road Recreation Ground</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>Site includes covers and sightscreens, based on public recreation ground. Despite this, no evidence of vandalism or litter identified. Outfield uneven although wicket is well prepared. Club satisfied with overall condition of facility although they provide support for most of the maintenance of the square to maximise quality.</td>
<td>Facilities limited to changing accommodation and toilets (2 rooms). Bar used at social club just down the road. Sites includes covers and sightscreens, based on public recreation ground. Despite this, no evidence of vandalism or litter identified. Outfield uneven although wicket is well prepared. Club satisfied with overall condition of facility although they provide support for most of the maintenance of the square to maximise quality.</td>
<td>Includes practice nets</td>
<td>Non Turf wicket patched and uneven - of relatively poor quality. Standing water evident at the time of site visit and surface worn in high traffic areas.</td>
<td>Amount of maintenance undertaken by CBC seen significant decline over recent years and there is no longer an onsite presence. Club supplement square maintenance to ensure that facilities are fit for purpose using own fine turf expertise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mansfield</td>
<td>Clipstone Miners Welfare</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>Outfield and wicket both even - confirmed by club and site visit. Grass length acceptable. Site includes sight screens, covers, separate scoreboard and rope boundary as well as portable cover for the square. Site is tidy overall. Club indicate that pitch quality improved has improved slightly due to focus on maintenance - top</td>
<td>Site includes two changing rooms, no separate male female / junior. One official's room. Changing is heated with showers. Recently painted and extended. Club indicate that extension to ancillary facilities and social room remains a key priority for them. Note these developments could potentially include practice nets that have been recently installed by the club and purchased a bowling machine</td>
<td>Includes practice nets</td>
<td>No artificial wicket provided - identified as the key priority for the club</td>
<td>Site maintained by cricket club themselves. Leased from Clipstone Social Club. Clipstone Welfare CC also maintain ancillary facilities. Club have access to appropriate maintenance facilities, but have struggled to implement any major improvement programmes due to a lack of external funding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub Area</td>
<td>Site</td>
<td>Pitch Quality</td>
<td>Site Quality Comments</td>
<td>Ancillary Facilities and Comments</td>
<td>Nets</td>
<td>Non Turf Wicket</td>
<td>Maintenance Issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mansfield</td>
<td>Debdale Park Sports and Recreation Club</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>Grass coverage on outfield good and wicket even. Club believe outfield to be slightly uneven, but rate the overall pitch as standard. Site includes scorebox and sightscreens. Site includes mowers / rollers, sight screens, showers, score box, practice nets and portable covers for the square. Club suggest pitch quality is hampered by the amount of football that is played on the outfield outside of the cricket season.</td>
<td>Excellent changing rooms with full social facilities. There are 8 rooms including separate junior rooms and male / female accommodation. Shared with other sports. There is one officials changing room. Facilities owned by CISWO, maintained by the Club. Changing is secured and parking is adequate. Facility includes heating and showers etc.</td>
<td>Includes mobile practice nets</td>
<td>Non turf wicket in reasonable condition. No rips or issues with the surface</td>
<td>Club have mowers and rollers. They indicate however that there is potential to improve the maintenance levels, particularly around the preparation of the wicket. The use of the outfield for football can hamper preparation of the outfield. A new groundsman has recently taken over and procedures will be reviewed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mansfield</td>
<td>Queen Elizabeth's</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>Facility of standard quality with even</td>
<td>Changing is secured and</td>
<td>No practice nets</td>
<td>No non turf wicket</td>
<td>Maintained by club, who have recently struggled with area of</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dressing at the end of last season. Recent improvements include new covers, painted sightscreens, changing rooms, toilets and tearoom. The club also put in practice nets and bought a bowling machine.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub Area</th>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Pitch Quality</th>
<th>Site Quality Comments</th>
<th>Ancillary Facilities and Comments</th>
<th>Nets</th>
<th>Non Turf Wicket</th>
<th>Maintenance Issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>outfield and wicket. Issues have been experienced where non turf wicket was previously laid with grass coming up and dying. Now improving</td>
<td>parking is adequate. Facility includes heating and showers etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>poor grass growth. No identified issues with existing maintenance, club have allocated groundsman to site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The John Fretwell Centre</td>
<td>Good (both pitches)</td>
<td>Site has professional aura with high quality wickets and outfield. Both pitches are of very high quality, the first pitch particularly so. Site includes sight screens, pavilion seating and rope boundary. Old wickets demonstrating evidence of repair.</td>
<td>4 changing rooms available with 1 officials room. Full cafeteria, bar and function room, heated. Site also accommodates indoor functions so is of high specification.</td>
<td>2 sets of practice nets (one associated with each pitch) one four bay and one two. Indoor training facility to ECB specification also provided although use restricted due to other activities in the centre.</td>
<td></td>
<td>No non turf wickets provided</td>
<td>Maintained by John Fretwell Sporting Trust. Dedicated groundsman ensures facilities are of high quality. No issues identified with quality of John Fretwell facility, but club raise concerns about quality of wickets experienced when playing away.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.15 Bringing together both the findings of the site specific information presented in Table 4.2, as well as the key issues arising through consultation, it is clear that across Mansfield District;

- the pitches at the John Fretwell Sporting Complex are the highest quality pitches in the district, with both pitches considered good and sustaining high standard (including Nottinghamshire County) fixtures;

- there are relatively few quality issues identified, with the only concerns raised in relation to the actual pitch quality relating to the evenness of the outfield. This reflects the league assessments, which indicate that all pitches are adequate to meet current requirements;

- significant effort has been put into maintenance of facilities, with most clubs referencing the work that has been put in. Mansfield CC however supplement Council grounds maintenance processes in order to ensure that the wicket remains fit for purpose and of sufficient quality to meet club need. Ongoing input from the club in the form of additional maintenance is required to ensure that facilities remain fit for purpose;

- there are also few concerns with the training opportunities provided. This contrasts with the current picture of cricket nationally, where facilities for training are often a key issue. All clubs have access to mobile training nets and only Clipstone CC require a non turf wicket. The non turf wicket at Chesterfield Road Recreation Ground is however poor and in need of reinstatement works if it is to remain functional; and

- the availability of changing facilities is also good, with all sites having a minimum of changing rooms and separate rooms and all are heated. All clubs also have social facilities. The pavilion at Chesterfield Road however is in a relatively poor condition, but the club use a social facility just up the road as their social base.

4.16 The ECB highlight the important of all components of pitch quality, prioritising pitch maintenance, pitch quality and the provision of appropriate pavilions. The forming of a successful cricket club, for the longer term, includes investing in a combination of social, environmental and economic factors. Addressing the quality of pitch provision helps to address these.

4.17 In addition to the stock of existing cricket pitches, the availability of former sites should also be noted. All non turf wickets are now in poor (and unusable) condition. While the history of both previously containing grass squares suggests that these sites offer the potential for reinstatement (site size and layout are appropriate), the challenges of providing cricket pitches in a public park setting (e.g. unofficial use of fine turf wicket, health and safety issues) should not be underestimated.

**Security of Tenure**

4.18 There are no clear issues identified in relation to the security of tenure for cricket in Mansfield District at the current time, with all clubs indicating that their access is secure although the length of the lease remaining at Clipstone Social Club is unknown.

**Demand**
4.19 There are 22 cricket teams currently playing in Mansfield District in total. Of these, 15 are adult teams. 32% of teams (7) are therefore junior teams. Half of these teams are based in the Warsop Sub area at the John Fretwell Centre, while the remainder are in Mansfield urban area.

4.20 These teams are based within four clubs and there is also one single team. Of note, there are 165 clubs affiliated to the Nottinghamshire Cricket Board which represents 8 local authorities. This means that just 3% of clubs in Nottinghamshire are based in Mansfield although the district represents circa 9% of the total population. This suggests that there are opportunities for the sport to grow and that there may be latent demand in the district.

4.21 All clubs accommodate players that are based within 2 – 5 miles of their home, suggesting that the catchment for cricket clubs is relatively local.

4.22 Reflecting the lower levels of participation just two of the clubs have junior sections. It should however be noted that there are also several large clubs located in the surrounding areas with higher quality facilities (within 5 miles) that may attract players from Mansfield. The closest of these is Mansfield Hosier Mills CC located in Ashfield. As highlighted previously however, anecdotally junior players are thought to travel further in a view to play at higher quality facilities.

4.23 Table 4.3 sets out the teams currently based in Mansfield District.

Table 4.3: Cricket Teams in Mansfield District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub Area</th>
<th>Club</th>
<th>Home Ground</th>
<th>Senior Cricket Teams</th>
<th>Junior Cricket Teams</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mansfield</td>
<td>Clipstone Miners Welfare CC</td>
<td>Clipstone Miners Welfare</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No junior teams, but recently commenced Kwik Cricket</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mansfield</td>
<td>Mansfield CC</td>
<td>Chesterfield Road Recreation Ground / Queen Elizabeth Academy</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mansfield</td>
<td>Sherwood Colliery CC</td>
<td>Debdale Park Sport and Recreation Centre</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warsop</td>
<td>Welbeck CC</td>
<td>The John Fretwell Sporting Complex</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5 (including 1 female)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mansfield</td>
<td>Pheasant Hill CC</td>
<td>Queen Elizabeth Academy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.24 As well as being the largest, Welbeck CC are the highest performing team, with one team in the Notts Premier League. All remaining clubs have teams playing in the Bassetlaw and District Cricket League, which is a feeder league to the premier league. Clipstone Welfare CC are in the Championship Division (with potential for progression to the premier league)
while Mansfield CC have a team in Division 1. There are specific facility requirements associated with teams in both of these divisions, which the grounds are currently meeting. All games in the Nott Premier Cricket league and the Bassetlaw and District Cricket League are played on a Saturday.

4.25 In addition, with the exception of Clipstone CC, the other clubs have teams in the Mansfield and District Cricket league which play on a Sunday. Junior play also takes place in the Bassetlaw and District junior cricket league.

4.26 In addition to the teams based within Mansfield urban area, the John Fretwell Centre (located near to Spion Kop) also hosts higher standard cricket. The site is now home to the Nottinghamshire Ladies Cricket Team, as well as the Nottinghamshire Male second team and is also a host ground for county age group fixtures. Representative teams are excluded from totals in Table 4.3 as they are made up of the same players as those in the club teams. They are however considered when evaluating the use of facilities and the impact that they have on the adequacy of provision. As well as adding extra demand for cricket facilities in the district, these high level games also raise the profile of the sport and could be a positive tool to support increases in participation.

Trends in Participation

4.27 Across Mansfield, there has been a recent decline in adult male cricket, with the total number of adults playing reducing. Mansfield CC, Sherwood Colliery CC have both lost teams this season and playing numbers at Welbeck CC are also declining. Clipstone CC have experienced slight growth but remain the smallest club in the district. This reflects patterns across the Nottinghamshire Cricket Board area, as well as wider nationally.

4.28 Wider within Nottinghamshire area, the Bassetlaw and District Cricket League (where the majority of teams in Mansfield District play) also indicate that they are experiencing declines in the number of players. The ECB recently carried out a player survey (2015) to understand trends in participation and the Bassetlaw and District Cricket League undertook a similar survey. This revealed the following to be barriers to participation:

- length of the game
- finish times
- costs and
- travel distances.

4.29 The Bassetlaw and District Cricket league are currently reviewing existing practices with a view to proposing rule change in the lower divisions in the hope that will stimulate growth in cricket in the area.

4.30 The league also highlights the pressures that clubs are under with regards to finding volunteers and the time and dedication required to maintain cricket pitches. The league seeks to promote participation by relaxing standards for teams in lower divisions to ensure that the ability to stage the game is given priority. A shortage of umpires, scores and volunteers is also a perennial problem and is worsening locally. This issue will again impact on the development of cricket in Mansfield and the wider area for the future.
4.31 Similarly, the Mansfield and District Sunday Cricket League reveal that player commitment has reduced, although the number of teams has broadly remained static. A key theme of AGM meetings is usually a shortage of players. The decline of grounds especially in and around the Mansfield area is highlighted as a key concern for the future of cricket.

4.32 Both Welbeck CC and Clipstone CC demonstrate growing numbers in their junior sections however (although number increases at Welbeck CC are thought to be at the expense of some of the other clubs, who have lost junior players to those with better facilities. While Clipstone CC do not have junior teams, they have recently started to develop Kwik Cricket and have experienced an increase in the number of junior players. Mansfield CC used to have a junior section, but have recently lost this. This decline was attributed to players going elsewhere in search of better facilities for matches and training and a higher standard of play. Mansfield Youth League has also experience significant decline, with significantly fewer teams than 10 years ago.

Displaced Teams

4.33 Mansfield Nomads play outside of the district in Newark and Sherwood but were based at Racecourse Park several years ago. The club play at Newstead at a relatively poor quality facility. The club however initially relocated outside of the district due to the deteriorating condition of both the wicket and outfield and the pavilion at the Racecourse site.

4.34 While the club initially relocated due to the quality of pitches in Mansfield (suggesting that this caused displaced / unmet demand) consultation indicates that they now associate themselves with the Newstead area and do not wish to relocate back to Mansfield.

Training Needs

4.35 Training outdoors takes place on artificial wickets and in training nets at a club’s base. All clubs in Mansfield District have mobile training nets and with the exception of Clipstone CC, all indicated that their facilities for training meet their needs.

4.36 Clipstone Cricket Club and the John Fretwell Centre do not have a non-turf wicket for training, while the quality of the non turf wicket at Chesterfield Road Recreation Ground is poor.

4.37 The ECB highlight the importance of clubs having access to appropriate training facilities – this is particularly important for clubs trying to develop junior sections, as juniors tend to gravitate towards high quality training facilities and a developmental (strong coaching) environment.

4.38 That said, some clubs within Mansfield indicate that despite having all the required facilities for matches and training, they continue to struggle to attract players to the club due to a lack of interest and / or other higher quality facilities in nearby areas, for example at Mansfield Hosiery Mills CC in Sutton in Ashfield.

Educational Demand

4.39 Queen Elizabeth Academy is the only school in the district to have a grass cricket pitch. The Nottinghamshire Cricket Board do however work within schools in the district through the Chance to Shine Cricket Programme, as well as various community initiatives. The school’s programme is focused around clubs that have achieved the Clubmark Standard - both Welbeck CC and Mansfield CC have already achieved this while Sherwood Colliery
CC are working towards it. This suggests that there are good foundations for the development of cricket participation in the district. Clipstone CC have not achieved Clubmark Status and are not working towards it currently. This means that their path to promotion to the Nottinghamshire Premier League is currently blocked.

4.40 For secondary school age groups, district cricket competitions take place at club cricket grounds, although there is limited activity at club cricket bases in the district.

4.41 Despite the work undertaken to introduce cricket to schools, most clubs continue to struggle to recruit players, with little evidence of transition from school to club. Clubs also highlight the limited exposure of cricket on terrestrial TV as reducing interest in younger age groups.

Casual Demand

4.42 There is limited informal use of cricket pitches, mainly because four of the five sites containing grass cricket pitches are on private property. The Chesterfield Road Recreation Ground is however a publicly accessible recreation ground which is accessible 24 hours per day. As a result, the site can be subject to informal and misuse. Vandalism has taken place in the past although few issues are currently experienced at present. Informal use of cricket pitches can present significant challenges given the technicalities involved in preparing the fine turf wicket.

Assessing the Supply and Demand Information and Views

4.43 The adequacy of facilities for cricket is measured by comparing the amount of wickets available against the level of use of these wickets. This is considered firstly at a site specific level and then compiled to present a Districtwide picture.

4.44 For cricket, unlike other pitch sports, the capacity of a pitch is measured on a seasonal basis (as opposed to weekly) and is primarily determined by the number and quality of wickets on a pitch. Play is rotated throughout the season across the wickets to reduce wear and allow for repair.

4.45 As a guide, the ECB suggests that a good quality wicket should be able to support:

- 5 matches per season per grass wicket (adults);
- 7 matches per season per grass wicket (juniors);
- 60 matches per season per non turf wicket (adults); and
- 80 matches per season per non turf wicket (juniors).

4.46 Demand is therefore measured in terms of the number of home games that each team will play per season. In Mansfield District, the majority of match play takes place on the grass square. Sherwood Colliery Cricket Club use non turf wickets in the event of bad weather for Sunday teams, as well as for junior teams. No competitive play at any of the other grounds takes place on non turf wickets.

4.47 It is also clear that a small amount of training also takes place on the grass squares, despite clubs having training nets. This is particularly the case at Clipstone CC who do not have a non turf wicket.
Demand at Peak Time

4.48 While use of the wicket across the season is important, across Mansfield District, the majority of adult demand is on a Saturday afternoon and availability of pitches at this time has therefore been considered. Junior teams and friendly teams generally play at other times across the week when pitches are available.

Situation at Individual Sites

4.49 Table 4.4 provides an overview of site specific activity for each of the pitches which are community accessible in Mansfield District. Spare capacity at each site is summarised graphically in Figure 4.1.

4.50 Table 4.4 clearly indicates that:

- based on accommodating competitive play only, on all sites the number of wickets is sufficient to meet current demand. All facilities are regularly used and while some are approaching capacity, there is some opportunity to increase participation within the existing pitch stock. Significant growth in the district may however result in a demand for additional facilities. This trend is likely to be contrary to existing participation trends which seem to be falling, although this may change in the future; and

- there is very little spare capacity available on a peak time (Saturday PM), with no pitches currently available.

4.51 At a site specific level:

- Overall, all sites have capacity for additional play across the season;

- use of the pitches at John Fretwell Sporting Complex is influenced by the requirements of the representative teams, as well as Welbeck CC, the incumbent cricket club. While there is a small degree of spare capacity on the 1st pitch at the John Fretwell Sporting Complex (although this pitch is reserved for the higher level teams), the second pitch is close to capacity;

- there is a small amount of spare capacity at Debdale Park Sport and Recreation Centre (Sherwood Colliery CC’s base) and site visits suggest that further strips could be prepared on this square if required. There is also spare capacity within Clipstone CC taking into account just competitive play. A lack of non-turf wicket provision however means that some training activity does take place on the pitch, reducing the spare capacity that is available.

- The recent decline in the number of teams within Mansfield CC means that there is also spare capacity on both Chesterfield Road Recreation Ground and Queen Elizabeth Academy; and

- Spare capacity at peak time (i.e. Saturdays) is more restricted, with just 1 match equivalent slot available on the currently active sites. This is due to the loss of the fourth team in Mansfield CC at Queen Elizabeth Academy.)
Both Racecourse Park and Forest Road have previously contained cricket pitches and are no longer used for this purpose. Reinstatement of these facilities would add additional capacity to the existing stock of facilities within the district.

Figure 4.1 - Spare Capacity at Cricket Pitches
### Table 4.4: Site Specific Usage (community accessible sites)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Number of Pitches</th>
<th>PitchQuality</th>
<th>Current Community Use</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>*Comparison</th>
<th>Spare Capacity for Community Use (Number of Strips)</th>
<th>Capacity for additional play on a Saturday (peak time)</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chesterfield Road Recreation Ground</td>
<td>1 (12 strips)</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>Circa 30 adult games, should be noted that site is also open access and can experience informal activity too.</td>
<td>Total current use equivalent to 6 strips</td>
<td>Able to sustain more play</td>
<td>6 strips - capacity for circa 3 teams</td>
<td>No spare capacity</td>
<td>Quality more limited than other sites due to public access, but square is adequate due to careful maintenance. Non turf wicket requires replacement and outfield is uneven. Site is also used on a Sunday for one team. Use is reduced in comparison to previous seasons due to a decline in the number of teams the club is running.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clipstone Miners Welfare</td>
<td>1 (9 strips)</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>28 adult games, also used for ad hoc training due to lack of non turf wicket</td>
<td>Total competitive use - 5.6 strips. Circa 7 strips used taking into account training</td>
<td>Able to sustain more play</td>
<td>1 - 2 strips, 3 if training was moved off wicket</td>
<td>No spare capacity</td>
<td>Club play in championship division and are therefore subject to relatively strict quality requirements. As a result, pitch quality is good and both the wicket and outfield are even. The lack of non turf wicket is the key priority for the club and would also build capacity at the site. Some of the spare capacity can also be attributed to a lack of junior participation at the site. All play takes place at peak time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debdale Park Sports and Recreation Club</td>
<td>1 (8 strips)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Circa 30 adult games and 10 junior games on grass wicket.</td>
<td>Adult matches use 6 wickets, while junior matches</td>
<td>Able to sustain more play</td>
<td>0.5 strips - no capacity for further teams</td>
<td>No spare capacity</td>
<td>Pitch well used but club believe there is scope to improve quality, particularly the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site</td>
<td>Number of Pitches</td>
<td>Pitch Quality</td>
<td>Current Community Use</td>
<td>Difference *Comparison</td>
<td>Spare Capacity for Community Use (Number of Strips)</td>
<td>Capacity for additional play on a Saturday (peak time)</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queen Elizabeth Academy</td>
<td>1 (8 strips)</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>18 adult games. Site also accommodates school use but this is limited</td>
<td>require a further 1.4</td>
<td>3.4 strips - capacity for 2 teams</td>
<td>Site available at peak time (one team)</td>
<td>Site developed in partnership with club, school and Notts Cricket Board. Scope for further use due to fewer teams with Mansfield CC and capacity for one team to play at peak time. Changing accommodation adequate, pitch maintained by club. Improving although some issues with area of poor grass.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The John Fretwell Sporting Complex</td>
<td>2 (15 strips and 13 strips)</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>First pitch accommodates circa 27 club games, 12 junior games and on average 19 other games (representative, Notts County etc)</td>
<td>1st pitch - Club Adult matches require 5.4 strips and juniors a further 1.7. The other matches use a further 4 wickets. The second pitch takes 39</td>
<td>1st pitch able to sustain additional play 2nd pitch - at capacity</td>
<td>1st pitch - circa 4 additional strips (2 adult teams) 2nd pitch - no remaining capacity. This is however based upon an</td>
<td>Excellent high quality facilities with full amenities and dedicated groundsman. Quality reflected by the use of the pitches for representative fixtures. Only limited capacity remaining given use of site by large club as well as representative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site</td>
<td>Number of Pitches</td>
<td>Pitch Quality</td>
<td>Current Community Use</td>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>*Comparison</td>
<td>Spare Capacity for Community Use (Number of Strips)</td>
<td>Capacity for additional play on a Saturday (peak time)</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>approximate distribution of play, and teams can be moved according to the facilities that are available</td>
<td>teams, charity and community groups.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Current Picture of Provision

4.52 The site overviews set out in Table 4.4 can be used to develop an overall picture of provision across Mansfield District. This is summarised in Table 4.5.

**Table 4.5: Cricket Pitch Provision - Capacity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Spare Capacity (Number of Strips - measured by number of adult teams that could be accommodated)</th>
<th>Sites with Spare Capacity to accommodate at least one additional adult team (2 strips or more)</th>
<th>Spare Capacity at Peak Time</th>
<th>Former cricket pitches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mansfield urban area</td>
<td>13 (circa 6 adult teams) and potential to use additional strips at some sites</td>
<td>Clipstone Miners Welfare, Chesterfield Road Recreation Ground, Queen Elizabeth Academy(3)</td>
<td>Queen Elizabeth Academy (0.5 match equivalents)</td>
<td>Racecourse Park and Forest Road (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warsop Parish</td>
<td>4 (circa 2 adult teams)</td>
<td>John Fretwell Sporting Complex (1)</td>
<td>None available</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17 strips (8 teams)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1 team - 0.5 match equivalents</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note - spare capacity measured by adult teams but could be used to accommodate junior teams instead.

4.53 Table 4.5 therefore reinforces the message outlined earlier indicating that while existing pitches are able to accommodate some play across the week, spare capacity is much more limited at peak time (Saturdays).

4.54 Map 4.1 illustrates the location and distribution of cricket pitches indicating spare capacity. It also highlights the location of the former sites that are not currently used.
Map 4.1: Spare Capacity at Club Based Cricket Pitches

Location of cricket fields

Sources: Ordnance Survey (Boundary Line)

Red denotes no spare peaktime capacity and/or no community access. Green denotes spare peaktime capacity.
Latent and Unmet Demand

4.55 There is limited direct evidence of latent demand for pitches that cannot be met within the local area, as the Nottinghamshire Cricket Board or local leagues have not been approached from teams wishing to play. There has also been a recent decline in member numbers in several clubs.

4.56 A new team, to be named Mansfield Asian X1 are however set to start playing from Summer 2016 and have approached the Council to source a pitch. Their long term aspirations are to set up a community club, but also in the shorter term to provide opportunities for family members to play cricket. Many of this new team are believe to be currently playing with Pheasant Hill CC (playing at Queen Elizabeth Academy) who hope to also continue to play next season.

4.57 The comparatively low level of participation in Mansfield also suggests that there may be some latent demand. As highlighted, local league and ECB research indicates that latent demand for cricket may exist due to an appetite for changed forms of the game (for example shorter games like Last Man Standing) and this is something that may have a direct impact on demand in future years.

Future Picture of Provision

4.58 Population growth, changes in participation trends and amendments to the existing facility stock will all impact upon pitch requirements. These issues are considered below in order to build an accurate picture of future demand.

Population Change

4.59 Team Generation Rates (TGRs) are an indication of how many people in a specified age group are required to generate one team. By applying TGRs to population projections, we can project the theoretical number of teams that would be generated from population growth and gain an understanding of future demand.

4.60 Table 4.6 summarises the current TGRs for cricket and uses them to evaluate the potential impact of projected changes to the population profile on demand. The findings below reveal that population growth and changes to the population profile alone will have no clear impact on the demand for cricket. This is based on a slight decline in the number of people in the age groups most likely to play senior cricket (ages 18 - 55) and only a very small increase in the number of junior residents (age range 7-18). This is likely to only contribute towards improving player numbers rather than creating a demand for any additional teams.

Table 4.6: Impact of Changes to the Population Profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sport and Age Groups</th>
<th>Number of Teams</th>
<th>Current population in age group within the area</th>
<th>Current TGR</th>
<th>Future population in age group within the area (2025)</th>
<th>Change in population</th>
<th>Potential Change in Team Numbers in Age Group (Number of Teams)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cricket Open Age Mens (18-55yrs)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26200</td>
<td>1747</td>
<td>26048</td>
<td>-152</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cricket Open Age Womens (18-)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26048</td>
<td>-152</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Sport and Age Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sport and Age Groups</th>
<th>Number of Teams</th>
<th>Current population in age group within the area</th>
<th>Current TGR</th>
<th>Future population in age group within the area (2025)</th>
<th>Change in population</th>
<th>Potential Change in Team Numbers in Age Group (Number of Teams)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>55yrs)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>637</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cricket Junior Boys (7-18yrs)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>637</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.61 In summary, population growth alone is therefore not likely to result in demand for any further pitches and the current position with regards the adequacy of pitches will remain.

### Participation Trends – Impact on Pitches

4.62 The ECB is seeking to implement a sustainable approach to the development of cricket, retaining existing players and developing new players at both junior and adult level, as well as addressing the ageing volunteer base. To promote growth of cricket, and in recognition of changing lifestyle patterns and the challenges of 50-over cricket, locally and nationally, the England Cricket Board (ECB) are now seeking to introduce alternative forms of the game. These include, for example: Last Man Standing and T20. These are similar in format to the midweek and weekend leagues and offer people who are unable to participate in full matches shorter forms of the game. These may place different pressures on the pitch stock in future years if demand grows.

4.63 Reflecting the above priorities of the ECB, the local leagues are also looking to review their existing procedures in order to stimulate growth of cricket in the area and to encourage new participants into the game.

4.64 Despite this, none of the cricket clubs within Mansfield District indicate that they are actively looking to increase participation above current capacity. Instead, most are seeking to remain stable and / or reverse the decline that they have recently experienced. The only known aspirations relate to the new team (Mansfield Asian X1) that will be developed in 2016.

4.65 The requirement for new pitches will therefore be dictated by any future increases in participation that can be driven through sports development initiatives, whether through the current league channels or through changing formats to the game.

### Forthcoming Changes to Supply

4.66 Since the request by Mansfield Asian X1 to create a new team for season 2016, Mansfield District Council have confirmed the intention to provide a new facility and it is likely that Racecourse Park will be reinstated in order to provide the club with a home. This will provide capacity for both the new team, but will also provide the ability to accommodate an extra match equivalent at peak time.

4.67 It should however be noted that acceptance into the league has not yet been confirmed and the use of the pitch at Racecourse Park will also be subject to confirmation of its suitability for league cricket once prepared. The challenges of providing facilities for cricket at public venues have already been noted.
Summary and Key Issues

4.68 The key issues for cricket in Mansfield District are summarised in the summary section in Section 12.
Introduction

5.1 This section evaluates the adequacy of pitches for rugby league. It provides:

• An overview of the supply and demand for pitches
• A picture of the adequacy of current provision to meet current and projected future demand.

Overview – Supply and Demand

Pitch Supply and Quality

5.2 There is only one existing rugby league pitch within Mansfield District. This is located at Debdale Park Sports and Recreation Club, a multi-sport site which also includes cricket and football facilities. It also functions as a social facility for the hockey club.

5.3 The rugby league pitch is used for football during the winter months and is managed by the onsite groundsman. While the pitch is not floodlit, it is enclosed by a perimeter fence and pitch size fits within RFL minimum guidelines.

5.4 At the time of site visit (during the playing season) the pitch was in standard condition, with good grass coverage and a flat surface. The pitch is also relatively even, although some holes were evident and grass cutting was adequate. There is a slight slope at one end and later visits during the football season showed the pitch to be quite wet, particularly in one corner. Club feedback demonstrates that grass was limited at the start of the season, having already sustained a season of football, but this was improved with grass seed. The pitch was also compacted, attributed to too much rolling for a rugby league pitch. A new groundsman has recently taken over and the pitch quality is already improving immeasurably, which is likely to see improvements in the quality of the facility for the forthcoming rugby season. The posts are however poor quality and require replacement in the short term.

5.5 The pitch is accompanied by good ancillary facilities within the Sports and Recreation Club which are shared between all the clubs. As well as changing accommodation for the pitch, this includes a full bar and social facilities. There is also a dedicated medical room as well as adequate car parking. Both the pitch and the ancillary facilities have been used to host finals for a variety of sports in recent years.

5.6 The site also includes a small sized pitch. The quality of this facility is however poor and the size of the pitch restricts the type of activity that can take place. The pitch is not approved for use for competitive rugby league.

Demand

5.7 Sherwood Wolf Hunt RLFC is the only rugby league club at Debdale Park Sports and Recreation Club. At the time of writing this assessment, the club have only been established for 18 months and already run two teams. The first team plays within the Midlands League Premier Division, a tier-four Rugby Football League (RFL) affiliated league. The second team is a development team playing within the same league structures. The club already has more than 50 players and recently hosted the Midlands Rugby League finals in 2015. While many of the players are new to rugby league, a large proportion of these are making the transition over from rugby union (or playing in both).
5.8 Although Mansfield has historically seen rugby league played (teams included Mansfield Storm, Mansfield Marksman, which developed into the Nottingham Outlaws) the Sherwood Wolf Hunt were established from scratch, primarily using social media.

**Training Needs**

5.9 The club trains from January onwards and therefore despite being a summer sport, are competing with football clubs for training slots. Sherwood Wolf Hunt will be training at Garibaldi School pitch until circa April, when nights become sufficiently light at the home ground to train without floodlights.

**Educational Demand**

5.10 The demand for rugby league in the district’s schools is limited as indicated by a lack of participation in the sport and a lack of dedicated rugby league pitches at school sites. None of the schools in the district currently enter any competitions such as the Champion Schools, The RFL secondary school competition programme, or the School Sports programme. There have been no local school games competitions organised.

5.11 The RFL however see opportunities to grow the sport in the district, driven through the success of Sherwood Wolf Hunt. The RFL has recently launched a new Embed the Pathway for Schools project, which aims to give thousands of schools across the country the opportunity to participate in rugby league. This seeks to grow the sport and successful implementation of this scheme in Mansfield may support the long term growth of The Sherwood Wolf Hunt. The club are currently looking into ways to deliver this programme in schools in Mansfield, identifying a possible partnership opportunity with students at West Notts College. The infancy of the club means that appropriate structures for the delivery of activity in schools and with children are still being established. This is addressed in the Playing Pitch Strategy.

**Assessing the Supply and Demand Information and Views**

5.12 The adequacy of pitch provision for rugby league is measured through the use of match equivalents and the ability of the pitch stock to service both training needs and competitive requirements is taken into account. To fully understand activity on a site, consideration is given to both:

- the adequacy of pitch provision over the course of a week; and
- capacity of a site to meet additional demand at peak time.

5.13 For rugby league, this analysis is based upon the following principles:

**Capacity over the course of a week**

5.14 The RFL sets a standard number of match equivalent sessions that natural grass pitches should be able to sustain without adversely affecting their current quality (pitch carrying capacity). For pitches used in higher standard leagues, pitch requirements are stricter.

5.15 Demand from the rugby club is converted into match equivalent sessions. This takes into account of both the requirement of pitches to accommodate competitive fixtures, and also the impact that training sessions will have on the capacity of pitches.

5.16 The guideline theoretical capacity for rugby pitches is summarised in Table 5.1.
Table 5.1: Theoretical Pitch Capacity Ratings (RFL)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pitch Quality Rating</th>
<th>Senior Rugby League Pitches</th>
<th>Tier 3 Conference League Matches</th>
<th>Match Equivalent Sessions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Unsuitable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.17 The Midlands League which includes the Sherwood Wolf Hunt falls into regional league level covering club and recreational play. Based on Table 5.1 above, a pitch capacity score of ‘good’ can therefore sustain 3 match equivalent sessions. Should the club achieve aspirations to further improve the level at which they are participating (i.e. to Tier 3 Conference League) and to maintain a ‘good’ standard of pitch capacity, the match equivalent sessions would need to reduce.

Peak Time Demand

5.18 To identify spare capacity at peak time, the number of match equivalent sessions at peak time is measured against the number of match equivalent sessions available.

5.19 Table 5.2 therefore summarises the adequacy of provision for Sherwood Wolf Hunt. It reveals that with a pitch capacity of 3 match equivalents per week, the one existing pitch is currently sufficient to meet the needs of the club.

Table 5.2: Requirements of Sherwood Wolf Hunt

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demand</th>
<th>Pitch Requirements (Match Equivalents)</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Pitch Requirements</th>
<th>Total Pitch Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 senior teams</td>
<td>0.75 match equivalents</td>
<td>There are two teams. The first team plays home and away matches (frequency?). The second team also plays home and away but on a less frequent basis (twice monthly).</td>
<td>Pitch size 100 x 68mm</td>
<td>To meet current needs, 1 pitch is sufficient – based on demand equivalent to 1.75 match equivalents per week. Capacity 3 match equivalents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>1 training session per week, part of which may take place on pitch during summer</td>
<td>Winter training takes place off-site at Garibaldi College. Fitness training takes place.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Future Picture

5.20 The future requirement for rugby league pitches will be impacted upon by changes to the population profile, as well as the aspirations of the club and National Governing Body.

5.21 The RFL are currently preparing a new Community Rugby League Facilities Strategy (England) to supersede the existing document (which is dated 2011 to 2015). The existing strategy highlights the key priorities as being:

- Playing surface improvement and maintenance
- Clubhouse improvement
- Security of tenure and quality facilities
- Wider access for places to play.

Population Change

5.22 Team Generation Rates (TGRs) indicate how many people in a specified age group are required to generate one team. The application of TGRs to population projections enables the projection of the theoretical number of teams that would be generated from population growth and provides an understanding of future demand.

5.23 With just two rugby league teams in the district (as well as a small decline in the number of people falling into the age group most likely to play adult rugby league which is 19-45 years old) the use of TGRs suggests that there is likely to be no increases in the amount of rugby league teams generated by population growth alone. This is summarised in Table 5.3.
Table 5.3: Impact of Changes to the Population Profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sport and Age Groups</th>
<th>Current population in age group within the area</th>
<th>Number of teams in age group</th>
<th>Current TGR</th>
<th>Future population in age group (2025)</th>
<th>Potential Change in Number of people in age group</th>
<th>Potential Change in Team Numbers in Age Group (Number of Teams) Current - 2026</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rugby League Adult Men (19-45yrs)</td>
<td>16930</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8465</td>
<td>16650</td>
<td>-280</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rugby League Adult Women (19-45yrs)</td>
<td>16930</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16650</td>
<td>-280</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rugby League Youth &amp; Junior Boys (12-18yrs)</td>
<td>3910</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4290</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rugby League Junior Girls (12-18yrs)</td>
<td>3910</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4290</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rugby League Primary Mixed (7-11yrs)</td>
<td>5840</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5980</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Changes in Participation Trends and club development plans

5.24 The club has experienced relatively rapid growth to date (up to 2015 season) and are hoping to start a junior section in 2016. Sherwood Wolf Hunt is working with other clubs in the Midlands to develop a coordinated junior programme, with a view to ensuring that there are competitive opportunities for younger players. It is hoped that a U14 team will be developed next season (2016), along with U9 training, with the following year an additional U14 team (other team progress to U15) and U10 / U11. The club are in the process of finalising a development plan to solidify these aspirations.

5.25 Participation growth is therefore most likely to be driven by the growth of the club and the spread of interest in rugby league across the district and surrounding area.

5.26 The club currently have access to only one pitch, which is sufficient to meet current needs (spare capacity 1.25 match equivalents per week). There is no further scope for the creation of a third adult team however unless they played outside of peak times which take place at weekends.

5.27 The existing pitch however offers scope for the creation of 2-3 junior teams (which would be played outside of peak times) although capacity would become very restricted if both matches and training were to be accommodated on the same pitch, along with junior play. Capacity would also become restricted if the first team were to progress to leagues requiring a higher standard pitch (as pitches should then only take two games per week).
5.28 There are further grass pitches on sites elsewhere in the district that are used for football during winter months that could be considered for rugby during the summer months (although this would need to be carefully balanced with cricket requirements). Linking with the wider aspirations of the committee at Debdale Park Sport and Recreation Centre, the club are also keen for the provision of the rugby league compliant pitch on the site to increase the capacity of the facility and scope for growth.

**Forthcoming Changes to Supply**

5.29 There are no confirmed changes to existing rugby league provision.

**Key Issues**

5.30 The key issues to address for rugby league are summarised in the summary section in Section 12.
Introduction

6.1 This section evaluates the adequacy of pitches for hockey and provides;

- an overview of the supply of artificial grass pitches (AGPs) that are suitable for hockey;
- an outline of demand for hockey pitches across Mansfield District and an understanding of activity at individual sites in the district;
- a picture of the adequacy of current provision; and
- the future picture of provision for hockey across Mansfield.

Pitch Supply and Quality

6.2 Hockey is almost exclusively played on AGPs. Guidance on AGPs (Sport England 2010) indicates the following surfaces to be suitable for hockey;

- water based (suitable for high level hockey);
- sand filled (acceptable surface for hockey);
- sand dressed (preferred surface for hockey); and
- short pile (acceptable surface for hockey at low standards).

6.3 Based upon the above criteria, in Mansfield District, there is one full sized pitch that meets with requirements, as well as a number of smaller sized pitches. There are also several smaller pitches that are not suitable for hockey.

6.4 Table 6.1 summarises the facilities available and the quality of these pitches, as well as their suitability for hockey.

Table 6.1: Suitability of Full Sized AGPs for Hockey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub Area</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Management and Access</th>
<th>Surface</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Floodlights</th>
<th>Quality Rating</th>
<th>Issues Identified</th>
<th>Suitability for Hockey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mansfield urban area</td>
<td>ALL SAINTS’ CATHOLIC ACADEMY</td>
<td>Available for use but not used</td>
<td>Sand Filled</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pitch does not have any markings on and is described by the school as very slippery. Required improvements to this facility incl. increasing size and resurface which is a key priority of the school.</td>
<td>Sand based surface but small sized - capability of accommodating training activities but not matches.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub Area</td>
<td>Site Name</td>
<td>Management and Access</td>
<td>Surface</td>
<td>Size</td>
<td>Floodlights</td>
<td>Quality Rating</td>
<td>Issues Identified</td>
<td>Suitability for Hockey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mansfield urban area</td>
<td>CHESTERFIELD ROAD RECREATION GROUND</td>
<td>Mansfield District Council - Open access (when unlocked during park hours)</td>
<td>Sand Filled</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Poor grip underfoot, lots of damage to the surface. The surrounding fencing is also poor. Some holes or rips in surface.</td>
<td>Sand based surface but small sized - capability of accommodating some training activity but not matches. Poor quality of facility however means site is not currently available for hire.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mansfield urban area</td>
<td>DEBDALE PARK SPORTS AND RECREATIONAL CLUB</td>
<td>Sports Club - available for use and used</td>
<td>Rubber crumb pile ()</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Condition poor - issues with surface</td>
<td>surface not suitable for hockey -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mansfield urban area</td>
<td>GARIBALDI COLLEGE</td>
<td>Nottinghamshire County Council (in house) - available for use and used</td>
<td>Rubber crumb pile ()</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Good (FA registered)</td>
<td>Site in good condition</td>
<td>surface not suitable for hockey -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mansfield urban area</td>
<td>MANOR SPORT &amp; RECREATION CENTRE</td>
<td>School/College/University (in house) - available for use and used</td>
<td>Sand Filled</td>
<td>Full size</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>Surface adequate following recent site improvements and additional sand laid.</td>
<td>Suitable for hockey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mansfield urban area</td>
<td>MANSFIELD RUGBY UNION FOOTBALL CLUB</td>
<td>Sports Club - available for use and used</td>
<td>Rubber crumb pile ()</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Pitch in good condition with no issues identified</td>
<td>surface not suitable -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warsop Parish</td>
<td>MEDEN SPORTS CENTRE</td>
<td>School/College/University (in house) available for use and</td>
<td>Sand Filled</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Standard to Good</td>
<td>Site is caged and floodlit. Changing facilities available within school.</td>
<td>Sand based surface but small sized - could accommodate some training but</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub Area</td>
<td>Site Name</td>
<td>Management and Access</td>
<td>Surface</td>
<td>Size</td>
<td>Floodlights</td>
<td>Quality Rating</td>
<td>Issues Identified</td>
<td>Suitability for Hockey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mansfield urban area</td>
<td>THE BRUNTS ACADEMY</td>
<td>School/Collage/University (in house) available for use and used</td>
<td>3g</td>
<td>Full size</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Good (FA Register ed)</td>
<td>Changing accommodation not provided with pitch</td>
<td>surface not suitable -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mansfield urban area</td>
<td>Mansfield Town Football Club</td>
<td>Sports Club</td>
<td>3g</td>
<td>Small sized (2)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Facilities in good condition. Changing facilities good.</td>
<td>surfaces not suitable -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.5 Table 6.1 demonstrates that:

- The only AGP in Warsop Parish is Meden School and Technology College, which is a small sized sand based pitch. The remaining facilities are all located within the greater Mansfield urban area;

- The only full sized pitch suitable for hockey is at Manor Sport and Recreation Complex in Mansfield Woodhouse. The other full size pitch at the Brunts Academy is primarily targeted at competitive football (and is listed on the FA register for this purpose);

- There are a further three small sized sand based pitches within the district. All are of limited quality and therefore play a very limited role in meeting the demand from hockey clubs. These facilities are more suitable for informal / casual play rather than formal sport. The pitch at Chesterfield Road Recreation Ground is considered to be so poor that it is not currently available for rent; and

- While some of the pitches are relatively new (Brunts Academy / Mansfield Town) the stock of sand based pitches is much older. The facility at Manor Sports Complex was built in 2004. Although the pitch surface was rejuvenated in 2013 (including removal of contaminated sand, repair to seams, lifting of surface pile and replacement sand infill) this did not constitute full surface replacement. The pitch is however currently considered to be standard - good.

6.6 A further small sized pitch is to be provided at West Nottinghamshire College by the end of 2015. This will also be suitable for football rather than for hockey.
6.7 The location of all AGPs in Mansfield District and their suitability for hockey is illustrated in Map 6.1. It demonstrates that despite a relatively high number of AGPs in the district, facilities are restricted for hockey. Map 6.1 also includes sand based AGPs located outside but in close proximity to Mansfield District, specifically:

- The Bolsover School (Bolsover District)
- Kingsway Park (Ashfield District)
- Quarrydale School (Ashfield District)
- Dukeries Leisure Centre (Newark and Sherwood District)
- National Academy / Church of England Technology College (Ashfield District)
- Minster School (Newark and Sherwood District)
- Goosedale Sports Club - (Gedling District)
- Redhill Leisure Centre - (Gedling District)
- Southwell Leisure Centre - (Newark and Sherwood District)
- Worksop College (Bassetlaw)
- Outwood Academy Valley, Worksop (Bassetlaw).
Map 6.1: Distribution of AGPs in Mansfield district and related surrounding areas

Location of AGPs

Sources: Ordnance Survey (Boundary Line)
Demand

Active People and Market Segmentation (Sport England)

6.8 The Active People Survey provides an indication of the types of people that play hockey and potential latent demand. The principles of these tools are explained in Section 3. Analysis of current participation according to Active People and Market Segmentation demonstrates that:

- Existing participation in hockey teams is geographically even across Mansfield District and the profile of participants is similar to that of other sports, with the dominant groups being Ben (28), Philip (26), Tim (22) and Jamie (21). When comparing participation levels to the England average, however, there is scope to increase the levels of participation in these groups further. There is a greater female profile in terms of participants than for other pitch sports, with 20 participants in the Chloe segment and 16 in the Leanne group although the number of females playing is still much lower than male.

- Overall there are just 216 current players in the district in total as divided into x number of teams.

- Reflecting the lower levels of participation from women, the Active People survey reveals that, while the majority of current participants are predominantly male, latent demand is highest in two specific female segments: Jackie (17) and Leanne (17). This suggests that there is further scope to develop hockey, particularly for women.

- Latent demand is also high for Jamie (17). There are no geographical variations in latent demand for hockey and therefore there is no clear direction as to which areas of the district interventions may be particularly successful. Segments with higher latent demand have below average levels of physical activity for their age groups and may benefit from a more informal introduction to hockey, rather than a strongly competitive environment.

Current Participation

6.9 There are two hockey clubs (running a total of 13 adult teams) that play within Mansfield District. North Notts Hockey Club also runs a junior section, although they do not play any competitive fixtures. Table 6.2 summarises the teams within each club and outlines the approximate number of hours that they use pitches, as well as the site they use. The usage is based upon the assumption that each team plays alternate home and away games.

Table 6.2: Hockey Teams in and around Mansfield District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Club</th>
<th>Teams</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Competition</th>
<th>Training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Notts Hockey Club</td>
<td>5 male, 4 ladies, 1 mixed and 1 junior section.</td>
<td>Manor Park Sports Complex and Worksop College (as overspill venue)</td>
<td>7.5 hours a week for senior teams</td>
<td>Tuesdays and Wednesdays at Manor Sports Complex - circa 3.5 hours (per</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Circa 4 hours on Sundays for Junior</td>
<td>per</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.10 Table 6.2 reveals that;

- The highest levels of usage for hockey take place at the weekend, when the AGPs are required to accommodate competitive fixtures. The clubs have separate training evenings which total around seven hours play per week;

- North Notts Hockey Club is the largest hockey club and the only club to play within the district. They use the pitch at Manor Sports Complex. Usage of this facility is particularly heavy at weekends (for competitive fixtures) but hours for training are more restricted during the week as the club must compete with demand from football clubs. The club also use an overspill venue outside of the district in Worksop (circa 12 miles away) for competitive fixtures. Due to the club’s use of pitches outside the district, the teams are considered to be ‘displaced’. The availability of a junior section as well as adult teams means that there are opportunities for progression across the different age groups

- As a result of the lack of availability at Manor Sports Complex, Mansfield Hockey Club travel to Kingsway Sports Complex in Ashfield. Their usage of the facility is relatively low, with 1 – 2 competitive fixtures played at a weekend and one training session during the week. This club is currently a senior male club only. The club consider themselves to be ‘displaced’ and are seeking relocation back into Mansfield due to the affiliation of the club with Mansfield. They would ideally like to be located in central Mansfield. The quality of facilities at the Kingsway Centre, which the club rents, has however been recently improved (surface is new this season) following investment by Ashfield District Council. The pitch surface is considered of good quality, with no significant issues identified. The only areas for improvement identified are the condition of line markings and the grip underfoot. Despite the quality of the pitch however, the club continue to seek provision in Mansfield District and believe the location of the pitch to be the key priority, along with access to better quality changing facilities than are currently available.

6.11 There has been a slight increase in the number of teams at North Notts HC while participation at Mansfield Hockey Club has remained static. As a consequence of North Notts HC’s rises in participation levels, requirements for accessing AGPs have increased at weekends, and greater pressures also exist for training times during the week. Both clubs however believe that a shortage of facilities is now starting to inhibit demand, and in particular, the requirement for Mansfield Hockey Club to travel is detrimental to the club’s opportunities to recruit and retain players. There is therefore thought to be a degree of latent demand in the district.
Junior Development Centre (JDC) / Junior Academy Centre (JAC) Demand

6.12 JAC and JDC sessions for Nottinghamshire are run at Goosedale Hockey Club (Bestwood Village) and Highfields Hockey Club in Nottingham. In addition, ad hoc use of Boots Ground, Magnus School Newark and Trent College are used for clubs. This means that none are run within Mansfield district.

6.13 The Nottinghamshire Hockey Development Group which is responsible for the organisation of these sessions and have found that access to a sufficient number of pitches in the district is very difficult due to an overall deficit of pitches in the county. The cost of facilities (and variation in prices) is also a challenge for these teams, as pitch hire costs are above the levels of fees that can be charged to players (without detrimental impact on participation).

6.14 Effort was made to run a dedicated JDC training in Mansfield area several years ago but it was not cost effective as there were insufficient players attending due to the relatively low levels of participation in the Mansfield area. Organisers of the JAC / JDC still believe there to be limited demand for use of a facility for JAC / JDC within the Mansfield area.

Educational Demand

6.15 Educational use of AGPs takes place outside of peak hours and there is therefore no impact upon the availability of the facilities for community hockey (as the artificial surface means that AGPs are not impacted upon by levels of use in the same way that grass pitches are).

6.16 School participation can however have a knock on impact on demand for hockey. Although there is a small amount of hockey taking place in schools currently, this is primarily led by Worksop based hockey clubs (meaning that club transfer into Mansfield based clubs is less likely).

6.17 At a national schools level, tournaments are run for U14, U16 and U18 age groups for both genders. The number of schools entering these tournaments is however declining. This can be attributed to lack of staff, the need for time off to participate and the loss or resurface of a pitch at a school sites means that the school no longer has a facility on which to train.

6.18 Brunts School, Manor Academy and Samworth Church Academy have all previously entered the competition, but no longer participate due to constraints on staff time, as well as the standard of hockey played in other parts of the country. There are no local competitions run for hockey in the district due to a lack of interest from schools (both in Mansfield and at County level). This is perceived to be a significant gap by school games coordinators, who see opportunities to introduce hockey. There has also been little interest from local clubs in delivering hockey sessions within schools. This means that the foundations for the growth of hockey in the district are currently limited.

Assessing the Supply and Demand Information and Views

6.19 The adequacy of AGPs to accommodate demand for hockey, taking into account both training and competitive fixtures, is discussed below.

6.20 Supply and demand of AGPs is measured by considering:

- the amount of play that a site is able to sustain (based upon the number of hours that the pitch is accessible to the community during peak periods up to a maximum
of 34 hours per week). Peak periods have been deemed to be Monday to Thursday 18:00 to 21:00; Friday 17:00 to 19:00 and Saturday and Sunday 09:00 to 17:00;

- the amount of play that takes place (measured in hours);
- whether there is any spare capacity at the site based upon a comparison between the capacity of the site and the actual usage; and
- any other key issues relating to the site which have arisen through consultation.

6.21 Table 6.3 therefore provides a summary of activity at Manor Sports Complex, the only site that is suitable for hockey within Mansfield District.

### Table 6.3: Usage of Pitch at Manor Sports Complex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pitch Quality</th>
<th>Carrying Capacity for Community Use</th>
<th>Current Community Use</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Comparison</th>
<th>Total Spare Capacity for Community Use</th>
<th>Spare Capacity at Peak Time</th>
<th>Key Issues and Views</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard</strong></td>
<td>30 hours (14 midweek, 16 weekends)</td>
<td>26 hours</td>
<td>4 hours</td>
<td>Able to accommodate additional play</td>
<td>4 hours</td>
<td>2 hours</td>
<td>Site is at capacity on Saturday during hockey peak period 10-4. Small amount of at weekends outside 10-4. There is some capacity during the week but this is generally in early slots (5 - 6pm) or later when demand is lower. Average usage is 40% hockey and 60% football. There is some capacity on Sundays when football is not being played.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Current Picture of Provision

6.22 Table 6.3 indicates that there is some spare capacity at Manor Sports Complex however this is primarily on a Sunday, and in earlier or late slots midweek. This means that there is limited scope to increase the amount of activity that takes place on this site. There is little spare capacity on a Saturday and it is often full all day, depending upon the balance of fixtures.

6.23 The use of the facility for football as well as hockey midweek provides further pressure. If training requirements were to increase significantly, capacity to accommodate this
increase would be limited unless there was a reduction in the availability of the pitch for casual football.

6.24 Although there is capacity on the small sized pitches, none of these offer a suitable training environment. This is due to the fact that both clubs subdivide the full pitch for different teams to enhance the social element of training. Thus, these smaller pitches are not suitable to meet the needs of the local clubs.

6.25 England Hockey indicates that an AGP should be considered able to sustain a maximum of four games per day. Table 6.4 illustrates the peak time demand from Mansfield clubs (and those that consider themselves to be displaced) and indicates that there is overall demand from the clubs to access an additional 2 match equivalents on AGPs within the district, based upon peak time.

Table 6.4: Peak Time Demand (based on full-sized pitch use)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capacity of full sized sand based pitches across the district at peak time (match equivalents)</th>
<th>Total Demand (Match Equivalents)</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6 (4.5 North Notts HC, 1.5 Mansfield HC0</td>
<td>Deficiency of 2 match equivalents (i.e. un-met need)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.26 As can be seen in Table 6.4, as peak time demand from North Notts Hockey Club (the only club playing within the district) is currently equivalent to 4.5 match equivalents, this means that the pitch at Manor Sport and Recreation Complex is already at capacity. This is reflected in the use of the overspill pitch in Worksop. The club have also negotiated with the league this season to play some fixtures on a Sunday morning in order to ensure that all required matches can be accommodated on the club’s pitch in Mansfield. There is therefore no remaining spare capacity at peak time and adult play at the club is constricted as a result.

6.27 This peak time capacity issue is reflected by the travelling of Mansfield Hockey Club. While the club only require 1 - 2 match equivalents at peak time, this level of capacity is not currently available within Mansfield District on a full sized pitch.

6.28 It is clear therefore that the existing levels of provision are insufficient to meet demand, if both hockey clubs are to be accommodated within the district. The amount of unmet demand would however equate to only 2 match equivalents per week. This relatively low level of unmet demand means that it is questionable whether new provision is sustainable without significant growth in participation.

Sport England Facility Planning Model (FPM) Modelling

6.29 Analysis of the actual usage of pitches against the hours that they are available can be compared with findings from the Sport England Facility Planning Model (ref date and where to obtain info), a theoretical model based upon national parameters. It includes full sized pitches only. An analysis prepared by Sport England for Mansfield District (2015) indicates that overall;

- taking into account the hours that the two full sized pitches (Manor Sports Complex and Brunts Academy) are available for community use, provision is equivalent to 1.5
pitches. This is because the hours that the pitch at Brunts Academy is available are significantly reduced.

- supply of pitches per 10,000 residents (0.19 pitches) is lower than the Nottinghamshire County average (0.42) and the England average (0.36). It is also lower than provision in Chesterfield (0.38) which is a similar local authority (based upon demographics and composition of the population profile) with suitable provision;

- the FPM model reveals that demand in Mansfield District is equivalent to 2,293 visits per week during the peak period; this is equivalent to 3.1 AGPs;

- whilst the model reveals that overall demand equates to 3 AGPs, the separate data for football and hockey illustrates that demand theoretically equates to 1 AGP for hockey and 2 AGPs for football;

- based purely upon a baseline supply and demand assessment, and taking into account all demand regardless of sport, there is therefore a shortfall of 1.6 AGPs). This shortfall predominantly relates to a need for pitches (although it does not take into account the presence of several small sided pitches in the district);

- satisfied demand takes into account the location of existing pitches. 92% of demand is satisfied, which is below Nottinghamshire averages but above that for Chesterfield, and the England average. Over 63% of demand from Mansfield residents is exported to other areas - this is a significant amount of exported demand;

- on balance, and taking into account the location of facilities in Mansfield and surrounds, unmet demand is equivalent to 0.25 AGPs. This is caused by a mix of a lack of capacity (51%) and residents being located outside of the catchment (primarily due to lack of car) of a facility (49%). There are no hotspots of unmet demand where new provision would be clearly justified; and

- the existing pitches are considered to be operating at 99% capacity, with around 70% of use by Mansfield District residents (30% imported from other areas).

6.30 The conclusions of the modelling undertaken by Sport England therefore suggest that;

- the unmet demand for facilities is relatively low overall and indicates a good level of provision (taking into account the availability of facilities in neighbouring authorities).
- The existing stock of AGPs however is at capacity and a significant amount of satisfied demand is met outside of the district. This means that there is limited opportunity for increased use of AGPs;
- The model however suggests that spare capacity could be increased by improving the amount of hours that the Brunts Academy is open for public use.

6.31 The model therefore does not reveal a requirement for additional AGP provision and indicates that just one pitch is required for hockey. This therefore does not directly correlate with the findings relating to the actual use of existing hockey pitches. It does however link with the displaced demand evident, which suggests that Mansfield is exporting demand from hockey clubs outside the district.
Future Picture of Provision

6.32 The future requirement for AGPs for hockey will be impacted upon by several things, including population growth, changes to the demographic profile, club development and evolving participation trends. These issues are considered in turn in order to build an accurate picture of future demand.

Population Change

6.33 Analysis in Section 3 indicated that while the population of Mansfield will increase, changes to the population profile mean that the proportion of people within the age groups most likely to play pitch sports will increase at a much slower rate.

6.34 Team Generation Rates (TGRs) indicate how many people in a specified age group are required to generate one team. By applying TGRs to population projections, we can project the theoretical number of teams that would be generated from population growth and gain an understanding of future demand. Table 6.5 summarises the implications of population growth and reveals that because of relatively low levels of hockey participation, population growth will be insufficient to generate an additional team of any type. It also indicates that the number of people falling within the age ranges that play senior hockey will actually decline, rather than increase.

Table 6.5: Impact of Changes to the Population Profile based on 2012 Subnational Population Projections (the most up to date data available in the level of detail required at the time of writing)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sport and Age Groups</th>
<th>Current population in age group within the area</th>
<th>Number of teams in age group within the area</th>
<th>Current TGR</th>
<th>Future population in age group within the area (2025)</th>
<th>Change in number of people in age group</th>
<th>Potential Change in Team Numbers in Age Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hockey Senior Men (14-55yrs)</td>
<td>26570</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3321</td>
<td>24800</td>
<td>-1770</td>
<td>-0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hockey Senior Women (14-55yrs)</td>
<td>26570</td>
<td>4* including mixed</td>
<td>6643</td>
<td>24800</td>
<td>-1770</td>
<td>-0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hockey Junior Boys (5-14yrs)</td>
<td>5400</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2700</td>
<td>6240</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hockey Junior Girls 5-14yrs)</td>
<td>5400</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2700</td>
<td>6240</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.35 This means that population growth would result in demand for pitches remaining stable – the increased population will mitigate the impact of the ageing population over time.

Changes in Participation Trends

6.36 While population growth will have limited impact on participation, England Hockey seek to build participation, with a particular focus placed upon retention of existing players as
well as an increase in the number of players aged 14+. In addition to the traditional form of the game, new forms of hockey have also recently been introduced, including Rush Hockey. These forms do not require formal facilities and can be played on any facility. The impact of their introduction and the rate of transfer to club hockey is not yet known.

6.37 While population growth will largely serve to offset the impact of the ageing population, both clubs have aspirations to grow (ie increase the proportion of people in the district playing hockey. Mansfield HC are keen to provide a junior section and North Notts HC are looking to continue increases in junior participation, as well as to continue the adult section. It is likely therefore that club development activities will have a greater impact than population growth.

6.38 There is capacity on the existing site on a Sunday to increase junior participation at North Notts Hockey Club, but no further capacity for adult play (due to a lack of available pitches at peak time). There is capacity for growth at the existing site for Mansfield HC, but the club are displaced and wishing to build their club within the Mansfield rather than Ashfield area.

6.39 Added to this, current usage of facilities means that if there was to be a requirement to increase the number of hours dedicated to training during the midweek peak period, there is more limited capacity to do this due to competing demands from football.

6.40 Projected unmet demand is therefore equivalent to at least 2 match equivalents at peak time (based upon current participation levels). This assumes that Mansfield HC are relocated into the town, rather than continue to develop in Ashfield. Any increases in hockey participation would see this increase further.

Forthcoming Changes to Supply

6.41 There are no known confirmed plans that will impact upon the supply of AGPs for hockey at the time of writing this assessment (2015).

Summary and Key Issues – AGPs for Hockey

6.42 The key issues for hockey are summarised in the summary section in Section 12.
7: Bowls

Introduction

7.1 This section assesses the adequacy of bowling greens in Mansfield District by presenting an overview of supply (quantity, quality, accessibility and availability) and demand.

Supply

7.2 Table 7.1 summarises the stock of bowling greens. It reveals that there are 8 sites containing 9 functional outdoor bowls greens. Two greens are located within the Warsop Parish sub area while the remainder are within the greater Mansfield urban area.

Table 7.1: Bowling greens in Mansfield District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location and Sub Area</th>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Ownership / Management</th>
<th>Number of Greens</th>
<th>Club Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mansfield - Sub Area 1</td>
<td>Mansfield Bowling Club</td>
<td>Managed by Mansfield Bowling Club, Owned by Queen Elizabeth’s Trust</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mansfield Bowling Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Town - Sub Area 1</td>
<td>Queensway Park Mansfield District Council</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Queensway Bowls Club</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mansfield - Sub Area 1</td>
<td>Racecourse Park Mansfield District Council</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Racecourse Park Bowls Club - Mansfield Gas Bowls Club</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sookholme - Sub Area 2</td>
<td>The John Fretwell Sporting Complex Warsop Sporting Trust</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Tichfield Sookholme Bowls Club - Mansfield Brewery Bowls Club</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mansfield Woodhouse - Sub Area 1</td>
<td>Yeoman Hill Park Mansfield District Council</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yeoman Hill Park Bowls Club (pay and play and friendlies only)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mansfield Woodhouse - Sub Area 1</td>
<td>Manor Sports Complex</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Brierley Park Bowls Club - Manor Park Bowls Club</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warsop - Sub Area 2</td>
<td>Longden Terrace Miners Welfare Club Longden Terrace Miners Welfare Club</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Longden Terrace Miners welfare Club</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mansfield - Sub Area 1</td>
<td>Bull Farm Park Mansfield District Council</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bull Farm Park PRD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.3 Clipstone Bowling Green is also located in close proximity to the Mansfield District boundary (but in Newark and Sherwood District).

7.4 There is clear evidence of recent decline in bowls with several sites having become disused and / or converted to alternative functions. These include:

- Carr Bank Park and Tichfield Park (both converted to petanque)
- Church Warsop Sports and Social Club and Welbeck Colliery Miners Welfare - both abandoned
- Mansfield Colliery Welfare Bowls Green - now used as 7v7 football pitch
- Former bowling green near Clumber Street within Mansfield town centre – no longer used but the green is still present.
- Forest Town arena – now used as a football training area

7.5 Added to the greens in Table 7.1, Clipstone Bowling Green is located just outside the district boundaries (in Newark and Sherwood). This green may be used by some of the residents of Mansfield District.

Quality

7.6 Non-technical site visits undertaken during the playing season (April - August) reveal that there is a wide range of facilities, with some excellent sites and others in poorer condition and showing signs of deterioration. All functioning sites are however considered serviceable. Two private sites stand out as being higher quality than other facilities, specifically Mansfield Bowling Club (new facilities in the ground of Queen Elizabeth School) and John Fretwell Centre. Both of these sites are new, with excellent purpose built greens and ancillary facilities. The accompanying facilities at both sites (bar and social facilities) help to ensure that these are maintained at a good quality for now and into the future. This is through the generation of additional income that can be used to support bowling green maintenance. Other private greens also benefit from this, while Council facilities do not offer the same opportunities. Overall, there is no significant variation in the quality of available provision between the two sub areas.

7.7 Figure 7.1 summarises the quality scores, based on the site visits, for the overall provision of bowls greens in the district. Overall, pathways and surrounds, spectator facilities and storage facilities are key areas for improvement, with most sites achieving scores of either acceptable or poor. Site assessment matrices outlining the scoring criteria are provided in Appendix D. Some paths in particular had trip hazards, resulting from deterioration of tarmac paths. While spectator provision was generally available at most sites, the number of seats and quality was wide ranging.

Figure 7.1: Quality Scores for Bowling Greens
7.8 While playing surfaces achieved higher scores overall, several issues were identified at the time of site visits, particularly with regards maintenance. These impact upon the quality of the surface and are likely to cause degeneration over the course of a season. It was felt that while grass cover was adequate at the time of visits on many greens, the issues that were starting to appear suggested that this would deteriorate later in the season. Generally, the greens are compacted and several exhibited thatching of the grass sward and moss and weed species within. Some investment in aeration, weed killing, fertilizer and verticutting would ease this relatively quickly and allow the grass to return. This issue was particularly apparent on Council greens, although was also evident on some of the private facilities.

7.9 In addition, the gutters on many of the sites are still sand earth or gravel and new materials such as rubber chips, matting or geotextile/astroturf would smarten up the appearance of the greens generally. Some of the boards on the greens need attention either because they are in need of painting or repair. These issues are summarised in Table 7.2.

**Club Perceptions of Quality**

7.10 Building upon the site assessments, clubs were asked for their views on quality. Similar issues were raised to those discovered at site visits, although clubs are on the whole satisfied with their green, with the majority of responses rating facilities as either acceptable or good (although there are some site specific issues identified). Reflecting the maintenance issues identified at site visits, grass cover was highlighted as being a key issue for improvement.

7.11 Paths and facilities for spectators took on lower levels of importance for clubs compared with the quality of greens. Litter and vandalism was raised as a key concern by some clubs although this was not evident at the time of site visits (potentially cleared off the bowling green by volunteers). These clubs were all accessible to the public.

**Figure 7.2: Club Perceptions of Quality**
7.12 Other general comments made by clubs were recurring, and highlight the perceived key issues of those currently playing bowls:

- requirement for improved maintenance during both the off season and during the bowling season itself;

- issues with vandalism and graffiti, and the negative impact that youths congregating around the greens have on perceived safety; and

- required improvements to the toilets, changing and clubhouse facilities. Working clean toilets are highlighted as being particularly important to users.

7.13 Mansfield District Council recognises many of the key issues raised, and highlight the challenges of undertaking the maintenance of bowls greens and their facilities during the winter. The main challenges are considered to be; overlapping time demands with the football pitch maintenance programme; the challenges of providing facilities within park including vandalism and unofficial use and associated issues. Building upon the general issues identified, Table 7.2 summarises the key issues identified by site. Site assessment matrices used are provided in Appendix D.
### Table 7.2: Overall Quality of Bowling Greens

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Site Visit (%)</th>
<th>Site Visit Comments</th>
<th>Club Perception</th>
<th>Key Issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bull Farm Park</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>Bowling green in good tidy condition in public park. The pavilion is well secured and the green is well fenced. Some steps and the gutters are sand with small wall surround.</td>
<td>Two meter round edge of the green is very poor, people go drinking near the clubhouse and use it as a toilet as there are no toilets in the park. Round the edges there are pot holes due to a lack of seeding and there are also issues with children playing football on the green. Vandalism and litter are key issues, grass and playing surface considered adequate.</td>
<td>Pot holes, vandalism and litter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longden Terrace Welfare Miners Bowling Green</td>
<td>77.27%</td>
<td>Green surface and grass cover good but pathways require improvement. At first glance green appears abandoned. Club have intention of redeveloping the green, pavilion and whole social club.</td>
<td>Site surface and maintenance good although some issues with litter. Club identify the redevelopment (or update of existing) pavilion as the key priority.</td>
<td>Pavilion requires improvement as well as pathways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manor Sports Complex</td>
<td>79.55%</td>
<td>Club in large sporting complex. Green surfaces and grass cover good. Tidy facility but boards and gutters require some repair. Brick pavilion in good condition</td>
<td>Clubs indicate that greens have improved in recent years. All elements of facility rated as good on green 1, and ratings also primarily good for green 2, with only areas for improvement identified as facilities for spectators and pavilion.</td>
<td>Basic repairs to boards and gutters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mansfield Bowls Club (Queen Elizabeth School)</td>
<td>88.64%</td>
<td>Highest quality facility in district, supported by new purpose built pavilion. Well maintained green with excellent surface - newly provided site.</td>
<td>High quality site with excellent green keeper. All elements of quality rated as good and no areas for improvement identified.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queensway Park Bowls</td>
<td>81.82%</td>
<td>Tidy site with a well maintained green, although timber edges require some attention. Brick pavilion but very limited spectator facilities</td>
<td>The green has improved over the last couple of years (attributed to improved maintenance). Paths are poor with trip hazards and the boards around the green also require attention. The pavilion leaks a little.</td>
<td>Paths and basic repairs to boards and gutters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racecourse Park</td>
<td>77.27%</td>
<td>A pleasant green in tidy condition. Grass slightly longer than other greens and some patchy areas on green, suggesting improved maintenance required and some remedial works needed. Brick pavilion. Some thatch on site.</td>
<td>Lack of maintenance over winter period impacts green. Maintenance started too late to influence green quality. Playing surface and green maintenance is poor - perceptions of both clubs. The toilets are also considered to be poor by one club.</td>
<td>Green surface</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Fretwell Sporting Complex</td>
<td>79.55%</td>
<td>Bowling club in large complex with excellent brick pavilion. Bark gutters and timber boards on surrounds of green, some boards need attention. Good surface at time of visit</td>
<td>Site suffers from poor grass cover and requires improved maintenance, particularly out of season. Changing rooms are poor, but club do benefit from use of bar, particularly when raining.</td>
<td>Improved maintenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeoman Hill Park Bowls</td>
<td>81.82%</td>
<td>Located with pleasant surroundings in a public park reached on foot from the parking area through park gate. Green in good condition and the inside of the pavilion was being painted by a volunteer. The gutters surrounding the green is sand filled and the gutter sides earth/</td>
<td>Council are currently investigating the potential to provide a dual football and bowls pavilion with a view to providing a community room. It is hoped that this would increase usage of the facility. No comments received from club.</td>
<td>Green surface (thatching)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
turf. A little tired but well looked after. Some updating of the gutters would bring the green up to date. Some thatch on site.
Accessibility

7.14 Distances travelled by bowlers to greens in Mansfield vary, with 34 percent (%) travelling less than one mile, 18% travelling between one and three miles and 26% travelling three to five miles. Twenty-one percent travel more than five miles.

7.15 Manor Park Bowls Club, Queensway Park Bowls Club and Clipstone Social Club have the most local catchments, while Titchfield and Sookholme, Brierley Park Bowls Club and Mansfield Bowls Club have the highest proportion of members that are travelling greater distances. Notably, these are the higher quality facilities, suggesting that participants are travelling to reach better quality greens and clubs with social facilities.

7.16 Map 7.1 illustrates the location of each of the greens and includes both a one mile catchment area around each green. It indicates that the majority of residents are within one mile of a bowling green as a result of the even distribution of facilities. Provision is however skewed to the north of the Mansfield Urban area, with facilities not easily accessible for those in the south of the district. Notably, most greens that have closed are in relatively close proximity to other existing sites, suggesting that the stock of facilities was above demand. This is particularly the case in Church Warsop, where two greens have recently been abandoned.
Map 7.1: Bowling greens in Mansfield District

1-mile catchments shown around sites in the local authority.

Sources: Ordnance Survey (Boundary Line)
Demand

7.17 Table 7.3 illustrates the current membership of bowling greens across Mansfield. The participation profile reveals several key characteristics, specifically;

- participation is currently relatively stagnant with most clubs either experiencing decline (due to age profile of participants) or remaining static. Mansfield Bowls Club, who have recently had new facilities, are one of few clubs where a significant increase has been experienced. There has also been an increase in membership at Titchfield and Sookholme (good facilities and close to others that have folded);

- with the exception of Mansfield Bowls Club (106 members) and Titchfield & Sookholme Bowls Club (45 members), playing membership of bowling clubs is low. The average membership of all clubs (taking into account respondents to the survey only) is 34. When excluding these sites with higher membership numbers, the average drops to 24. Bowls England consider membership of below 20 to be unviable.

- the profile of participants is clearly skewed towards males, with 70% of members being male. More notably, Mansfield Bowls Club, Manor Park Bowls Club and Mansfield Gas Sports Clubs are the only clubs where the balance is even. In the majority of instances, females represent a fifth or less of members. This suggests that there may be latent demand for female players; and

- there is also a lack of junior participants, with Mansfield Bowls Club having eight. Additionally, the Racecourse and Manor Park bowls clubs are the only other clubs with junior members.

7.18 When assuming the average membership (excluding the two large clubs listed above) is 24 members senior adult members for each of the two non-responding clubs, this brings the total membership to 362 senior adult players. Additionally, there are just 12 players aged under 18 across the district. Membership of Clipstone Bowls Club, just over the border in Newark, also equates to an additional 20 senior players.

Table 7.3: Membership of existing clubs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub Area</th>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Club Name</th>
<th>Club Membership</th>
<th>Membership Trends</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Warsop Parish</td>
<td>Longden Terrace Miners Welfare Bowling Green</td>
<td>Longden Terrace Bowls Club</td>
<td>24 in total, including 16 male and 8 female. No junior participation</td>
<td>Decreased - primarily due to age, but have also lost a lot of members to other clubs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mansfield Town</td>
<td>Manor Sports Complex</td>
<td>Brierty Park Bowls Club</td>
<td>25 in total, including 20 male and 5 female. No junior participation</td>
<td>Static</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Manor Park Bowls Club</td>
<td>25 in total, including 11 male and 11 female, as well as 3 junior participants</td>
<td>Static</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mansfield</td>
<td>Mansfield</td>
<td>Mansfield Bowls Club</td>
<td>106 in total, including 50</td>
<td>Increased - club</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 7.1: Club Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub Area</th>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Club Name</th>
<th>Club Membership</th>
<th>Membership Trends</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Town</td>
<td>Bowls Club</td>
<td></td>
<td>male and 48 female. There are 8 junior members. The club also benefits from 33 non playing members</td>
<td>believe this can be attributed in part to the availability of good quality coaching as well as links with other establishments - schools, disabled user groups etc. The ancillary facilities also allow the club to function socially.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mansfield Town</td>
<td>Queensway Park Bowling Green</td>
<td>Queensway Bowls Club</td>
<td>30 in total, including 25 male and 5 female. No junior participation</td>
<td>Static</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mansfield Town</td>
<td>Racecourse Park Bowling Green</td>
<td>Racecourse Bowls Club</td>
<td>22 members (20 male, 1 female and 1 junior male). No junior members</td>
<td>Decreased - older members passing away</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mansfield Gas Bowls Club</td>
<td>25 in total 13 male and 12 female members. No junior members</td>
<td>Decreased - older members passing away</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warsop Parish</td>
<td>John Fretwell Sporting Complex</td>
<td>Tichfield Sookholme Bowls Club</td>
<td>40 members in total, including 30 male and 15 ladies.</td>
<td>Marginal increase - club generally remains around same numbers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mansfield Brewery</td>
<td>24 members (assumed average)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mansfield Town</td>
<td>Yeoman Hill Park Bowling Green</td>
<td>Yeoman Hill Bowls Club</td>
<td>24 members (assumed average)</td>
<td>Pay and play club (roll up and play) no league play.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mansfield Town</td>
<td>Bull Farm Park</td>
<td>Bull Farm PRD</td>
<td>17 male members and 7 female members - 24 in total</td>
<td>Static</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 7.19 All clubs indicate that they have capacity for new members and are actively seeking new participants. The flexibility of fixtures means that there is scope to accommodate more teams on all existing greens and indeed, increasing the number of members will be key to the sustainability of bowls as a sport in the district. This is particularly true of the private facilities, which are reliant upon income to maintain the greens and associated facilities. There are no patterns in membership numbers within the two sub areas in which the greens are located.

#### 7.20 Figure 7.3 illustrates the views of clubs in relation to perceived barriers to the growth of bowls. It indicates that the overriding issue for bowls is the declining membership and the number of clubs that are struggling to attract players. Other issues with facilities are much more secondary to this issue.
7.21 While the low membership numbers is a concern, there is also relatively limited recruitment or sports development taking place to attract a diverse range of people (e.g. younger players, etc.) to the sport within the local area. An exception to this is the Mansfield Bowling Club, who link with local schools and other community groups. Most clubs are reliant upon word of mouth and flyers. Some clubs seek to build on the popularity of indoor bowls by placing adverts in locations where this takes place. The Mansfield District Council Sports Development team worked with Mansfield Bowls Club in the six weeks following its opening by delivering taster sessions; these were relatively successful and the numbers of players at the club site is testament to the development work that has been undertaken by the club.

Figure 7.3: Barriers to the growth of bowls

Latent demand and Participation Trends

7.22 The Active People Survey and Market Segmentation data, are a useful theoretical tools for evaluating of the proportion of the population that currently play bowls and the amount of people that would like to play. It also provides an indication as to how this varies across the district. This can be used to understand if any latent demand exists. It should be noted that the Active People survey should be treated as a theoretical tool only. Figures used represent the most up to date assessment available at the time of writing. It supports and provides further evidence to back up the analysis of what is happening on the ground.

7.23 The Sport England Active People Survey reveals that by March 2015, 0.69% of the population of England aged 16+ played bowls at least once per month. This represents a statistically significant change from Active People 1(2005 / 2006) where 1.04% of the population aged 16 and above played bowls. The sport of bowls is therefore declining across the UK.

7.24 Interestingly, the Active People suggests that in Mansfield district, the proportion of people playing bowls in varies geographically, with lower proportions of people playing in the more urban areas than in more rural parts of the district. This is illustrated in Map 7.2 overleaf.
The survey suggests that 843 people in the district are currently believed to play bowls (an amount significantly higher than the known membership of clubs). Reflecting the general make up of the clubs in the district, these largely fall within the older age groups categorised as ‘Elsie’ and ‘Arnold’, ‘Frank’, ‘Ralph’, and ‘Phyllis’ and ‘Roger’ and ‘Joy’. The proportion of people in the Elsie and Arnold and Frank categories playing is higher than may be expected, whilst there may be scope to increase the amount of residents in the Roger and Joy and Ralph and Phyllis categories. Full detail of the 19 market segments that Sport England have devised is outlined in Section 3.

Market segmentation also suggests that there are 197 additional residents that would like to play (percent increase of 23%). By and large, these are in the same Market Segmentation profile categories as those that are already playing bowls. Only residents categorised as ‘Terry’ display a greater interest in bowls than current participation would suggest. Latent demand appears to be distributed evenly across the district as a whole. This suggests that marketing needs to target similar groups to those already playing.

**National Governing Body (NGB) priorities**

Bowls England is the NGB for Flat Green Lawn Bowls in England. The organization’s strategic plan (2013 – 2017) indicates that the vision of the organization focuses upon;

- promoting the sport;
- recruiting new participants; and
- retaining existing participants.

In particular, the Governing Body highlights the health benefits that bowls can bring and the role of bowls in improving health issues. Consultation with the NGB indicates that key issues for bowls in general include;

- the older age profile of members and the impact that this has on growing and maintaining participation. In particular, there is a lack of people aged 20 - 50 and a shortage of young people;
- the need for greater flexibility in the sport if participation is to increase. Current patterns of play rely on afternoon / early evening starts, meaning that the sport can be restrictive for younger members and people in full-time employment;
• the cost of maintaining facilities, declining membership and lack of funding to effect improvements;
• the need for closer involvement with schools and sports development staff;
• lack of voluntary help for clubs (coaches and administrators), and;
• the need to promote new ‘short’ forms of the games (e.g. New age bowls, sets play) to attract new players with less spare time.

7.29 The Bowls Development Alliance’s (the development body for Bowls England and English Indoor Bowling Association that is funded by Sport England) Whole Sport Plan seeks to;
• target those over 55 to increase participation, with a view to ensuring that bowls becomes the number one sport for participants aged 55 and over;
• support clubs to provide a quality experience that will maintain club membership;
• provide a quality coaching structure including recognised qualifications;
• provide more opportunities for those aged 16 and over with a disability.

7.30 The achievement of these goals will be delivered through a variety of means, including packages for clubs to aid recruitment, Play Bowls Road shows to promote the sport and working in hot spot areas. Nottinghamshire is currently identified as a hotspot area (funding for 2014 - 2017) and there is a development officer working in the area. Funding is available to support clubs with recruitment and retention of players, as well as to support coach development. This initiative has led to successful increases in participation in clubs across Nottinghamshire, with increase of up to 50% of club membership seen.

7.31 To help inform the strategy in relation to addressing increases in participation, the Bowls Development Alliance have recently completed a National Participation Survey (2015) and concluded:
• socialising, fitness and enjoyment were the key drivers for playing bowls. A desire to compete and win was a much lower priority for existing participants;
• the health benefits of bowls were found to be a strong motivating factor for those currently playing bowls. Amongst non-participants (particularly younger aged non-participants) bowls has been perceived to be of lower health benefit than competing activities (including gardening and walking); and
• many former bowlers raised longstanding health issues or disabilities as a reason for no longer participating. It was felt that the sport could do better to create a more inclusive and accessible environment.

7.32 Opportunities to incorporate these findings are addressed in the Playing Pitch Strategy.

7.33 Locally in Mansfield, most clubs are not affiliated to Bowls England (just Queensway Bowls Club and Brierley Park Bowls Club are), instead being associated with the Nottinghamshire Bowls Federation, which is part of the English Bowling Federation or England Women’s Bowling Federation. This is an organisation which has less stringent laws of the game with regard to the condition of bowling greens. This organisation is still recognised by Sport England as a Governing Body but from 1st April 2017 clubs will not be eligible for support through the Bowls Development Alliance.
7.34 The majority of competition within the Nottinghamshire area is driven by this organisation and few clubs choose to also affiliate with Bowls England primarily due to cost. The key benefits of doing this are perceived to be insurances and entry into Bowls England Competitions (as well as National teams) of which there are fewer locally. The majority of clubs therefore do not believe these benefits to be value for money as they do not have aspirations to play at a higher level.

Adequacy of provision

7.35 There are no supply and demand models for bowling greens. The adequacy of provision and key issues to address is therefore evaluated by drawing together the data collated above and evaluating the key issues impacting current and projected future participation.

7.36 Figure 7.4 illustrates the satisfaction levels of existing clubs and demonstrates that more than half of all clubs are dissatisfied with provision. Clubs using both public and private greens responded in similar ways, although some refer to grounds they must play on away from home; thus there were no clear patterns. One clear unifying reason for clubs being dissatisfied is based on the perception that there are not enough greens of appropriate quality. This also links with the membership statistics, which suggest that players are travelling further to facilities deemed to be higher quality.

Figure 7.4: Club Satisfaction with the current stock of facilities

7.37 Based on the participation data (both from existing clubs and estimated projections), there is not sufficient demand to support additional facilities. In particular:

- All responding clubs indicate that they have scope to accommodate additional members.
• Recent participation has been static or declining and most are actively seeking to obtain new members. Retention of existing members and recruitment of new members is highlighted as the key priority for bowling clubs nationally. Locally, key barriers to membership growth include a general lack of proactivity in club development and active recruitment. The majority of clubs currently rely on word of mouth.

• The average membership of responding clubs is just 36 players and most clubs have fewer members than this. This is significantly below optimum levels in which approximately 80-100 members is considered a healthy membership for a bowls club (Bowls England) The sharing of greens by some clubs means that membership per green is slightly higher, at 41 members per green on average (33 when excluding Mansfield Bowls Club, which skews figures due to their higher than average numbers). Bowls England suggests that clubs of below 20 members may struggle in terms of sustainability. Longden Terrace Bowls Club and Bull Farm Bowls Club both have below 25 members, indicating that they are coming close to this level.

• There are four greens that are no longer used, having recently fallen into disrepair - these are listed at the beginning of this section.

7.38 The quality of greens and the recruitment of additional players are viewed as key priorities by both clubs and providers. Increases in club membership will be essential if the existing stock of facilities is to remain viable. This will however require proactive attempts to increase membership, while the majority of recruitment is currently quite passive.

Future Demand

7.39 Although there is sufficient capacity currently, the profile of participants in bowls means that the ageing population is likely to influence participation more so than for most other sports. The 2012 subnational population projections (the most up to date source available in the level of detail required at the time of writing) indicate that the proportion of residents in the district aged 60+ is likely to increase slightly from 24.4% now, to 24.9% by 2025. This will represent an increase of circa 600 people aged over 60 with a possible knock on impact for bowls. Table 7.4 summarises the potential impact of this population growth and presents two scenarios as follows:

• A – using club membership as a base – this provides an accurate reflection of current participation across the district (394)

• B – basing participation on figures according to the Active People Survey 2015 (843), which highlights a degree of latent demand.
Table 7.4: Calculation of potential growth in bowls up to 2025 (based on Subnational Population Projections 2012)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Situation</th>
<th>Current Participation</th>
<th>Active People Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Area considered</strong></td>
<td><strong>(Known Club Membership)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Population Aged 60+</td>
<td>25,800</td>
<td>25800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Participation Level in Bowls</td>
<td>1.73%</td>
<td>1.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Membership of Bowling Clubs*</td>
<td>374(assumes 24 each for Mansfield Brewery and Yeoman Hill Bowls Club)</td>
<td>843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Current Population Participating in Bowls</td>
<td>1.44%</td>
<td>3.26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Future Situation |                       |                       |
| Future Population aged 60+ (2025) | 26400 | 26400 |
| Assumed Future Participation in Bowls (participation remains constant) | 1.44% | 3.26% |
| Potential Future Participants in Bowls | 380 | 860 |
| Projected growth in participants by 2025 | 6 | 17 |

7.40 Table 7.4 therefore indicates that based upon existing club membership, assuming participation rates remain constant, demand for bowls is likely to increase by 6 players as a direct result of population growth. Assuming that membership of all greens is even, this would mean membership would remain consistent with existing levels. While this can be accommodated within the existing stock, it remains a low level of participation and below levels required for provision to be sustainable. If higher participation rates were used (based on those in the Active People Survey - the end column of Table 7.4), this growth would increase to 86 players per green and provision would be optimum to meet demand (optimum membership 80 – 100).
7.41 It is clear however that analysis of existing bowling clubs represents the most accurate means of determining demand for bowling greens, particularly in the context of the recent decline that has been experienced.

7.42 On this basis, this suggests therefore that there is sufficient stock to of facilities to meet current and future demand, and that indeed, if all greens are to be retained, there is a need for increased participation to support the existing infrastructure. Higher levels of membership are likely to be a key way of maximising the sustainability of clubs as increased numbers of members will bring with it higher levels of income, which will be required to support the management and maintenance of greens. All greens have extensive capacity, with the exception of Mansfield Bowls Club, which is close to reaching capacity (Max circa additional 20 members). This green is a higher quality facility with a much wider catchment area as a result of the opportunities provided. This demonstrates the potential that can be achieved if effort is made to improve facilities although it is acknowledged that social facilities play an important role in attracting new players.

7.43 It is acknowledged that growth is unlikely to be even, with the location of new housing developments significantly impacting the choice of club. With the exception of Mansfield Bowls Club, none of the clubs are likely to become over capacity without significant increases on participation, as well as the benefit of new members arising from housing developments. The large scale developments approved for planning permission in (Linhurst (southern extremity of Mansfield) 1,700 dwellings (non-started), Land at Penniment Farm (Abbott road) 430 dwellings (none started), and Sandlands Way Forest Town 329 dwellings (233 already built as of 31st March 2015) may have the greatest impact. The location of Mansfield Bowls Club’s relatively close proximity to Linhurst (as well as other smaller developments which cumulatively will impact) means that the greatest impact may be felt at this club. It is here where capacity is most limited, and access to and promotion of other greens will therefore be essential.

7.44 Future participation in bowls is therefore only likely to grow significantly if a more aggressive approach to recruitment is taken by clubs. Most clubs do little marketing of existing opportunities outside of word of mouth and leafleting currently and there has been little growth in the sport, with some who have been involved in the sport in the area for years expressing concerns about the decline in the number of members, and in the number of teams entered into league and cup fixtures. Clubs also demonstrated an aspiration for support in this area and the Bowls Development Alliance are keen to work with clubs in Mansfield to deliver this. To date there has been little proactive development of bowls in the district.

7.45 Without participation increases, or in the event of further decline in participation, sustainability of existing club sites will remain the key challenge to address. Clubs highlight the importance of increasing support and the challenges that they face with sustainability and this will be a key issue moving forwards. The retention of existing bowling greens and increasing the usage of these facilities therefore represents the key priority.

7.46 The key issues arising for bowls are therefore summarised in the summary section in Section 12.
8.1 This section assesses the adequacy of tennis provision in Mansfield District by presenting an evaluation of supply (quantity, quality, accessibility and availability) and an overview of demand. The key findings are then summarised, alongside the issues to be addressed.

Quantity

8.2 There are 53 tennis courts across Mansfield District. Of these, 33 courts are available for public use including 10 courts situated within parks which are free to access. The majority of courts that are not available for community use are located at school sites, although there are some exceptions.

8.3 Manor Sports and Recreation Centre is a dual public / school use site, functioning as a public leisure facility outside school hours. Garibaldi College also offers community use of their courts. While courts at Samworth Academy are listed as being available online, in practice these proved more difficult to access and the school indicate that they are not open for public access. Many other schools indicated that their tennis courts are not available, even though other facilities are open for hire. There is just one community club in the district, Mansfield Tennis Club, who have 9 courts.

8.4 Tennis courts are focused predominantly in the greater Mansfield urban area, with just three in Warsop Parish (at the Meden School and Technology Complex, which are not available for community use).

8.5 While there are a large number of courts, just 10 are floodlit, allowing for evening and weekend activity.

- four of these are at Manor Sports and Recreation Centre
- Three at Mansfield Tennis Club
- three at The Meden School and Technology Complex (although this site is not available for community use).
- there are also floodlights at Garibaldi College but these are not operational.

8.6 Opportunities for play outside of daylight hours are therefore fairly restricted. Planning permission has however been granted for the floodlighting of three further courts at Mansfield Tennis Club, which will increase the overall stock of facilities that can be used all year round.

8.7 The facilities that are available are set out in Table 8.1 overleaf.

---

Table 8.1: Tennis courts in Mansfield District
There have been some recent changes to the stock of tennis courts, with the loss of a tennis court at Yeoman Hill park which followed public consultation demonstrating a lack of demand for the facility. In addition to those listed above in Table 8.1, there are also two courts at Racecourse Park and Carr Bank Park that are no longer used for tennis.

There are also markings for tennis on Chesterfield Road MUGA but no nets or posts have ever been provided at this site and there is no known demand to do so. This site is currently closed due to the poor surface.
Quality

8.10 Site visits to tennis courts were undertaken during the summer (April to August 2015) and feedback was also gathered from providers and users (April to November 2015). Table 8.2 summarises the key issues arising from analysis of the quality of facilities. It clearly demonstrates that Mansfield Tennis Club is the highest quality site, although some parts of the facility are tired and the pavilion, which is very basic, would benefit from improvement. The matrices used for the site assessment can be found in Appendix D. Red cells indicate that there is an area for improvement.

8.11 Council and school sites are largely functional although there are some loose materials (Carr Bank) and paint wearing off some courts (Racecourse). Some school sites are tired and of limited quality although all are functional hard courts, often also containing netball markings.

Table 8.2: Quality of tennis courts across Mansfield District (sites with community use)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub Area</th>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Site Visit Comment</th>
<th>Club / Provider Comment</th>
<th>Overall Quality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sub Area 1 - Mansfield</td>
<td>Carr Bank Park</td>
<td>Permanent metal nets prevent removal and vandalism, limited quality. Some loose material on playing surface, but fence and paths in good condition. Nets have weed-killed edges and courts are kept tidy, although lichen is evident on the tarmac.</td>
<td>Courts are accessible to the public and free of charge. They monitored on an infrequent basis and improvements made when required. There is a small group of regular users at this site.</td>
<td>Standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub Area 1 - Mansfield</td>
<td>Mansfield Tennis Club</td>
<td>Poor signage and pavilion is old and in need of replacement - requires both internal and external upgrade. Nets and equipment in good condition although posts on some courts require rust removal and painting. Court surface good, there are no loose materials on the acrylic/tarmac courts. There was evidence of recent seeding on the grass courts, demonstrating commitment to maintenance procedures. Tidy facility overall with picnic benches and seating for spectators.</td>
<td>Courts in good condition, but changing is poor and clubhouse is only acceptable. Club have recently painted courts, repaired boundary wall and removed trees around the court. The club believe a covered area is required as well as an upgrade to the existing pavilion. A new pavilion is the club’s key priority.</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub Area 1 - Mansfield</td>
<td>Racecourse Park Tennis</td>
<td>4 courts have permanent fence nets, 2 have seasonal nets and posts 2 other courts have no equipment at time of visit. Court surfaces are good, although paint has worn off courts with permanent nets The other courts are in better condition. The chainlink fencing is tired and old and while functional, Nets that are not permanently fixed get stolen. Courts are accessible free of charge and so are monitored on an infrequent basis. Improvements made when required</td>
<td></td>
<td>Standard</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Site Visit Comment

- **Sub Area 1 - Mansfield**
  - **Manor Park Sports and Recreation Centre**: Facilities of reasonable quality, but fading line markings and surface would benefit from improvement. The facilities are tired. Surface needs replenishing and line markings improving to make them more attractive to users. Courts are located directly opposite a resource and training centre and provider sees and opportunity to link this with the courts (also contains classrooms / showers etc) and seek to develop the venue for club / coaching / training activity.
  - **Garibaldi College**: Floodlights do not currently work and site suffers from moss and slippy surfaces when wet, although school has facilities to clean this. Facilities of adequate quality.
  - **Samworth Church Academy**: Courts located on MUGA. Good condition overall although marked out on top of netball courts. Courts are concrete but adequate.
  - **The Brunts Academy**: Site not assessed due to lack of access. Site quality assumed.
  - **The Meden School and Technology College**: Facilities adequate but basic. Fenced and floodlit, functional. Located adjacent to AGP. Fence likely to require repair in short term.

### Club / Provider Comment

- **Overall Quality**
  - Standard
  - Poor - Standard

### Accessibility

8.12 Mansfield Tennis Club reveal that their club attracts users from a relatively wide catchment across Mansfield, with the majority of users travelling between three and five miles to reach the facility. Tennis courts within parks are thought to have a more local catchment based on feedback from grounds maintenance teams.

8.13 Map 8.1 illustrates the location of all sites containing tennis courts, with a three-mile catchment around the club facility and a one-mile catchment around each local facility. This mapping analysis reveals that:

- The distribution of tennis courts is relatively poor, with no facilities located within the southern area of the district. All Saints Catholic School is located within the western area of the district, but this is not open to the public. While most of the district’s urban areas are generally compact and therefore accessible, closer local access to facilities may encourage more people to play. Manor Sports and
Recreation Complex is an important site, as it is the only facility serving Mansfield Woodhouse in the northern Mansfield sub-area.

- Both the Brunts Academy and Samworth Church Academy are in close proximity to parks with existing publicly accessible tennis courts sites (Carr Bank Park and the Racecourse respectively). These courts would potentially serve the same catchment, but in reality, this isn’t the case as the academy sites aren’t open to the public.

- Meden School and Technology College is the only site with tennis courts located within the Warsop Parish Sub area and is therefore of local importance if tennis is to be promoted in this area. This site is not currently accessible.

- Overall, access to tennis courts for community use is limited to a rather restricted range of sites within the Mansfield sub area.
Map 8.1: Outdoor tennis courts in Mansfield District

Location of outdoor tennis courts

1-mile catchments shown around sites in local authority

Sources: Ordnance Survey (Boundary Line)
Demand

8.14 A Sports England Active People (2015) analysis indicates that nationally, the proportion of people playing tennis is declining. While at the time of Active People 1 (2005 / 2006) 1.12% of the adult population was participating nationally, this has now decreased to 0.94%. The percentage of adults in Mansfield District who play tennis is set out in Map 8.2 and Figure 8.1.

Map 8.2: Mansfield District adult population who play tennis - 2015

Figure 8.1: Profile of the market segments who participate in tennis - 2015
8.15 The key findings based on Sports England’s Active People’s Survey (date):

- between 1.1% and 5% of residents within the district play tennis. Participation is lower within Warsop Parish and within the northern part of the Mansfield sub-area (north of the town centre), and higher within the southern part of the Mansfield sub-area. This does not correlate directly with the distribution of tennis courts; most courts are located in the areas where participation is patchy. There is therefore no clear relationship between the location of tennis courts and the participation rates (according to Active People Surveys).

- tennis is played across both sexes and that the age range of participants is more diverse than for other sports considered in this study, although the proportion of female participants is lower than seen in other local authorities. In total 1,477 people across the district play tennis, with the number of players highest in the groups of Philip, Jamie, Tim and Ben. While the dominant participants are similar to those playing other sports, it is clear that tennis provides an effective way of engaging residents who do not participate in some other sports considered within this assessment, with strong profiles also for Chloe, Leanne, Helena, Alison, Jackie, Elaine and Roger and Joy. Notably, comparison with national and regional averages suggests that there is particular scope to increase participation amongst key participants (Ben, Tim, Chloe, Helena, Alison) but that particularly in the Philip category, a higher proportion of people are already playing than may be expected. Full details of the categories of market segmentation as defined by Sport England can be found in Section 3.

8.16 The Active People analysis of the estimated percentage of adults who would like to play tennis in the district is set out in Map 8.3 and Chart 8.2. Map 8.3 reveals that the perceived desire to play tennis varies across the district, with residents in Warsop Parish. Additionally, the north eastern part of the district (Mansfield Woodhouse) have a lower perceived desire to play tennis than in for residents in the the southern areas of the district.

8.17 Figure 8.2 illustrates that those who do not currently play but would like to play tennis are likely to be from similar market segment groups (Sport England Market Segmentation Groups) to current participants, but that there is particular latent demand from Jackie and Leanne as well as Jamie, Philip and Tim. Thus, it may be advantageous to target initiatives to increase participation towards these groups.
The graphs estimate that tennis is also the only sport studied in this report of which there are more residents who would like to play than actually play (1,764 estimated people would like to play compared with 1,477 who play). This suggests there is a high level of suppressed demand for tennis and that there is potential to make the most of this in order to increase participation. This should however be treated with caution, as it is a finding that is replicated in many local authorities and is a theoretical estimate only.
Existing participation

8.19 Existing participation in Mansfield District takes place in many forms:

- formal club membership at one club based site;
- pay and play activity at school facilities; and
- more informal play at public park sites.

Club Activity

8.20 There is only one formal tennis club within Mansfield District and their club activities and their membership trends are summarised in Table 8.2. Membership of the club has increased following recent decline and the club believe that they are effectively recruiting new members through offering a variety of opportunities, as well as creating links with secondary schools and West Notts College. Representatives of the school sector also highlight strong links with Mansfield Tennis Club.

Table 8.3: Mansfield Tennis Club - Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Club Name</th>
<th>Activities Available</th>
<th>Membership Numbers</th>
<th>Participation Trends</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mansfield Tennis Club</td>
<td>Competitive play, casual play, coaching (private and both adult and kids sessions) and mini tennis (Saturday morning aged 4 - 16).</td>
<td>120 seniors and 35 juniors, 155 in total</td>
<td>Club membership is increasing, and this is in part attributed to an improved coaching programme. Members travel predominantly between 3 - 5 miles from home to the club site, but some travel greater than 5 miles to use these facilities. The club do a lot of outreach work with senior schools in the district and Vision West Notts College and believe that this has benefited membership numbers. Club is looking to recruit second coach to enable further development of the club.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Informal Play at Public Parks

8.21 Access to public tennis courts is currently free of charge and is unmonitored. Users do not have to book and are able to use facilities for as long as they like whenever they like, although they must bring their own equipment. Mansfield District Council don’t record tennis use. For this reason, exact levels of participation are not currently known.

8.22 Anecdotally however, there is significant scope to increase usage of facilities. This is based on observations during site visits undertaken: despite it being summer holidays, there was only limited evidence of use of the public tennis courts.

8.23 The Lawn Tennis Association’s (LTA) Insight research (LTA 2014) demonstrates that, typically, public courts in particular are likely to attract a higher proportion of younger people (aged 14 - 29) while older players will gravitate towards clubs. Other LTA research demonstrates that while approximately 50% of players will play at club sites, they would expect 50% of activity to take place at parks and schools in the form of more casual tennis. Even more recent (LTA 2015) LTA intelligence suggests that the proportion who play on the more informal sites may even be higher.
8.24 Linking with their new strategy, the LTA see increasing participation in public parks as a key priority. Interestingly, Mansfield Tennis Club highlight a lack of good quality public courts as the key barrier to increasing participation in the district.

Use of School Sites

8.25 Schools with tennis courts were consulted about tennis participation during the consultation process (April - November. Feedback from schools demonstrates that there is relatively limited use and few inquiries for access to tennis courts. Likewise based on lower demand, the Manor Sports and Recreation Centre is considering a reduction in the number of tennis courts that they currently offer (from 8 to 5, including 3 floodlit courts) with a view to providing further facilities for football and netball.

8.26 It is clear, however, that there is little marketing of the facilities that are available at these sites and therefore potentially a lack of awareness amongst members of the public. Mansfield Tennis Club are currently liaising with secondary schools and are developing these relationships as a key means of increasing club membership. One challenge to this is the low level of uptake within the school curriculum. School games coordinators indicate that there are opportunities to increase the amount of tennis played within schools due to the proactive nature of the Mansfield Tennis Club, but highlight the challenges in running tennis competitions; these typically involve a low number of students but require a high student to staff ratio.

8.27 Analysis of demand overall therefore suggests that there is an opportunity to increase participation and take advantage of the potential interest in tennis based on the Active People analysis. Interestingly. Mansfield Tennis Club believes that one of the key barriers to tennis development in the district is the lack of good quality public tennis courts, which can be used as a basis for early tennis development. There are also clear opportunities to grow the game in schools.

National Governing Body (NGB) priorities and intelligence

British Tennis Strategic Plan 2015 - 2018

8.28 The mission of the national LTA Strategic Plan is to get more people playing tennis and more often, Linking with the three types of facilities that are found in the district, this will be delivered through three strands:

- **Delivering service to clubs**, including providing support for clubs of all sizes by sharing best practice learning, applying focus on clubs seeking to grow the game and their community and helping clubs to achieve management excellence.

- **Participation focus** - building partnerships in the community through the delivery of strong local parks and community tennis venues to deliver inclusive access, investment in people delivering strong experiences in parks and targeted investment in welcoming park facilities for people to socialise and play.

- **Enhancing the tennis offer in education**, including strengthening tennis in schools while introducing a new secondary school programme, providing support to develop more effective links between schools and other places where tennis is played and maximising playing opportunities to help build a future workforce in colleges and universities.

8.29 The LTA Strategic Whole Sport Plan facilities investment programme can support and facilitate the delivery of the above priorities. It is focused in priority areas to address gaps or improve provision where critical to park or community programmes.
8.30 The LTA is currently prioritising delivery of tennis in core cities, however the prioritised work streams remain relevant to Mansfield, as they demonstrate how the LTA believes that participation in tennis can successfully be improved.

8.31 LTA national insight work demonstrates that the greatest opportunity for additional growth is amongst 20 - 39 year olds and 40 - 49 year olds. This means that both park courts and club based facilities will be important in driving this participation. It also demonstrated that infrequent park players need and want a range of things to play more often and identify key barriers specifically:

- the existing profile of tennis players is restricted - players are more likely to be male (particularly aged 14 - 39) and in the ABC1 demographic. Not having someone to play with is identified as a key barrier (27%);
- the poor quality of facilities;
- the need to effectively market and promote opportunities for tennis, including a centralised court booking process; and
- a lack of online presence.

8.32 It also reveals that men may like group based coaching and fun tournaments, while women enjoy turn up and play formats with a facilitator.

8.33 This assessment has demonstrated that many of the above issues exist in Mansfield and can therefore be considered barriers to participation.

8.34 Consultation with the LTA revealed the following:

- potential facility developments at Mansfield Tennis Club, increasing the number of floodlit courts and replacing the existing clubhouse, would help to increase membership numbers and improve customer experience;
- parks provision is suitable for the Mansfield population however improvements to access and booking procedures would help to encourage greater usage; and
- access to educational courts outside school hours should also be an important part of the provision mix going forward across the district

Adequacy of provision

8.35 There are no demand models to measure the adequacy of outdoor tennis courts. In absence of this, adequacy of provision is measured by evaluating all information collated above in comparison with some baseline parameters.

8.36 Sport England’s Active People (2015) survey for the district reveal that across Mansfield District, an estimated 1,477 people currently participate in tennis and a further estimated 1,746 people would like to play. This significant latent demand is spread across different population groups and both genders. Overall, this suggests that there is a potential tennis playing population of 3,223. These projections, indicate that there is a strong opportunity to promote physical activity in the town.

8.37 This estimated level of participation is significantly higher than current levels of club membership (155 club members in total) suggesting that it represents either an overestimate of participation, or that the amount of pay and play / casual access activity is very high across the town.
8.38 LTA research demonstrates that, nationally around 40 – 50% of play takes place at community venues (as opposed to clubs). This LTA evidence would suggest that the approximate playing population in Mansfield is 310 people and would indicate that the estimate provided by the Active People Survey is high.

8.39 This is also supported by feedback from providers that there is limited use of the free to access and pay and play tennis courts.

8.40 While there are no formal standards or measures to assess the amount of facilities required in the district, the LTA have however derived indicative standards to estimate the number of courts required based on court capacity. Alongside these standards, other elements should be taken into account including plans for tennis development, club structure and overall predicted sustainability of provision.

8.41 These broad standards can be applied (drawing firstly upon data collated as part of the Active People Programme) to estimated tennis playing population figures whilst taking into account latent demand, to give an indication of the adequacy of provision as follows:

- based upon an assumed standard of 1 court per 45 participants (not floodlit) and 1 court per 60 players (floodlit), the existing stock of active outdoor courts that are available for community use will serve 1545 players. According to Active People, there are 1477 existing players meaning that the stock of facilities is sufficient and above that required to meet demand; and

- if latent demand (according to Active People Survey 2015) was to be realized, provision would fall below the levels required. Given that the existing facilities serve 1545 players, a total playing population of 3,223 people would theoretically require an additional 37 courts (depending upon the provision of floodlights this may reduce slightly).

8.42 This suggests a significant amount of additional provision would be needed to meet projected future demand for tennis facilities in the district. Based on the lack of demand through schools and observed low level use of courts on the public parks, in reality, there is no evidence to suggest that the level projected by the active people survey is currently required.

8.43 Additionally, Mansfield Tennis Club membership suggests the actual playing population of Mansfield District is more likely to be equivalent to 310 (based upon the assumption that 50% of activity is club based and 50% more casual). Therefore, it is evident that there is significant amount of spare capacity within the existing stock and that unless significant additional participation is generated, more facilities are not required.

8.44 Based on this assessment, further provision is not required to sustain participation growth. Alternatively, the level of spare capacity suggests that there are significant opportunities to increase participation in tennis across the district. This additional usage is needed to ensure that the existing facility infrastructure. This includes the strong network of school based facilities offering opportunities to grow the number of players, as well as scope to increase activity on public courts.

8.45 The capacity of the club base at Mansfield Tennis Club can be measured specifically using the LTA parameters; this is set out in Table 8.4. It reveals that the site has capacity for 450 players, while current membership equates to 155. There is therefore extensive spare capacity. Additional floodlighting (for which there is planning permission) is seen as a positive move towards increasing participation numbers.
Table 8.4: Capacity of Mansfield Tennis Club

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Court Capacity - Floodlit</th>
<th>Court Capacity - Non Floodlit</th>
<th>Total Capacity</th>
<th>Membership</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mansfield Tennis Club</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>Space to accommodate up to 295 new members. Current site has planning permission for the floodlighting of three further courts. This would increase capacity by an additional 45 players.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Providing a Variety of Opportunities to Play Tennis**

8.46 Overall, there is capacity to increase tennis activity across the district without new provision, with scope to increase usage on all types of facilities.

8.47 While there is significant capacity for growth within the club base, to ensure that tennis is accessible to all, it is important that a range of opportunities with different access arrangements are provided, for example casual access and pay and play, as well as formal club membership. This is supported by the Sport England Market Segmentation, which reveals that not all existing or potential players would wish to be in a formal club. Facilities at schools and parks are therefore a key component of the overall tennis infrastructure in the district.

8.48 Indeed, to ensure the sustainability of the existing network in facilities, there is a need to increase participation and maximise usage. To deliver this, the key barriers identified for participation will need to be reduced, including:

- Quality of some facilities
- Poor distribution of provision, with a particular lack of access in Warsop Parish
- The awareness of courts and lack of use of school sites.

8.49 There is felt to be a particular opportunity to improve use of courts at school sites, potentially through the introduction of satellite clubs (linking with the existing club) as well as through increased tennis activity during curricular time.

**Impact of population growth**

8.50 The wider range of participants in tennis means that population growth may have a greater impact than for other sports. Population growth is however relatively limited and there will therefore be little impact on the overall amount of people playing tennis without interventions to increase participation.

8.51 Assuming that 50% of participants play casually (and the remainder are club members), total participation equates to 310 people. This represents 0.3% of the population.

8.52 Assuming that participation remains constant at 0.3% and applying this to future growth forecasts, there would be an increase in demand of around 10 people. This could be accommodated within the existing club and public infrastructure.
8.53 It should be noted that Active People surveys suggest that the potential participation in tennis could be quadrupled and that there is significant latent demand. If this level of growth was to be achieved, participation would be insufficient. As the existing stock of facilities could accommodate just over 1500 players however, participation would need to multiply by 5 before additional courts would be required.

8.54 Summary and Key Issues

8.55 The key issues arising for tennis in Mansfield District are summarised in the summary section within Section 12.
Introduction

9.1 This section assesses the adequacy of outdoor athletics track provision in Mansfield District by presenting an overview of supply (quantity, quality, accessibility and availability) and demand.

9.2 Athletics track provision includes at least one running track but can also include facilities for other athletics sports including high jump, hammer, long jump etc.

9.3 The UK Athletics Facilities Strategy 2014 - 19 advocates the need to look what is happening locally both in terms of track supply but also, in terms of demand and club and athletics participation.

National Governing Body (NGB) priorities

UK Athletics Facilities Strategy 2014-19

9.4 The UK Athletics Facilities Strategy 2014-19 asserts that facilities are essential for attracting, retaining and developing athletes in the future. Having the right facilities in the right places will be crucial for meeting growing demand, increasing participation in physical activity and athletics, improving the health of the nation and supporting a new generation of athletes in clubs and schools through to national and world class level.

9.5 UK Athletics (UKA) and the Home Country Athletics Federations (HCAFs) recognise the challenges faced by facility owners and venue operators. The five year UKA Facility Strategy (2014-2019) uses a track & field facility model designed to support a sustainable UK network of development, training and competition venues. This is designed to meet the HCAF’s needs aligned to UKA’s Athlete/Participant Development Model. In addition to formal track and field provision, the UKA recognises the huge amount of club activity that takes place on roads, paths and trails and the strategy also maps out a plan for future ‘running’ facilities.

9.6 This strategy does not seek to identify priority facilities, clubs or geographical areas. Instead, it provides the direction and guidance that will enable the four Home Country Athletics Federations (England Athletics, Athletics Northern Ireland, Scottish Athletics and Welsh Athletics) to establish their-own priorities and deliver the principles of the UKA Facilities Strategy within their-own national context. It identifies the following key outcomes for athletics:

- Increased participation across all athletics disciplines
- Increased club membership by providing facilities that support a participation pathway from novice through to club member
- Increased talent pool
- Long term improvement in the development of athletes of all ages and abilities
- Securing the long term future of existing facilities
- More attractive and inspiring facilities for existing and potential athletes
- Improving the athletics experience for all participants
• Improved relationships and interactions between stakeholders, particularly clubs and facility operators.

9.7 The UK Athletics supports protecting and enhancing the current track stock over the need for additional formal track provision. It also acknowledges the need to look at needs on a local basis and following local analysis.

9.8 England Athletics are currently developing their own strategy building upon the UK Athletics work.

Supply

9.9 In terms of supply there is one track in Mansfield located in Berry Hill Park, the details of which are set out in the table below.

Table 9.1: Details of Berry Hill Track Mansfield District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Facility Type</th>
<th>Facility Sub Type</th>
<th>Floodlit</th>
<th>Lanes</th>
<th>Facility Status</th>
<th>Access Type</th>
<th>Management Type</th>
<th>Year Built</th>
<th>Year Refurbished</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BERRY HILL TRACK</td>
<td>Athletics Tracks</td>
<td>Synthetic</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>Pay and Play</td>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9.10 The track was originally cinder and was built in 1958. It used to be owned by the National Coal Board and is now owned and managed by Berry Hill Park Trust. The track was upgraded to an all-weather synthetic surface in 1989 and was re-surfaced in 2004.

9.11 The club based at the track was Mansfield Harriers AC however at present they are not using the facility owing to a dispute with the Berry Hill Park Trust. The club are currently using the using the West Notts College indoor track and the track in Ashfield district (Ashfield Comprehensive School in Kirkby-in-Ashfield).

9.12 The track includes an eight lane track and a 10 lane home straight. It has full provision for field and throwing events, with one high jump pit, a pole vault runway and pit, two long jump/triple jump runways and pits, shot-putt and discus circles.

9.13 The location of the Berry Hill track is set out in the map overleaf.
9.14 The table at the end of this section sets out details of all athletics tracks within a 30-minute drive-time (approximate distance between 12-14 miles) of the Berry Hill track. This includes seven additional tracks which are within an accessible distance for district residents. Even though indoor training facilities aren’t counted in this study, it is important to note that athletics clubs like the Mansfield Harriers may use a combination of indoor and outdoor training areas according to seasonal training needs.

**Demand Analysis**

9.15 The Sport England Active People data on participation in track and field athletics is only available at national and regional (East Midlands) levels. For the East Midlands, the data is only available from 2005/06 to 2012/13. This gap in information is due to insufficient responses to the Active People survey to support a reliable participation rate. The table below summarises participation rates.

9.16 Based on Sport England’s benchmark measure of at least once a week participation of at least 30 minutes duration of moderate intensity, the rate of participation at the England wide level in 2005 - 06 was 0.31% of adults participating. In 2014 – 15, the rate was 0.25% of adults participating at least once a week.
9.17 At the East Midlands regional level, adult participation in track and field was 0.30% of adults participating in 2005 – 06 and in 2012 – 13 it was 0.23% of adults participating.

**Table 9.2: Rate of Participation in Athletics - based on adults taking part in athletics at least once a week for 30-minutes at moderate intensity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geographic area</th>
<th>Percentage (%) of adults taking part</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>0.31% of adults (2005-6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.25% of adults (2014-15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Midlands</td>
<td>0.30% of adults (2005-6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.23% of adults (2012-13)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9.18 Overall, there has been a slight decline in participation over the past ten and eight years respectively, as also demonstrated in Chart 9.1 below.

**Chart 9.1: Rate of once a week participation in track and field athletics England wide and East Midlands Region**

- Drilling down further, it is possible to gain an understanding of how many adults are interested in participating in athletics within the district, based on Sport England’s Active People Market Segmentation data (source and date used). It is important to point out that there are some limitations to this assessment which include the following:
  - It includes the number of adults interested in undertaking a sport/ activity or would like to do the sport/ activity. This includes a number of other sports and activities, thus it is not limited to athletics.
  - The frequency of participation is once a month.
  - It measures participation in all types of athletics, including road running and track and field. It is important to note that generally, road running and Park Runs participation is much higher than formal athletics (i.e. track and field) in the district. In addition to Park Run course at Manor Park, running courses (1, 2, and 3 mile) have been marked out. District and National Cross Country Running events also take place on Berry Hill Park. Based on the facilities (i.e. parking, etc.) and their size, Manor Park and Berry Hill provide important resources for running events.

9.19 The map below shows the percentage of the Mansfield adult population who do participate in athletics, as defined above, during 2012 – 13 and how this varies spatially.
In the turquoise areas residents’ participation is between 5% - 10%. In the dark blue areas, the rate is between 2% - 5% of residents doing athletics at least once a month. These two areas are approximately equal with 50% of the land area of the authority in each.

9.20 Overall this shows that participation is much higher when considering once-a-month activity in all types of athletics than for just once-a-week activity in only track and field athletics.

**Map 9.2: Participation in athletics for Mansfield District 2012-13**

9.21 The latent demand for athletics is measured by those adults who aren’t currently active in athletics would like to participate. This information is provided by sport England’s Market Segmentation web tool (2012-13). The participation results, for the district, are set out in the map below. It shows that, for all but one output area, the rate of participation for those who would like to participate in athletics is between 2% - 5% of all adults. In the one output area shaded purple the rate of participation is 1% - 2% of adults.

**Map 9.3: Participation for adults who would like to take part in athletics in Mansfield District (2012-13)**

9.22 Consultation with Matt Foad from England Athletics, the National Governing Body overseeing athletics, provided feedback on athletics in the district, is summarised below:
• Berry Hill athletics is strategically important based on its location in the county. The demand for its use and its historic role in supporting a strong club.

• With all that has gone on with the facility it has impacted on the club negatively and they have declining numbers. Without a club base the Mansfield Harriers and Athletic Club is suffering and it is therefore important that an athletics facility is available in Mansfield.

• Sport England is looking to their solicitors to try to resolve the situation at Berry Hill. It would make sense that this facility be retained, developed and improved for athletics long term.

Supply and Demand Analysis

9.23 In terms of comparative provision, the table below shows that Mansfield District has the highest provision of athletic tracks when compared with the neighbouring authorities, or, those authorities within a 30-minute drive time of the Berry Hill track.

Table 9.2: All weather athletic tracks and lanes per 1,000 population Mansfield District and the neighbouring authorities or authorities within a 30-minute drive (approximate distance) of the Berry Hill track

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Population 2015</th>
<th>Number of Outdoor Synthetic Tracks</th>
<th>Number of Lanes</th>
<th>Lanes per 1,000 population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mansfield District</td>
<td>105,526</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashfield</td>
<td>122,343</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bassetlaw (1)</td>
<td>114,302</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolsover</td>
<td>77,267</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gedling</td>
<td>115,905</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newark &amp; Sherwood (2)</td>
<td>117,687</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nottingham</td>
<td>313,705</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.022</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: (1) The Bassetlaw track is a permanent grass track. (2) The Newark and Sherwood track is a cinder surface.

Accessibility

9.24 In terms of accessibility, Map 9.2 illustrates the location and travel time to the tracks nearest to the Berry Hill track. The nearest track is at Ashfield Comprehensive School, which is 15 minutes away and is the current home of Sutton and Ashfield Harriers. Tupton Hall School in New Tupton situated south of Chesterfield is straddling 30 minutes drive time catchment from the Berry Hill track. This track opened in 2003 and it is a Private Finance Initiative (PFI) school. Community access to the track is managed by the PFI contractor for all the facilities on the school site.

9.25 Access to both tracks is based on negotiated community use access arrangements at that site. It is not a local authority owned or managed facility.

9.26 The Mansfield club currently use the Ashfield School athletics track on Sutton Road in Kirkby in Ashfield which is about a 15-20 minute drive from Berry Hill.
9.27 After that, the three nearest located tracks are south of the Berry Hill (site 3 on the map). These three sites straddle the 20 – 25 drive time catchment circles of the Berry Hill track location. The track in Gedling Borough at Carlton le Willows school is however a cinder track. The second track is the Harvey Hadden track in Nottingham City and the third is at Rutland Sports Park in Erewash Borough. Both are synthetic surface tracks of 8 and 6 lanes respectively and both are operated by the local authority. The Harvey Hadden track is part of a very extensive indoor and outdoor sports complex, serving Nottingham City and a wider sub regional area. The athletics track has a grandstand for 700 people.

9.28 In short, there is a limited number of athletic tracks within the catchment area of Berry Hill. In addition access to them maybe constrained due to the location on school sites. At Harvey Hadden, in Nottingham, the track serves large population catchment within Nottingham and its wider area. Nottingham also has the lowest overall provision of tracks based on number of lanes per 1,000 population. Thus, demand for these sites is likely to be high with competition between users/clubs for access.

9.29 The Rutland Sports Park track in Erewash is a local community track owned and operated by the local authority but according to the data it is between a – 40-45 minute drive time of the Berry Hill track location.

*Map 9.2: Location of athletic tracks within approximate drive times of Berry Hill track Mansfield*
The Berry Hill track was originally cinder and built in 1938. It used to be owned by the National Coal Board and is now owned and managed by Berry Hill Park Trust.

The track was upgraded to an all-weather synthetic surface in 1989 and was re-surfaced in 2004. So 12 years since the last re-surfacing of the track.

Investment is now desperately needed particularly in terms of the ancillary facilities.

Ashfield School athletics track on Sutton Road in Kirkby in Ashfield is the nearest track to Berry Hill and is about a 15-20 minute drive from Berry Hill and is the current Mansfield AC base was opened in 2005 and is relatively new.

The track at Tupton Hall School is a PFI school and managed by the PFI contractor for the overall facilities on the school site.

In effect, access to the track would have to be negotiated as part of the community use access arrangements at that site. It is not a local authority managed facility.

After Ashfield School, the three nearest tracks to Berry Hill are located south of the Berry Hill site. These three sites straddle the 30 – 25 drive time location of the Berry Hill site.

There are 4 other synthetic tracks within a 30 minute drive time of the Berry Hill location. Three of these tracks were opened in the 2000 decade at: Tupton Hall School (2003); Rutland Sports Park (2006 Erewash Borough); and Nuffield Health and Fitness Centre at Mount St Mary’s College (2007 also in NE Derbyshire but to the north of the authority above Chesterfield).

The St Mary’s College track is the only one of the three 2000 decade tracks which has been resurfaced, in 2015.

The other synthetic track is at Harvey Hadden opened in 1965 and re-surfaced in 2004.

So overall a recent provision of synthetic tracks within 30 minutes’

In addition to the Berry Hill athletics track there is a total of seven other tracks within a 30 minute drive time of the Berry Hill track location. However, two of these tracks at Carlton – ie – Willows Academy (Gedling) and Bramcote College (Brotkow) are cinder tracks.

Ashfield School athletics track on Sutton Road in Kirkby in Ashfield which is about a 15-20 minute drive from Berry Hill and is the current Mansfield AC base was opened in 2005 and is relatively new.

The track at Tupton Hall School is a PFI school and managed by the PFI contractor for the overall facilities on the school site.

In effect, access to the track would have to be negotiated as part of the community use access arrangements at that site. It is not a local authority managed facility.

After Ashfield School, the three nearest tracks to Berry Hill are located south of the Berry Hill site. These three sites straddle the 30 – 25 drive time location of the Berry Hill site.

There are 4 other synthetic tracks within a 30 minute drive time of the Berry Hill location. Three of these tracks were opened in the 2000 decade at: Tupton Hall School (2003); Rutland Sports Park (2006 Erewash Borough); and Nuffield Health and Fitness Centre at Mount St Mary’s College (2007 also in NE Derbyshire but to the north of the authority above Chesterfield).

The St Mary’s College track is the only one of the three 2000 decade tracks which has been resurfaced, in 2015.

The other synthetic track is at Harvey Hadden opened in 1965 and re-surfaced in 2004.

So overall a recent provision of synthetic tracks within 30 minutes’

In addition to the Berry Hill athletics track there is a total of seven other tracks within a 30 minute drive time of the Berry Hill track location. However, two of these tracks at Carlton – ie – Willows Academy (Gedling) and Bramcote College (Brotkow) are cinder tracks.

Ashfield School athletics track on Sutton Road in Kirkby in Ashfield which is about a 15-20 minute drive from Berry Hill and is the current Mansfield AC base was opened in 2005 and is relatively new.

The track at Tupton Hall School is a PFI school and managed by the PFI contractor for the overall facilities on the school site.

In effect, access to the track would have to be negotiated as part of the community use access arrangements at that site. It is not a local authority managed facility.

After Ashfield School, the three nearest tracks to Berry Hill are located south of the Berry Hill site. These three sites straddle the 30 – 25 drive time location of the Berry Hill site.

There are 4 other synthetic tracks within a 30 minute drive time of the Berry Hill location. Three of these tracks were opened in the 2000 decade at: Tupton Hall School (2003); Rutland Sports Park (2006 Erewash Borough); and Nuffield Health and Fitness Centre at Mount St Mary’s College (2007 also in NE Derbyshire but to the north of the authority above Chesterfield).

The St Mary’s College track is the only one of the three 2000 decade tracks which has been resurfaced, in 2015.

The other synthetic track is at Harvey Hadden opened in 1965 and re-surfaced in 2004.

So overall a recent provision of synthetic tracks within 30 minutes’

In addition to the Berry Hill athletics track there is a total of seven other tracks within a 30 minute drive time of the Berry Hill track location. However, two of these tracks at Carlton – ie – Willows Academy (Gedling) and Bramcote College (Brotkow) are cinder tracks.

Ashfield School athletics track on Sutton Road in Kirkby in Ashfield which is about a 15-20 minute drive from Berry Hill and is the current Mansfield AC base was opened in 2005 and is relatively new.

The track at Tupton Hall School is a PFI school and managed by the PFI contractor for the overall facilities on the school site.

In effect, access to the track would have to be negotiated as part of the community use access arrangements at that site. It is not a local authority managed facility.

After Ashfield School, the three nearest tracks to Berry Hill are located south of the Berry Hill site. These three sites straddle the 30 – 25 drive time location of the Berry Hill site.

There are 4 other synthetic tracks within a 30 minute drive time of the Berry Hill location. Three of these tracks were opened in the 2000 decade at: Tupton Hall School (2003); Rutland Sports Park (2006 Erewash Borough); and Nuffield Health and Fitness Centre at Mount St Mary’s College (2007 also in NE Derbyshire but to the north of the authority above Chesterfield).

The St Mary’s College track is the only one of the three 2000 decade tracks which has been resurfaced, in 2015.

The other synthetic track is at Harvey Hadden opened in 1965 and re-surfaced in 2004.

So overall a recent provision of synthetic tracks within 30 minutes’

In addition to the Berry Hill athletics track there is a total of seven other tracks within a 30 minute drive time of the Berry Hill track location. However, two of these tracks at Carlton – ie – Willows Academy (Gedling) and Bramcote College (Brotkow) are cinder tracks.

Ashfield School athletics track on Sutton Road in Kirkby in Ashfield which is about a 15-20 minute drive from Berry Hill and is the current Mansfield AC base was opened in 2005 and is relatively new.

The track at Tupton Hall School is a PFI school and managed by the PFI contractor for the overall facilities on the school site.

In effect, access to the track would have to be negotiated as part of the community use access arrangements at that site. It is not a local authority managed facility.

After Ashfield School, the three nearest tracks to Berry Hill are located south of the Berry Hill site. These three sites straddle the 30 – 25 drive time location of the Berry Hill site.

There are 4 other synthetic tracks within a 30 minute drive time of the Berry Hill location. Three of these tracks were opened in the 2000 decade at: Tupton Hall School (2003); Rutland Sports Park (2006 Erewash Borough); and Nuffield Health and Fitness Centre at Mount St Mary’s College (2007 also in NE Derbyshire but to the north of the authority above Chesterfield).

The St Mary’s College track is the only one of the three 2000 decade tracks which has been resurfaced, in 2015.

The other synthetic track is at Harvey Hadden opened in 1965 and re-surfaced in 2004.

So overall a recent provision of synthetic tracks within 30 minutes’
drive time of the Berry Hill track. There are three tracks opened since 2005 and with an average age of 10 years but only one has been re-surfaced.

have priority access for its residents/clubs. Also as reported its location is according to the data, between 20 – 25 minutes’ drive time from Berry Hill site and further from the north of Mansfield District.

Summary

9.30 The Berry Hill athletics track in the district is of a scale to provide for all disciplines; track, field and throwing events. The track has a synthetic surface, laid in 1989 and resurfaced in 2004 and its overall quality is poor. Although not currently in use as the club have moved to Ashfield, it is a venue which could provide a district wide or greater function in relation to athletics. The NGB are keen to support and see it continue however significant investment will be required for this to happen.

9.31 A 30 minute drive time catchment area of the Berry Hill location identifies seven other tracks, however two of these are cinder tracks. The nearest running track to Berry Hill is at Ashfield Comprehensive on Sutton Road in Kirkby in Ashfield which is about a 15-20 minute drive from Berry Hill and is where Mansfield AC are currently based having moved from Berry Hill.

9.32 After that the nearest tracks are all south of the Berry Hill location. Based on the data they are a 30 – 35 minute drive time of the Berry Hill site and further from the north and centre of Mansfield District. These tracks are at Harvey Hadden in Nottingham City (1965 and resurfaced in 2004) and Rutland Sports Park in Erewash Borough (opened 2006). Tupton Hall track opened in 2003 and according to the data has not been re-surfaced.

9.33 The track at Berry Hill is therefore important strategically and should be protected in policy terms. The quality of the track is however poor and the facility needs investment. The NGB are keen to protect it and as a resource for the athletics cub it is a critical facility if the sport is to flourish.

9.34 The view of the club to move back to Berry Hill will be critical as without a home club the track will struggle. Equally as important is the view of the Trust to accommodate them, at present this is unclear. The Council’s view on supporting and investing in athletics will also be crucial as whilst the track can be protected in the local plan this will not address the quality issues nor the availability for longer-term community use as it is owned and managed by the trustee group.

9.35 If investment and access is not forthcoming then it could be argued that investment in athletics may be better served via revenue support to Parkruns etc.
**Table 9.3: All weather athletic tracks within 30 minutes’ drive time of Berry Hill Park Mansfield**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Facility Type</th>
<th>Facility Sub Type</th>
<th>Floodlit</th>
<th>Lane(s)</th>
<th>Changing Rooms</th>
<th>Facility Status</th>
<th>Access Type</th>
<th>Ownership Type</th>
<th>Management Type</th>
<th>Year Built</th>
<th>Year Refurbished</th>
<th>Broad location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ASHFIELD COMPREHENSIVE SCHOOL &amp; LEISURE CENTRE</td>
<td>Athletic Tracks</td>
<td>Synthetic</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>Sports Club / Community Association</td>
<td>Academies</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Ashfield</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARLTON-LE-WILLOWS ACADEMY</td>
<td>Athletic Tracks</td>
<td>Cinder</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>Private Use</td>
<td>Academies</td>
<td>School/College/University (in house)</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Gedling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HARVEY HADDEN SPORTS COMPLEX</td>
<td>Athletic Tracks</td>
<td>Synthetic</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>Pay and Play</td>
<td>Local Authority</td>
<td>Local Authority (in house)</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Nottingham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TUPTON HALL SCHOOL</td>
<td>Athletic Tracks</td>
<td>Synthetic</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>Sports Club / Community Association</td>
<td>Community school</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>North East Derbyshire</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRAMCOTE COLLEGE</td>
<td>Athletic Tracks</td>
<td>Cinder</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>Pay and Play</td>
<td>Academies</td>
<td>School/College/University (in house)</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Broxtowe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUFFIELD HEALTH FITNESS CENTRE AT MOUNT ST MARY’S COLLEGE</td>
<td>Athletic Tracks</td>
<td>Synthetic</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>Pay and Play</td>
<td>Other Independent School</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>North East Derbyshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUTLAND SPORTS PARK</td>
<td>Athletic Tracks</td>
<td>Synthetic</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>Pay and Play</td>
<td>Local Authority</td>
<td>Local Authority (in house)</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Erewash</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Introduction

10.1 This section assesses the adequacy of pitches for football in Mansfield District. It includes:

- a brief overview of the supply and demand for football;
- an understanding of activity at individual sites in the district;
- a picture of the adequacy of current provision; and
- the future picture of provision for football.

Football in Mansfield District – An Overview

Pitch Supply

10.2 There are 67 individual formal grass football pitches currently available for community use across Mansfield District. Where additional markings have been added over the top of existing pitches, pitches are only counted once (as the largest size pitch).

10.3 Table 10.1 summarises the breakdown of grass pitch sizes and also outlines the level of community access that is available. It should be noted that in many instances, adult and junior football pitches (11v11) are interchangeable, with the maximum and minimum size guidelines overlapping. Sites have been classified using their pitch size as a guide and taking into account the current users of each pitch.

Table 10.1: Football Grass Pitches across Mansfield District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pitch Type</th>
<th>Recommended Pitch Dimensions (including run off)</th>
<th>Pitches Available to the Community (Used or not used)</th>
<th>% of Total Pitch provision</th>
<th>Pitches Secured for Community Use (used or not used)</th>
<th>Percentage of Pitch Type Secured for Community Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adult Football 11v11 (aged 16+)</td>
<td>106 x 70 m</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior Football 11v11 (age U13 - U16)</td>
<td>88/97 x 56/61 m</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 v 9 (age U11 and U12)</td>
<td>79 x 52 m</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 v 7 (age U9 and U10)</td>
<td>61 x 43 m</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 v 5 (age U7 and U8)</td>
<td>43 x 33 m</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>67</strong></td>
<td><strong>39</strong></td>
<td><strong>58%</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10.4 Of the pitches that are currently available for community use:

- There is a range of pitches of different sizes across the district, with 58% of pitches being 11v11 (adult or junior) and the remainder catering for younger age groups.
• Just 58% of grass pitches offer secured access for community use. This is also subject to change due to the conversion of state schools within the district to academy status which will have greater say of their own facilities. Garibaldi College, Manor Sports Academy, Samworth Church Academy, Brunts School, Queen Elizabeth Academy and All Saints Academy all currently offer community access to grass football pitches but may choose to change this in the future.

10.5 There is a small amount of overmarking of pitches taking place in Mansfield District, with three pitches over-marked (e.g. a 9v9 pitch marked out over 11v11 pitches) at the time of completion of the audit. There is also evidence of the use of the run off areas of some larger pitches for 5v5 and 7v7 play and training.

10.6 Pitches that don’t currently offer community use include other school sites and private club sites. The majority of these are located at primary schools. Most of these sites are relatively limited in quality and almost all are not regularly marked out as formal pitches; instead cones and other methods are used to mark the pitches.

10.7 Meden School and Technology College, at Meden Sports Centre, is the only site with playing fields of significant size (size dimensions) that does not currently allow community access to their grass pitches. This suggests that the existing football provision at this facility is relatively well used. Indoor facilities (as well as a small sand based artificial grass pitch or AGP) are open for community use at Meden School on a dual use agreement, suggesting that there may be opportunities to arrange access to these facilities if required.

10.8 The totals in Table 10.1 and 10.2 exclude The One Call Stadium at Field Mill. This is the home to Mansfield Town Football Club (FC), a professional club which does not constitute as a community venue. The site is also home to other teams such as the Ladies First team and hosts occasional school activities and finals.

Artificial Grass Pitches (AGP)

10.9 The Football Association (FA) now approves certain types of AGPs for use in competitive fixtures which are subject to regular testing. These are recognised in the FA’s National Facilities Strategy as key facilities which play an important role in the overall football provision.

10.10 Within Mansfield District, there is one full sized pitch at The Brunts Academy is included on the FA register as well as a smaller (60m x 40m) pitch. There are formal community use agreements for both of these pitches.

10.11 In addition, there are also smaller pitches at the Mansfield Rugby Club, Debdale Park, Mansfield Town FC (2 pitches) and Garibaldi College. Planning permission has also been granted to develop a small sided pitch at West Notts College. This is now built but is not open for community use. While these cannot be used for matches, they do supplement the stock of full sized pitches as they can be used for training and more informal (leisure leagues) football fixtures.

10.12 There are also small sized sand based pitches (at Meden Sports Centre and All Saints Catholic Academy) as well as a full sized sand based pitch at Manor Sports and Recreation Centre. These pitches are not approved surfaces for football, but are used for training as well as some recreational play.
10.13 While not in Mansfield District, both Joseph Whitaker School and Shirebrook College have full size pitches and are located in close proximity to the borders with Mansfield District. Sutton School in Ashfield District also has a full-size pitch on the FA register.

Closed / Potential Sites

10.14 There are several sites that have formerly contained playing fields that no longer do so. These sites offer the potential to increase the pitch stock and to address any existing or projected future deficiencies and therefore need to be taken into account when evaluating the adequacy of provision.

10.15 Table 10.2 outlines the known former sports pitches.

Table 10.2 - Former Sports Pitches

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Woburn Lane</td>
<td>This site is currently subject of a planning application for a new training ground for Mansfield Town FC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church Warsop Sports and Social Club</td>
<td>Includes a derelict social club as well as a grass pitch. Pitch appears to have previously been of relatively high standard, flat and with perimeter fence. There is also a derelict bowling green on this site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former Ravensdale School</td>
<td>The school was rebuilt elsewhere (now Samworth Church Academy) and the playing fields remain derelict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former Sherwood School</td>
<td>This site is also now derelict having been replaced by the Samworth Academy pitch provision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosebrook Primary School</td>
<td>Owned by the County Council, the majority of the land is no longer used by the school (which is to be rebuilt). Consideration has been given to providing new pitches nearby as part of the Abbott Road Playing Fields if this playing field land is lost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Road Recreation Ground</td>
<td>Formerly a cricket ground and football training area, but no longer providing any formal pitches on site. The non turf wicket for cricket is dangerous and there are 2 sets of old goal posts, both of which are loose and also dangerous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land adjacent to Newgate Lane Primary School</td>
<td>Land was previously part of school playing field, but is no longer used as such</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandy Lane Playing Fields</td>
<td>Former playing field site but with no existing pitches this season</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Littleworth former school</td>
<td>Site is no longer maintained as a school playing field and remains Unused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>playing field</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westfield Lane</td>
<td>Site was historically playing fields</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chesterfield Road AGP -</td>
<td>This site contains a small sand based AGP which is currently not available for public access due to the poor condition of the facility.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10.16 The analysis of the future need for these sites is set out in the Strategy and Action Plan based on the overall assessment analysis.

10.17 The following sites have fewer pitches than they have previously had or are not available for use this season:

- The Carrs - there is a changing pavilion on site but the pitches are not marked out; and
- River Maun Recreation Centre.

10.18 In addition to the above sites, several existing sites could potentially accommodate more pitches. These are set out in Table 10.3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Pitches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mansfield urban area</td>
<td>Queensway Park, Racecourse Park (small pitch only), Bull Farm, Yeoman Hill (small pitch only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warsop Parish</td>
<td>The Carrs Recreation Ground (Market Warsop) with significant potential of 8 pitches, Carr Lane Park</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10.19 Pitches that are not operating as formal playing pitches in November 2015 were excluded from all calculations in this assessment. Any lost (i.e. former) playing fields also do not impact upon the figures outlined in this report. Rather, the future of these pitches and their potential role in meeting current or projected demand are considered within the Playing Pitch Strategy document.

**Distribution of Playing Fields**

10.20 Table 10.2 provides a more detailed breakdown of the distribution of football pitches that are available for community use. It indicates that the majority of pitches are located within the greater Mansfield urban area, where the greatest proportion of the population lives.

10.21 It also clearly demonstrates that all unsecured pitches (school sites) are located in the Mansfield area and that there is a reasonably high dependence on unsecured sites in this part of the district.

**Table 10.2: Distribution of Pitches across Mansfield District**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Adult Football (11v11)</th>
<th>Youth Football (11v11)</th>
<th>9v 9</th>
<th>7v 7</th>
<th>5v 5</th>
<th>Sub-total (grass pitches)</th>
<th>AGP (on FA register)</th>
<th>% of Total Grass Pitch Stock</th>
<th>% of Pitches that are Unsecured</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mansfield sub area</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warsop Parish sub area</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mansfield District</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>10.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10.22 Map 10.1 illustrates the scale and distribution of football pitches in and around the district, including the level of access available for each site. For pitches that are available to the community, the degree of certainty that this availability will continue has been recorded. Sites are therefore classified as follows:

- **Secured community use** - defined as sites where access is likely to continue. This may include sites with:
  - A formal community use agreement;
    - A leasing or management agreement requiring pitches to be available to the community/a community club;
    - A formal policy for community use adopted by the owner and or educational establishment;
    - Written confirmation from the owner and or educational establishment.

- **Unsecured access** - sites are currently available but may not continue to be. Many schools fall into this category, as schools with academy status have potential to change their access arrangements at any given time (unless there are specific agreements written into funding bids for example)

- **Not applicable** - site - is not available for community use.
Map 10.1: Distribution and Accessibility of Football Pitches

Location of football pitches

Sources: Ordnance Survey (Boundary Line)
Ownership and Management

10.23 Figure 10.1 illustrates that the majority of sites with pitches in the district are managed or owned by Mansfield District Council and schools. The Council therefore have a degree of control over the range, type and quality of facilities provided.

10.24 In relation to school playing fields, the secondary school sector is a key provider of pitches for community use, although are considered unsecured, as they are provided by academies. There are several recent examples of community use policies changing at schools managed as academies. There are also several former colliery welfare social clubs managed by trusts or other community organisations and provide important bases for clubs.

10.25 The high proportion of facilities owned and managed by public bodies, provides an excellent resource for supporting and further enabling football participation. This also signifies an overall reliance on the public sector to provide and maintain this resource. The FA National Strategy recognises the challenges that this reliance brings and seeks to increase the number of asset owning clubs, as well as to work closely with partners to improve opportunities for football.

Figure 10.1: Management of Playing Pitches (pitches available for community use only)

Views on the Pitch Stock across Mansfield District

10.26 Figure 10.2 indicates that there are mixed views in relation to the overall quality of the pitch stock in Mansfield. However, overall, more clubs are satisfied with the pitch stock than are dissatisfied but there are still recognised issues that need to be addressed.
10.27 The key reasons given by those responding clubs that were dissatisfied are:

- pitch quality, including maintenance issues and dog fouling;
- the cost of facility hire; and
- a lack of access to appropriate facilities, particularly for younger age groups.

10.28 Figure 10.3 outlines the barriers to football development identified by clubs. It reflects the reasons for dissatisfaction including the following key issues: a lack of pitches for younger age groups, the cost of hiring facilities and a lack of external funding. A shortage of coaches and volunteers was also thought to negatively impact the growth of the game.
Pitch Quality and Changing Accommodation

10.29 All local leagues running within Mansfield District require (within their rules) clubs to keep their grounds in playable condition (and deemed suitable by the league Management Committee). Pitch quality is therefore an essential component of an effective pitch stock.

10.30 The presence and quality of changing facilities is an important factor when determining the suitability of pitches. A lack of facilities can impact on the desirability of grounds for clubs, particularly where there is a lack of toilets and changing facilities.

10.31 There are specific rules relating to pitch quality, changing accommodation and social facilities for clubs participating in leagues at levels on the football pyramid, as discussed later in this document (paragraph or heading?). The Nerf Junior Premier League requires changing accommodation and access to social facilities for teams and coaching staff following the match.

10.32 Pitch quality and changing accommodation are therefore as important as the number of pitches.

Quality of Pitches in Mansfield District

10.33 The quality of pitches was assessed through a combination of site visits, questionnaires and interviews with providers and users (September - December 2015). Site visits revealed that the vast majority of pitches are categorised as standard. There are few pitches of very high quality with site assessment scores ranging from 44% (poor) to 90% (good). Appendix D contains the site assessment matrices used.

10.34 Figure 10.2 summarises the site visit scores achieved.

Figure 10.2 - Pitch Quality Ratings
10.35 It should be noted however that site visits indicate that pitches are positioned towards the lower end of the standard range, with the average score achieved being 62%. 53% of all pitches visited achieved scores of below 60%. As these visits were undertaken comparatively early in the season (October / November), and following a period of reasonably good weather, there is potential that sites will deteriorate further during the winter months. Many sites are therefore on the verge of becoming poor.

10.36 There are no clear patterns regarding the quality of pitches relating in relation to the location or distribution in the district. Most quality issues identified were prevalent on most sites. In general, the best quality pitches were those owned and managed by community organisations or trusts and those supporting teams playing at a high standard. A good example of this is Forest Town Welfare which supports a pyramid club. There were also some examples of sites with mixed quality pitches (e.g. one good quality and the remainder poor). The Welbeck Colliery Welfare is a particular example of this.

10.37 Pitches managed and maintained by Mansfield District Council were generally of an overall lower standard. Based on feedback provided by Council maintenance officers, the maintenance currently undertaken by the Council should reflect a higher standard than recorded during the site inspections undertaken for the Playing Pitch Strategy.

10.38 This indicates that there is either an underlying issue (e.g. drainage and de-compaction) and a further requirement for capital investment to address these issues or that maintenance procedures need to be tailored more specifically to each site as there was little evidence of appropriate management work being undertaken.

10.39 Assessments undertaken by the Institute of Groundsmanship (IOG) pitch assessor (2014/2015) who performed technical assessments on a sample of pitches across the district also reflected many of the issues revealed by the non-technical assessments. These include:

- the maintenance regimes afforded to most pitches in the district are basic programmes of cutting grass and line marking and there is little evidence of out of season works;
- almost all pitches across the district demonstrate signs of compaction of the surface and significant aeration works are required;
- there is major weed infestation in the surfaces of several sites, with remedial works needed. The condition of grass is also poor, with most pitches being predominantly meadow grass rather than preferred grass species. There are also some examples of worm casts;
- in some instances, the level of fertiliser used is poor, resulting in either yellow pitches and / or poor grass cover;
- many pitches are uneven and require levelling (as well as removal of weeds);
- many sites are subjected to informal use due to their location in public parks, which places further pressures on the pitches. A small number suffer from dog fouling issues;
- drainage is a concern on some sites, with standing water evident; and
• in contrast, changing facilities is relatively good, with almost all pitches accompanied by ancillary facilities, even if the pitch quality was limited. In addition, many of the clubs on private / welfare sites also offer social facilities.

10.40 Further research undertaken by the IOG revealed that improvements in the machinery available and the techniques used would help to improve the condition of the pitches.

10.41 These maintenance issues impact both the pitch condition in the short term, but also the long term sustainability of these facilities.

Views on Pitch Quality

10.42 Figures 10.4 and 10.5 evaluate the user perception of pitch quality (all pitches). Figure 10.4 illustrates that the quality of provision is believed to be relatively static, although some clubs do highlight an improvement over the last three years.

Figure 10.4: Trends in Pitch Quality

10.43 The majority of improvement is perceived by clubs to have arisen due to investment and an effort to improve pitch maintenance.

10.44 Figure 10.5 illustrates the club perceptions relating to quality of pitches and provides an interesting insight. It indicates that despite the site visit and wider stakeholder consultation findings which indicate that pitch provision is overall poor; clubs are relatively satisfied with provision (an average score of 3 equate to a good rating, 2 is standard and 1 is poor).

10.45 Breaking this down further, it is evident that single team clubs, who predominantly use public pitches (which by and large are of lower quality) are more satisfied than larger / private clubs. The majority of private clubs, in contrast to clubs using private pitches, tend to identify specific areas for improvement with their existing facilities. It is likely that this relates to higher expectations, with these clubs seeking to play at a higher standard. This is in contrast to clubs playing on lower quality pitches who play primarily for recreational purposes where pitch quality is less important. Several large clubs however commented on the poor quality of facilities when they are playing away ie. at other sites within the district that are of lower quality than their own home ground.
10.46 Figure 10.5 shows that clubs believe that dog fouling is the key issue on pitches across the district. There are also some concerns about the drainage and evenness of pitches.

**Figure 10.5: Club Perceptions of Quality**

![Perceived Quality of Pitches (Clubs)](image)

10.47 Specific comments made also generally revolve around the same issues, with some sites suffering from mole hills and issues with drainage. Many larger clubs also indicate that they are facing challenges maintaining the pitches to the level that is required by the FA (or other) due to the costs involved.

10.48 Despite clubs suggesting that they are relatively satisfied with facilities, local league secretaries highlight greater concerns about the quality of pitch provision, in particular noting the impact that this has on participation. This is particularly true of those using senior pitches and those on Council managed sites.

10.49 Figure 10.5 indicates that like pitch quality, satisfaction with changing accommodation is high. There are some site specific issues raised however. Quality issues and views specific to each site are summarised in Table 10.6.

**Quality of AGPs**

10.50 Artificial grass pitches (AGP) and their associated facilities (e.g. changing rooms) were assessed in (date) based on (site surveys, feedback forms, interviews, etc.) Table 10.3 summarises the AGPs that are suitable for football (3g pitches only) and highlights the quality issues identified, as well as any rating of the site.
Table 10.3: Quality of AGPs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>FA Register</th>
<th>Quality Issues identified</th>
<th>Overall Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BRUNTS ACADEMY</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>None, although changing facilities are not always accessible with pitch hire.</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GARIBALDI COLLEGE</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Pitch in good condition although likely to require replacement surface within next five years</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEBDALE PARK SPORTS AND RECREATIONAL CLUB</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Limited quality with concerns about the pitch surface as well as the border surrounds, some of which are dangerous</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANSFIELD RUGBY UNION FOOTBALL CLUB</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Pitch in good condition and well maintained</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANSFIELD TOWN</td>
<td>2 Small pitches</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>New pitches in good condition but FA comment these are currently poorly maintained.</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10.51 In addition, the pitch at Manor Sport and Recreation Centre is also used for football although it is sand based. This pitch is rated as standard, having recently undergone a rejuvenation programme. The FA does not promote the use of sand based surfaces for football and this site has therefore been excluded from analysis.

Demand

Current Participation – Match Play

10.52 Table 10.4 summarises the make-up of teams currently based in Mansfield District. It demonstrates that 33% of teams are senior teams, with the remainder being youth and junior teams. The existing pitch stock broadly correlates with the split of teams. In line with the Playing Pitch Strategy (PPS) methodology, Table 10.4 excludes professional teams playing at Mansfield Town FC (4). The strongest performing team plays at League 2 level, while the other teams play at Reserve and Age Group Level.

10.53 In addition to these teams included in Table 10.4, there are numerous teams that originate from neighbouring local authorities, but are currently playing within Mansfield due to participation in the Kickstart league. This league is a central venue league using pitches at the Brunts Academy (U9 on , U10 on grass), Queen Elizabeth Academy (U8) and Manor Park Sports Complex (U12, U13 and U15). The U7 competition is held in Ashfield at Kingsway Park. The presence of this league therefore places extra demand on the pitch stock in the district and the needs of these teams are taken into account within this assessment. Of the 98 teams that currently play in the league (81 play at venues in Mansfield), 33 originate from Mansfield District (and are included in Table 10.4).
10.54 While there are strong participation rates for males, female football is less well established, representing only 5% of teams. This is however broadly in line with national averages.

10.55 Participation in disability football in Mansfield District is strong, with 6 teams in total participating in the Notts Positive Goals Football League (for mental health issues) and the Want to Play Football League (linked to Woodhouse Colts FC) for Pan Disability.

10.56 There are also over 50 teams playing in the Junior Elite Futsal League at West Notts College. While this does not impact upon demand for outdoor pitches (as it is played indoors), it demonstrates the variety of football that is on offer in the district. Competitions currently range from U10 to U16. Additionally, Futsal provides strong foundations for football skills development and the growing interest in this form of the game may have a knock on impact on participation in outdoor football in Mansfield in years to come. These teams are excluded from Table 10.4 as they do not impact on grass pitches.

Table 10.4: Football Teams in Mansfield District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sport and Age Groups</th>
<th>Number of teams in Mansfield District</th>
<th>% of Teams in Mansfield District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Football Adult Men (16-45yrs)</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football Adult Women (16-45yrs)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football Youth Boys (12-15yrs)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football Youth Girls (12-15yrs)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football 9v9 Boys (10 – 11 years)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football 9v9 Girls (10 – 11 years)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7v7 (8 – 9 years)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5v5 (6 – 7 years)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>158</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10.57 Table 10.5 provides a more detailed breakdown of the number of teams by sub area.

Table 10.5: Teams by Sub Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sport and Age Groups</th>
<th>Mansfield</th>
<th>Warsop Parish</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Football Adult (16-45yrs)</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football Adult Female (16 - 45 yrs)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football Youth (12-15yrs)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Sport and Age Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sport and Age Groups</th>
<th>Mansfield</th>
<th>Warsop Parish</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Football Female Youth (12-15yrs)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football 9v9 (10 – 11 years)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football 9v9 (10 – 11 years girls)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7v7 (8 – 9 years)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5v5 (6 – 7 years)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent totals by sub-area</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10.58 Table 10.5 above indicates that 82% of teams are located within the greater Mansfield urban area (Mansfield sub-area). This is where almost 90% of pitch provision is located; therefore supply broadly correlates with demand.

### Displaced Demand

10.59 Given the close proximity of neighbouring authorities, there is a degree of movement of football clubs between teams in neighbouring districts. Much of this can be attributed to the central venues used by the Kickstart league, which bring teams in from neighbouring authorities to play.

10.60 There is a small amount of displacement within the district, specifically:

- Mansfield Town Ladies travel to Joseph Whitaker School (Rainworth) to play;
- One team from Mansfield Town Youth FC travel to Rainworth Miners Welfare in order to find an available pitch suitable for use in the Nerf JPL;
- Warsop Athletic FC travel to Sherwood Fields;
- Linney Group travel to Ashfield to play, although as a company they are based within Mansfield District; and
- U7 teams playing in the Kickstart league travel to Ashfield.

10.61 These teams are included within the totals set out in Table 10.4 and 10.5 as ideally, they wish to play in the district. As set out, Mansfield District also imports teams to play at Central venues as part of the Kickstart league. These teams are displaced from their home authorities due to the structure of the league in which they participate.

### Club Structure and Participation Trends

10.62 A high proportion of junior teams in the district fall under the banner of a large club. Relatively few however offer transition from mini soccer all the way through to adult
football. With the exception of Woodhouse Colts JFC (who have a Sunday league senior side) all those offering a transition between age groups are linked to pyramid clubs (and therefore offer a good standard of football at senior level) specifically AFC Mansfield and AFC Mansfield Youth, Mansfield Town FC, Sherwood Colliery Youth FC and Welbeck Welfare, Manor Youth, Mansfield Boys Youth and Market Warsop Youth FC are also large clubs but these do not offer transition between age groups.

10.63 The remainder of teams are single / dual adult teams predominantly playing recreational football in the local leagues. These teams are largely reliant upon the use of Council and / or school facilities and they do not typically have links with junior clubs. The FA football participation report suggests that the number of clubs offering both adult and junior teams is much lower in Mansfield than national averages.

10.64 Despite the presence of large clubs, FA Data (2013 - 2014 participation report) indicates that just 78% of youth and mini soccer teams play within a club that has achieved charter standard status – this compares poorly to the national average of 81% and is also below the national game strategy target. This suggests that there are opportunities to continue the development of football clubs in the district. The limited number of clubs with both adult and junior teams also suggests that there is also scope to develop greater links between junior and senior football.

10.65 The presence of the Kickstart league also positively impacts upon football in the area, as it facilitates the administration of football for smaller clubs, providing pitches, referees and changing accommodation and removing the onus on clubs to do so for themselves.

Recent Trends in Participation

10.66 The Football Association (FA) participation reports for the district (2013 – 2014) show a decline in participation between season 2012 - 2013 and season 2013 – 2014. This includes a loss of 2 teams. Both senior and junior team numbers declined, while there was a small increase in mini soccer participation.

10.67 For those responding to the club survey, participation has remained largely static, although more teams have seen an increase than a decline, particularly at youth and mini levels. Notably, it is the larger clubs that have seen an increase in participation, while others are struggling to maintain the number of teams that they are running.

10.68 There is also clear documented evidence of the decline in adult football in Mansfield District, with the most local league, the Mansfield and District Sunday Football League experiencing a decline and now having capacity for a further two divisions (24 teams) in 2015. If not reversed, declining participation will result in a lower demand for pitch provision.

10.69 A decline in adult football has been evident nationally for several years. The FA nationally, and the Nottinghamshire FA locally are currently working with clubs to arrest this decline. The main reasons for declining participation can be linked to: higher participation costs (particularly since the closure of many local pubs and social clubs that typically offered low costs); lack of volunteers and a general lack of interest. The quality of pitches in Mansfield District is also thought by the league to be a contributing factor.

10.70 In contrast, both the Kickstart League (which recently introduced a U15 age group in 2014) and the Young Elizabethan League both indicate that the numbers of teams in the
area are increasing, creating a more positive picture for the development of mini and junior football within Nottinghamshire.

10.71 Few clubs currently believe that the inadequacies of the existing stock of pitches are inhibiting demand.

**Pyramid Clubs**

10.72 Mansfield Town is the highest performing club in the district, playing in league two of the national league system and operating on a professional basis.

10.73 Below this, in the non league system, there are three teams based in Mansfield District playing in leagues that form part of the higher echelons of the football pyramid. These are;

- AFC Mansfield - Northern Counties East League Division 1 (Step 6);
- Clipstone FC - Northern Counties East League Division 1 (Step 6);
- Sherwood Colliery FC - Central Midlands League South (Step 7); and
- Welbeck Welfare FC - Central Midlands League South (Step 7).

10.74 As a result of the standard of football played, there are specific requirements that must be adhered to in relation to the facilities provided at the home ground.

10.75 For both AFC Mansfield and Clipstone FC, who have the most stringent requirements, facilities must meet with the FA Ground grading specification G, which is available in full at [http://nav.thefa.com/sitecore/content/TheFA/Home/Leagues/NationalLeagueSystem/Gr
doundGrading](http://nav.thefa.com/sitecore/content/TheFA/Home/Leagues/NationalLeagueSystem/Gr
doundGrading).

10.76 The specification includes;

- adequate security of tenure;
- clubhouse facility on or adjacent to the ground that provides refreshments to spectators;
- adequate car parking on or adjacent to the ground;
- fixed perimeter barrier ideally 2 metres from touchline and goal line;
- high standard playing surface (or use of AGP on FA register) and floodlights;
- games cannot be played on adjoining pitches where they are likely to interfere with the playing of a match;
- spectator accommodation should be for a minimum of 100, at least 50 of which should be seated and located in one stand. There should also be toilets accessible to spectators; and
- changing accommodation (2 rooms) and separate room for match officials, with medical facilities.
10.77 Clubs at Step 7 must meet Ground Grade H. AFC Mansfield are seeking promotion this season, and will be required to meet ground grading specifications F, if this is achieved.

10.78 Issues identified at each site in relation to meeting these criteria will be evaluated later in this section.

**Training Needs**

10.79 The majority of football teams in Mansfield District use AGPs to train, with The Brunts Academy, Manor Sports and Recreation Centre and Garibaldi School being particularly popular venues. Several clubs also travel to Joseph Whitaker School in Rainworth and Shirebrook College in Derbyshire which are just outside the district boundary.

10.80 Additionally, many clubs indicate that they train on grass at the beginning of the season (until the clocks change) while some use floodlit grass pitches (Welbeck Colliery) midweek. Those teams training on grass, indoors or not at all indicate that this is due to the lack of availability of the AGPs and / or the costs associated with hiring AGPs. Larger clubs are seen to book these leaving no spare capacity at attractive times (6 - 8pm).

10.81 The majority of single adult teams indicate that they do not train at all, purely playing on a Sunday for recreational benefits.

10.82 The adequacy of AGPs for training (and match play) will be considered later in this section.

**Educational Demand**

10.83 The majority of primary schools in the District have their own playing fields. While not all schools mark out their playing field area(s) as formal pitches, most have the capacity to do so. Other playing fields are used on an ad hoc basis.

10.84 At the secondary school level, there is good access to school facilities, with all schools currently willing to offer community use of their sites. It is however essential that curricular requirements are balanced with this use. While impacting on the overall ability to sustain community play, school use of grass pitches has limited impact on peak time demand and the availability of pitches, as this largely takes place midweek. The Mansfield and Ashfield Schools FA organise a Town Cup for secondary schools and all schools in the district participate in this. This has helped to cement football as the most popular sport in the district and indicates that there are strong foundations for the growth of the game. Matches are played home and away at school sites, meaning that grass pitches are used for midweek matches.

10.85 Based on this competing demand for pitches from schools, these sites only sustain fewer community games per week on average than facilities owned and managed by other providers. This main reason for this is to protect against quality deterioration from overuse.

10.86 While school sites offer an important opportunity to increase the amount of facilities for the community they are there primarily to meet curricular needs. Several schools in Mansfield indicate that pitches do not currently meet this requirement. This is based on, issues raised by the schools through interviews and surveys (date). As a result, a combination of quality and supply needs were raised:
• All Saints School - have to tailor activities to the facilities that the school has. AGP line markings are poor and faded and the playing fields require drainage and sanding
• Manor Sports Academy - while pitches are heavily used, they are of a good quality overall. The school are currently looking at tailoring the grounds maintenance contracts to ensure that pitches better meet local need
• Garibaldi College - looking at replacement surface within next 5 years
• Samworth Church Academy - lack of small sided pitches and goals available.

Casual Demand

10.87 Many of the sites in Mansfield District also function as public recreational areas. This impacts upon the quality of some pitches, particularly with regards dog fouling, which emerged as a key issue for many pitch users. Many clubs interviewed felt that not enough is done about the issue. While this recreational use (e.g. dog walking) is not necessarily extensive enough to reduce the capacity of pitches, particularly during the winter months, it impacts upon the player experience on occasion and also renders pitches which frequently suffer unpopular.

10.88 Abbots Road, Berry Hill Park, Carr Lane and Queensway Park all exhibited some dog fouling at the time of site visits. Abbots Road, Oak Tree Leisure Centre, Racecourse Park and Yeoman Hill Park were all highlighted as suffering from significant dog fouling issues by clubs.

Other Issues

10.89 Other issues raised in relation of the use of pitches are summarised below:

Cost of facility hire and running the club

• The cost of facility hire was raised by both adult and junior clubs and was a key concern for clubs using both public and private facilities. For those using public pitches, both leagues and clubs perceive higher costs to be a key contributing factor for the decline of adult football, particularly with a reduction in the availability of sponsorship.

• For those at private pitches, both clubs and providers highlighted the pressures of ever increasing costs of maintenance and the difficulties of covering this within the fees paid through subs to clubs. Many clubs felt that increasing fees would have a negative impact on participation, but indicate that they struggle to fulfil maintenance requirements through the income received.

• While the Kickstart league is also perceived to be positive in terms of football development, it was also noted that players subs support the running of this league, leaving no contribution for club improvement and development. A season ticket (available at a reduced rate and payable at the end of the season) was introduced by the Council with support from the Nottinghamshire FA with a view to addressing this issue. It should be noted however that this is only really applicable to larger clubs due to paying up front. Smaller clubs find it difficult to pay upfront.

Lack of awareness and skills for club development / fundraising
• Some clubs in and around Mansfield district have been successful with applications for funding and the development of their clubs. Many of these clubs, as well as others who have raised internal and external funding as a key issue, highlight a lack of awareness within the football community as to how to apply for funding and a lack of skills to actually prepare applications.

• Several clubs however highlight the benefits that have arisen through volunteer support.

Communication

• Existing internal operational structures within Mansfield District Council in relation to green space maintenance teams, pitch booking teams and sports development teams are not closely linked. This has meant that communication between these has been inadequate. Sometimes changes to pitch requirements can be made that are not communicated and there is also limited working to develop sporting activity on the pitch sites.

Adequacy of Pitch Provision – Assessing Supply and Demand information and Views

10.90 The Sport England Methodology enables evaluation of the adequacy of grass pitch provision, taking into account both the quality and number of pitches provided. Adequacy is measured both over the course of a week and at peak time using the concept of match equivalents. There is a strong interrelationship between the quality of a pitch and the amount of matches that it can sustain.

Weekly Capacity

10.91 The quality of the pitch has a greater influence on weekly capacity - this directly impacts the number of matches that can be sustained. Table 10.6 summarises the guidelines used with regards pitch capacity (extracted from Sport England Guidance on the Production of a Playing Pitch Strategy, prepared by the FA).

Table 10.6: Capacity based upon Pitch Quality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agreed pitch quality rating</th>
<th>Adult Football</th>
<th>Youth Football</th>
<th>Mini Soccer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of match equivalent sessions a week</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10.92 It should be noted that several pitches in Mansfield are rated as standard, but are considered to be on the verge of being considered poor. A poor pitch has a lower capacity than a standard pitch and pitch quality (and potential deterioration) therefore has a potentially significant impact on the overall adequacy of the pitch infrastructure. This scenario will be returned to later in this section.

10.93 There are some examples evident of overmarking (where one pitch is marked with two sets of lines to cater for different age groups). Where additional markings have been added over the top of existing pitches, pitches are only counted once (as the largest size pitch). For example, a senior pitch with 9v9 markings is considered to be a senior pitch. The
use of the pitch by the 9v9 team is however taken into account. For the purposes of analysis therefore, it has been assumed that where a senior or youth pitch is used by a team playing 9v9, 7v7 or 5v5, this is equivalent to half a match equivalent, due to the more limited wear and tear that such teams generate on the pitch as a result of smaller players and shorter playing periods, as well as reduced numbers. This is in line with existing Sport England guidance.

**Peak Time Demand**

10.94 Peak time demand is determined by evaluating the number of match equivalents at peak time and comparing it to the number of pitches available. Peak time is deemed to be the period in which the most play on that pitch type takes place.

10.95 Pitches can only be considered to have spare capacity at peak time when they are not already utilised to their full capacity over the course of a week. An adult pitch that is not used on a Sunday morning (District Wide peak time), but is used more than three times per week at other times (Saturday morning, Sunday afternoon and midweek for example) would not be considered able to sustain additional play either at peak time, or at other times, even though no one would be using the facility then, as this would be detrimental to the quality of the pitch.

10.96 While adult leagues in the area have specific (and non-flexible) kick off times, kick off times for the younger teams can be staggered, ensuring that clubs are able to accommodate all desired play. In general, this means that peak time is less focused and that more matches can be accommodated on one pitch (subject to weekly capacity). The patterns of play for each type of football and the impact on demand for pitches in Mansfield District is outlined in brief below:

- **Senior Football** – circa 50% of adult teams in Mansfield play in the Mansfield and District Sunday League and as such, peak time for senior football is Sunday morning. The East Midlands veterans league also plays on a Sunday, but in the afternoon, as do the ladies football leagues. Outside of this, the majority of other teams play on a Saturday, including those playing in the higher echelons of the football pyramid.

- **Youth and 9v9 football** – demand is split, meaning that demand for pitches is lower at peak time and ensures that better use is made of existing resources. The Chad Mansfield league plays on a Saturday, while the Young Elizabethan league plays on a Sunday. The Kickstart league, which uses central venues, also plays on a Sunday. The U12 league (9v9 takes place) at Manor Park Sports Complex. The U13 and U15 (both 11v11) are also played at Manor Park Sports Complex. Peak time is just Saturday AM, although relatively significant play also takes place on Sunday.

- **5v5 and 7v7** - the majority of mini soccer takes place through the Kickstart League, which is currently on a Sunday. While U7 play takes place at Kingsway Park (Ashfield), Queen Elizabeth’s Academy hosts U8 play, U9 is at the Brunts Academy (pitch) while U10 also takes place at The Brunts Academy on grass.

10.97 The above indicates that demand in Mansfield is reasonably spread across the weekend. This reduces the overall number of pitches required to accommodate peak time demand and maximises the use of existing resources. It does however place greater demands on pitch quality, with some facilities required to host activity on both Saturday and Sunday.
10.98 It should also be noted that the AGP at the Brunts Academy is included within analysis relating to pitch capacity. As the site is included on the FA register, it can be used for match play and therefore provides an extra facility. This pitch is currently important for match play in the district, hosting multiple fixtures for the Kickstart league every Sunday. The pitch at Garibaldi School is also included on the FA register. This is a small sized pitch and can be used for mini football only.

10.99 The adequacy of AGPs for both training and matches will be returned to later in this section.

**Situation at Individual Sites**

10.100 Table 10.7 provides a summary of the activity that takes place at each site offering community use in Mansfield District. It sets out the current supply and demand and outlines whether the pitch is being overplayed, played to the appropriate level or is able to sustain additional fixtures. Any other issues arising with the site, including key quality concerns, are also briefly summarised.

10.101 Quality ratings are derived from a combination of site visits (where as an indication, sites achieving a score of 50% - 80% are rated standard). Sites above this are considered good and below are rated poor) as well as consultation. Site visit scores do not necessarily correlate directly with the rating given, as club and provider feedback, as well as the overall impression at the time of the site visit is also taken into account to produce a final rating. Site visit scores for example may be influenced by a good (and therefore highly scoring) maintenance programme, but if this is ineffective due to underlying issues, quality is reduced.

10.102 Issues will be explored by pitch type and geographical area, however the key issues emerging from site overviews are as follows:

- The majority of matches take place on a Sunday morning, meaning that there are few sites that are used in all available slots across the weekend. There are however no controls over the number of matches that each pitch sustains within the Council pitch booking system, with teams able to book games in any slot.

- There is very little evidence of any overplay, with the majority of pitches able to accommodate more play across the week. This is influenced by the higher demand at peak time. While there is little overplay, there is also relatively limited spare capacity, with only Garibaldi College, Brunts Academy and All Saints Academy able to accommodate more than 2 additional match equivalents per week on pitches of any size.

- The overplay evident is primarily associated with pitches on sites used by the Kickstart Football league, which operate multiple consecutive matches at central venue sites (Brunts Academy, Manor Park Complex). On these sites, there are more pitches than are currently booked by the league, but play is concentrated onto a small number of facilities. While overplay is evident at these sites, there are no clear quality concerns arising from this activity currently with all sites amongst the higher rated facilities, although there is a degree of compaction evident on the pitches. The only other recorded overplay is at King George Recreation Ground and Carr Lane Park - in both instances, this occurs due to the poor quality of the facility which restricts the overall capacity for play and at Manor Sport and Recreation Centre, which is due to a high number of teams using the youth pitches.
• While there is no overplay at other sites, this is directly influenced by participation in the Kickstart league. Play at central venues reduces the demand for pitches at the club home ground and several larger clubs indicate that this use of central venues enables them to run teams in age groups that they would otherwise not have capacity for. There is however a downside of this arrangement for clubs, as all income from these teams goes straight to the Kickstart league and the parent club does not benefit, leading to greater pressures on the maintenance of facilities at the home ground. It is clear that if teams were to leave the Kickstart league and play home and away fixtures instead, pitch provision at some key club bases would be limited. In particular, Sherwood Colliery FC (Debdale Sport and Recreation Centre), AFC Mansfield and Woodhouse Colts (Forest Town Arena and Queensway Park, Welbeck Welfare and Mansfield Town FC Youth would be impacted by this. Debdale Sport and Recreation Centre, Forest Town Arena both have a pitch that cannot sustain any further activity without overplay and there is limited remaining spare capacity at all of these sites

• There are very few facilities that are currently available that have limited use. All Council venues where no demand was evident are not available this season. All Saints Academy is the only site offering community use where no pitches are used. There are also some pitches at Brunts Academy, Samworth Church Academy and Garibaldi College that are not used

• At peak time, there is more limited spare capacity although almost all sites have capacity to accommodate at least some use on one or more pitches. Berry Hill Park, Carr Lane Park, Debdale Sport and Recreation Club, Manor Sports Complex, Manor Sport and Recreation Centre, Forest Town Arena, Oaktree Leisure Centre, Garibaldi College, Brunts School and Queen Elizabeth Academy all have at least one pitch on site with no further capacity at peak time. Looking at the sites as a whole, spare capacity is fairly restricted at large club bases, specifically Debdale Sport and Recreation Centre, Forest Town Arena / Queensway Park and the John Fretwell Centre.

10.103 It is clear therefore that many of the sites with a greater degree of spare capacity are those that are unsecured (school sites).

10.104 There is no use of the pitch at Garibaldi School for competitive fixtures, however Brunts Academy is a key venue for competitive fixtures and is used both Saturday morning and Sunday morning. There is scope in particular to accommodate further play on this pitch later in the day on both of these sites.
Table 10.7: Site Specific Usage at each site (community sites that are available regardless of whether they are used or not)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub Area</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Pitch Type</th>
<th>Security of Community Use</th>
<th>Number of Pitches</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Total Capacity (Match Equivalents per Week)</th>
<th>Total Match Equivalents including Other Activity</th>
<th>Match Play and Other Use (Spare Capacity)</th>
<th>Peak Time Spare Capacity</th>
<th>Current Position</th>
<th>Site Overview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Abbots Road</td>
<td>Adult 11v11</td>
<td>Secured</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Able to sustain additional play</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Able to sustain additional play</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Adult 11v11</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Able to sustain additional play</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9v9</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Able to sustain additional play</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All Saints Academy</td>
<td>7v7</td>
<td>Unsecured</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Able to sustain additional play</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pitches are well drained but evidence of mole damage in close proximity to pitch. Spare capacity both at peak time (1 additional match equivalent) and across the week. One pitch is better than the other and clubs also highlight concerns over moles. Pitches small and could be considered youth pitches (although used by adult teams). The school is open to community use but is not currently used as a venue for any activity. There is therefore spare capacity on existing pitches (even taking into account school use) although they are of relatively limited quality. School has aspirations to improve existing facilities.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub Area</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Pitch Type</th>
<th>Security of Community Use</th>
<th>Number of Pitches</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Total Capacity (Match Equivalents per Week)</th>
<th>Total Match Equivalents including Other Activity</th>
<th>Match Play and Other Use (Spare Capacity)</th>
<th>Peak Time Spare Capacity</th>
<th>Current Position</th>
<th>Site Overview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Youth 11v11</td>
<td>Unsecured</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Played to level pitch can sustain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berry Hill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Secured</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Able to sustain additional play (AGP)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7v7</td>
<td>Unsecured</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Played to level pitch can sustain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9v9</td>
<td>Unsecured</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Pitch overplayed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brunts Academy</td>
<td>5v5</td>
<td>Unsecured</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Able to sustain additional play</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pitch is of limited quality but is rented at a high cost. Club must do all maintenance on the site. All use takes place on Saturday morning, games played consecutively so they can be accommodated. No further availability at peak time or across the week. Quality close to poor which would see pitch become overused.

Site plays a central role in the provision of facilities for football, providing facilities of good quality for play in the NERF premier league, as well as accommodating the Kickstart league on both (U9) and grass (U10). The pitch is also used for senior and youth play. The high levels of activity, as well as school use, mean that there is no remaining capacity on the 7v7 or 9v9 pitches. There is limited further capacity on the AGP on a Sunday.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub Area</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Pitch Type</th>
<th>Security of Community Use</th>
<th>Number of Pitches</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Total Capacity (Match Equivalents per Week)</th>
<th>Total Match Equivalents including Other Activity</th>
<th>Match Play and Other Use (Spare Capacity)</th>
<th>Peak Time Spare Capacity</th>
<th>Current Position</th>
<th>Site Overview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bull Farm Park</td>
<td>Adult 11v11</td>
<td>Secured</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Scope to increase play both across the week and at peak time. Pitch is of limited quality and close to becoming poor, which would see a reduction in the capacity of pitches.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clipstone Miners Welfare</td>
<td>Adult 11v11</td>
<td>Secured</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Pitch one of the better sites in the district. Accommodates pyramid team and is therefore used on a Saturday PM. Spare capacity on Sundays and across the week. Site requires improvement to changing facilities, potential to link with existing cricket club and Clipstone Colts (who play outside the District).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Debdaile Sport and Recreation Ground</td>
<td>Youth 11v11</td>
<td>Secured</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Pitches of improving quality following appointment of new groundsman, although some work required with decompaction. First team pitch must meet ground grading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7v7</td>
<td>Secured</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Able to sustain additional play</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub Area</td>
<td>Site Name</td>
<td>Pitch Type</td>
<td>Security of Community Use</td>
<td>Number of Pitches</td>
<td>Rating</td>
<td>Total Capacity (Match Equivalents per Week)</td>
<td>Total Match Equivalents including Other Activity</td>
<td>Match Play and Other Use (Spare Capacity)</td>
<td>Peak Time Spare Capacity</td>
<td>Current Position</td>
<td>Site Overview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Adult 11v11</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Played to level pitch can sustain standards and has no remaining capacity. Youth team facilities also at capacity at peak time caused by overmarking of youth and 9v9 pitches. Site suffers from poor drainage, particularly on second pitch. Sufficient capacity to accommodate 7v7, generated in part by the participation of most teams in the Kickstart Youth League (central venue fixtures). The poor quality AGP on site cannot be used for matches, but accommodates some training for younger teams. Club have aspirations for development of AGP as well as improvement of clubhouse. Changing accommodation good and site includes full bar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Field Mill</td>
<td>Adult 11v11</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Able to sustain additional play Home ground to Mansfield Town FC. Accommodates ladies team also, although some displacement is experienced if quality standards are high.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mansfield District Council: Playing Pitch Strategy Assessment Report
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub Area</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Pitch Type</th>
<th>Security of Community Use</th>
<th>Number of Pitches</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Total Capacity (Match Equivalents per Week)</th>
<th>Total Match Equivalents including Other Activity</th>
<th>Match Play and Other Use (Spare Capacity)</th>
<th>Peak Time Spare Capacity</th>
<th>Current Position</th>
<th>Site Overview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Adult 11v11</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Able to sustain additional play</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7v7</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Able to sustain additional play</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Town Arena</td>
<td>Youth 11v11</td>
<td>Secured</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Played to level pitch can sustain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub Area</td>
<td>Site Name</td>
<td>Pitch Type</td>
<td>Number of Pitches</td>
<td>Security of Community Use</td>
<td>Number of Pitches</td>
<td>Rating</td>
<td>Total Capacity (Match Equivalents per Week)</td>
<td>Total Match Equivalents including Other Activity</td>
<td>Match Play and Other Use (Spare Capacity)</td>
<td>Peak Time Spare Capacity</td>
<td>Current Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garibaldi</td>
<td>College</td>
<td>Adult 11v11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Played to level pitch can sustain</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Played to level pitch can sustain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Youth 11v11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Played to level pitch can sustain</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Played to level pitch can sustain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AGP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Able to sustain additional play</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Able to sustain additional play</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King George V</td>
<td>9v9</td>
<td>Secured</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 Pitch overplayed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Able to sustain additional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9v9</td>
<td>Unsecured</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Played to level pitch can sustain</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Played to level pitch can sustain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Adult 11v11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Pitch overplayed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Pitch overplayed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub Area</td>
<td>Site Name</td>
<td>Pitch Type</td>
<td>Security of Community Use</td>
<td>Number of Pitches</td>
<td>Rating</td>
<td>Total Capacity (Match Equivalents per Week)</td>
<td>Total Match Equivalents including Other Activity</td>
<td>Match Play and Other Use (Spare Capacity)</td>
<td>Peak Time Spare Capacity</td>
<td>Current Position</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9v9</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>-1.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Pitch overlaid</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Youth 11v11</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Pitch overlaid</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manor Park Complex</td>
<td>Adult 11v11</td>
<td>Secured</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Able to sustain additional play</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Site Overview:
The site is one of the home venues for the Kickstart league (U12 use 2 9v9 pitches) and both U13 and U15 use youth pitches. The 9v9 pitches are overplayed (used by Kickstart) based upon the site capacity, and youth pitches are also overplayed meaning that there is little scope to increase usage. There is however spare capacity on senior pitches meaning that the site can be reconfigured to allow further usage if demand arises. Pitch maintenance quality appears higher here than other Council pitches, confirmed by IOG site visits although there is evidence of worm casts and compaction, some of which could be improved with additional maintenance efforts.

Quality of facility which limits capacity. No remaining spare capacity on a Sunday morning as a result of overplay. Only limited use of the 9v9 pitch.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub Area</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Pitch Type</th>
<th>Security of Community Use</th>
<th>Number of Pitches</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Total Capacity (Match Equivalents per Week)</th>
<th>Total Match Equivalents including Other Activity</th>
<th>Match Play and Other Use (Spare Capacity)</th>
<th>Peak Time Spare Capacity</th>
<th>Current Position</th>
<th>Site Overview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manor Sports Academy</td>
<td>Youth 11v11</td>
<td>Secured</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Pitch overplayed</td>
<td>which may be attributed to high levels of play.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9v9</td>
<td>Unsecured</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Able to sustain additional play</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mansfield Primary Academy</td>
<td>7v7</td>
<td>Unsecured</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Able to sustain additional play</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mansfield Primary Academy</td>
<td>7v7</td>
<td>N/a</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Able to sustain additional play</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub Area</td>
<td>Site Name</td>
<td>Pitch Type</td>
<td>Security of Community Use</td>
<td>Number of Pitches</td>
<td>Rating</td>
<td>Total Capacity (Match Equivalents per Week)</td>
<td>Total Match Equivalents including Other Activity</td>
<td>Match Play and Other Use (Spare Capacity)</td>
<td>Peak Time Spare Capacity</td>
<td>Current Position</td>
<td>Current Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oaktree Leisure Centre</td>
<td>Adult 11v11</td>
<td>Secured</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Able to sustain additional play</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Queen Elizabeth</td>
<td>Adult 11v11</td>
<td>Unsecured</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Able to sustain additional play</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pitches to the rear of leisure centre. Pitches are compacted and well used, with no remaining capacity at peak time although there is scope for further play during the week. Some poor drainage as there are boot slides on the surface. Weed infested and uneven. There is room for a further pitch on the first field on this site. Clubs suggest that dog fouling is also a concern.

Important venue for the Kickstart Football league, accommodating 5v5 football. These pitches heavily used and taking into account school use, are approaching capacity. There is however scope to accommodate further play on other pitches. School carefully manage facilities to ensure pitches are played within their limits and quality of pitches and changing accommodation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub Area</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Pitch Type</th>
<th>Security of Community Use</th>
<th>Number of Pitches</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Total Capacity (Match Equivalents per Week)</th>
<th>Total Match Equivalents including Other Activity</th>
<th>Match Play and Other Use (Spare Capacity)</th>
<th>Peak Time Spare Capacity</th>
<th>Current Position</th>
<th>Site Overview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Queensway Park</td>
<td>Youth 11v11</td>
<td>Secured</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Able to sustain additional play This site is used interchangeably with Forest Town Arena as an overspill ground. There is a small amount of spare capacity on the site (based upon an average spread of usage across the two facilities). Pitch quality is basic and with heavy usage and/or lack of maintenance could become poor, which would mean capacity was reduced and the site was overplayed. Changing accommodation adequate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9v9</td>
<td>Secured</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Able to sustain additional play Pitches are of limited quality and close to becoming poor, which would see a reduction in capacity. Activity is primarily concentrated at adult peak time, with only 0.5 match equivalents available. A further 1.5 match equivalents could however be accommodated across</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Racecourse Park</td>
<td>Adult 11v11</td>
<td>Secured</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Able to sustain additional play</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub Area</td>
<td>Site Name</td>
<td>Pitch Type</td>
<td>Security of Community Use</td>
<td>Number of Pitches</td>
<td>Rating</td>
<td>Total Capacity (Match Equivalents per Week)</td>
<td>Total Match Equivalents including Other Activity</td>
<td>Match Play and Other Use (Spare Capacity)</td>
<td>Peak Time Spare Capacity</td>
<td>Current Position</td>
<td>Site Overview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Samworth Church Academy</td>
<td>Youth 11v11</td>
<td>Unsecured</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Able to sustain additional play</td>
<td>Site currently offers limited community use, with only one club accessing the facilities and challenges booking and hiring the site. Pitch quality is standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vision West Nottinghamshire College</td>
<td>Adult 11v11 Small sided 3g</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Able to sustain additional play</td>
<td>Small sided 3g now open but not open to the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yeoman Hill Park</td>
<td>Adult 11v11</td>
<td>Secured</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Able to sustain additional play</td>
<td>Recently maintained and one of the higher quality Council pitches, there is spare capacity both across the week and at peak time (0.5 match equivalents). Further decompaction and weed kill is however required to ensure that pitch capacity is retained. Changing facilities small and clubs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub Area</td>
<td>Site Name</td>
<td>Pitch Type</td>
<td>Security of Community Use</td>
<td>Number of Pitches</td>
<td>Number of Pitches</td>
<td>Rating</td>
<td>Total Capacity (Match Equivalents per Week)</td>
<td>Total Match Equivalents including Other Activity</td>
<td>Match Play and Other Use (Spare Capacity)</td>
<td>Peak Time Spare Capacity</td>
<td>Current Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Adult 11v11</td>
<td>Secured</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Played to level pitch can sustain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carr Lane Park</td>
<td>Warsop Parish</td>
<td>Adult 11v11</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>Played to level pitch can sustain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7v7</td>
<td>Secured</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Able to sustain additional play</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5v5</td>
<td>Secured</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Able to sustain additional play</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pitch of poor quality which limits site capacity - site is poorly drained and compacted. At capacity adult peak time and also used on Sunday afternoon meaning pitch is overplayed. Located in an area of housing growth so may see further demand. Space on site for additional pitches if was required.

Site provides a full range of pitches in terms of size, as well as good ancillary provision. The adult pitch is heavily played with no remaining capacity at peak time or during the week. There is however scope to increase play on the remaining pitches.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub Area</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Pitch Type</th>
<th>Security of Community Use</th>
<th>Number of Pitches</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Total Capacity (Match Equivalents per Week)</th>
<th>Total Match Equivalents including Other Activity</th>
<th>Match Play and Other Use (Spare Capacity)</th>
<th>Peak Time Spare Capacity</th>
<th>Current Position</th>
<th>Site Overview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9v9</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Able to sustain additional play</td>
<td>both across the week and peak time. Pitch quality amongst the highest in the district.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meden Sports Centre</td>
<td>Adult 11v11</td>
<td>N/a</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Able to sustain additional play</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meden Sports Centre</td>
<td>5v5</td>
<td>N/a</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Able to sustain additional play</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Adult 11v11</td>
<td>Secured</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Able to sustain additional play</td>
<td>Pitches on the site suffer from poor drainage and maintenance works are required to bring facilities up to a higher standard. Assuming that facilities are at a standard level, there is spare capacity on both the adult and 9v9 pitches. If pitch quality was to deteriorate however, supply would become very closely matched with demand. This level of capacity is also influenced by participation in the Kickstart (central venue) leagues for younger teams, as well as the spread of play across the weekend. It should</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Welbeck Colliery Welfare</td>
<td>9v9</td>
<td>Secured</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Able to sustain additional play</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub Area</td>
<td>Site Name</td>
<td>Pitch Type</td>
<td>Security of Community Use</td>
<td>Number of Pitches</td>
<td>Rating</td>
<td>Total Capacity (Match Equivalents per Week)</td>
<td>Total Match Equivalents including Other Activity</td>
<td>Match Play and Other Use (Spare Capacity)</td>
<td>Peak Time Spare Capacity</td>
<td>Current Position</td>
<td>Site Overview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

also be noted that football teams at the club do not have access to training facilities and are using the rugby pitch (floodlit). This is causing overplay of this pitch. Club seeking to provide additional facilities but maintenance improvements also needed.
Current Picture

10.105 The site overviews set out in Table 10.7 provide an understanding of the issues regarding the adequacy of pitch provision across the District and the situation at individual sites.

10.106 Issues can be further evaluated looking first at the adequacy of provision for each type of pitch, as well as exploring whether the situation differs in the two sub areas (Mansfield Town and Warsop Parish).

10.107 The key issues arising are summarised in the sections that follow.

**Adult Football Pitches (11v11)**

10.108 Table 10.8 summarises the use and spare capacity at full size grass football pitches. Peak time analysis reflects the peak time for adult football (Sunday morning).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub Area</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Security of Community Use</th>
<th>Site Capacity (Match Equivalents Per Week)</th>
<th>Total Match Equivalents</th>
<th>Spare Capacity</th>
<th>Spare Capacity at Peak Time</th>
<th>Current Position</th>
<th>Spare Capacity at Peak Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mansfield</td>
<td>Abbots Road</td>
<td>Secured</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Able to sustain additional play</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All Saints Academy</td>
<td>Unsecured</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Able to sustain additional play</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bull Farm Park</td>
<td>Secured</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Able to sustain additional play</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clipstone Miners Welfare</td>
<td>Secured</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Able to sustain additional play</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Debdale Sport and Recreation Ground</td>
<td>Secured</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Played to level pitch can sustain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Garibaldi College</td>
<td>Unsecured</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Played to level pitch can sustain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>King George V</td>
<td>Secured</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Pitch overplayed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manor Park Complex</td>
<td>Secured</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Able to sustain additional play</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Forest Town Arena</td>
<td>Secured</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Able to sustain additional play</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oaktree Leisure Centre</td>
<td>Secured</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Able to sustain additional play</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Queen Elizabeth</td>
<td>Unsecured</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Able to sustain additional play</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Racecourse Park 1</td>
<td>Secured</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Able to sustain additional play</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yeoman Hill Park</td>
<td>Secured</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Able to sustain additional play</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warsop</td>
<td>Carr Lane Park</td>
<td>Secured</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Pitch overplayed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John Fretwell Centre</td>
<td>Secured</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Played to level pitch can sustain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Welbeck Colliery Welfare</td>
<td>Secured</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Able to sustain additional play</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 10.8 reveals that there is a good level of spare capacity across the stock of adult pitches in Mansfield District specifically:

- 11 sites with an adult football pitch have a degree of spare capacity. This is all relatively minimal; Welbeck Welfare, Forest Town Arena, Abbots Road and Oaktree Leisure Centre are all able to accommodate at least 2 additional match equivalents per week. Play on the main pitch is however restricted at both Welbeck Welfare and Forest Town Arena to ensure that pitch quality is maintained for pyramid teams and this should be taken into account (both currently have 2 match equivalents available)

- John Fretwell Centre, Garibaldi College and Debdale Sport and Recreation Centre all have pitches that are played to the level that they can sustain. Again play at Debdale Recreation Centre is restricted on the main pitch and in reality, the second pitch is often overused (this is influenced by the overmarking of a 9v9 pitch on the second pitch)

- there are two sites that are currently overplayed – King George V Recreation Ground and Carr Lane Park. These pitches are categorised as poor and therefore directly impacted by quality

- taking into account the overplay (1), spare capacity across the week equates to 23.5 match equivalents, with 12 match equivalents available at peak time. This spare capacity is spread across most existing sites, but reflecting the distribution of pitches, is primarily found within the Mansfield Sub area. Spare capacity in Warsop equates to just 1.5 match equivalents both across the week and at peak time.

Supplementing the availability of grass pitches, at peak time, the pitch at Brunts Academy is suitable for adult football play. This pitch has no spare capacity at peak time (Sunday morning) but would be able to accommodate adult teams either Sunday afternoon or Saturday afternoon.

For adult football therefore, provision is sufficient to meet current demand overall and there is scope for an increase in participation (although adult football has recently been declining).

There are also several sites that have reduced provision this season due to a lack of demand. These include Queensway Park, Racecourse Park (small pitch only) Bull Farm, Yeoman Hill (small pitch only), Carr Lane Park. There is significant scope for pitches at The Carrs (potentially 8 pitches).

With potential provision at the Carrs (8 pitches) as well as sites with reduced provision, the stock of facilities could be increased by at least 10 pitches without new sites.

Impact of non-secured community use

Pitches at All Saints Academy, Garibaldi College and Queen Elizabeth Academy are unsecured for community use. If these sites were no longer available, existing use would need to be relocated and spare capacity would reduce.

Excluding school use, spare capacity would reduce by 2 match equivalents across the week (21.5 total) and 3 at peak time (9 match equivalents total remaining). The relocation
of teams currently using the sites would see this fall to 7 match equivalents at peak time and 19.5 across the week.

10.116 The loss of unsecured pitches would therefore impact upon the adequacy of supply for adult football, but there would remain sufficient provision, particularly in the context of the existing trends of declining participation in this age group.

Youth Football

10.117 In reality, for most sites across the district, full sized pitches are used by both junior and adult teams and there are only a small number of youth pitches in the district. This is made possible by the differing peak period, with peak time for youth football being Saturday morning. The capacity at these sites is summarised in Table 10.9 overleaf.
### Table 10.9: Capacity at Youth Football Pitches

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub Area</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Security of Community Use</th>
<th>Site Capacity (Match Equivalents Per Week)</th>
<th>Total Match Equivalents</th>
<th>Spare Capacity</th>
<th>Spare Capacity at Peak Time</th>
<th>Current Position</th>
<th>Spare Capacity at Peak Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mansfield Town</td>
<td>Berry Hill</td>
<td>Unsecured</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Played to level pitch can sustain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Debdale Sport and Recreation Ground</td>
<td>Secured</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Able to sustain additional play</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manor Sports Academy</td>
<td>Unsecured</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Pitch overplayed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manor Park Complex</td>
<td>Secured</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Pitch overplayed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mansfield Colliery Welfare / FTA 3</td>
<td>Secured</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Played to level pitch can sustain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Queensway Park</td>
<td>Secured</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Able to sustain additional play</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Samworth Church Academy</td>
<td>Unsecured</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Able to sustain additional play</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Garibaldi College</td>
<td>Unsecured</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Played to level pitch can sustain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mansfield District Council: Playing Pitch Strategy Assessment Report
Table 10.9 reveals that overall, there is only a very small amount of spare capacity at specific youth pitches. Although spare capacity across the district equates to 2.5 match equivalents, there is overplay of 3.5 match equivalent leaving supply lower than demand (-1). Pitches at both Manor Sports Academy and Manor Complex are overplayed although it should be noted that there is extensive spare capacity on adult 11v11 pitches at Manor Complex on a Saturday morning.

All junior provision is located within Mansfield and there are no pitches within Warsop Parish.

The pitch at Brunts Academy is also used for junior play on a Saturday morning, accommodating two match equivalents. There is therefore little remaining capacity for further play to reduce pressures on junior grass pitches. The remaining junior matches are played on Sunday morning and there is no further capacity on the pitch at this time. The pitch at Garibaldi College is too small to accommodate junior play.

**Impact of Unsecured Pitches**

Manor Sports Academy, Samworth Church Academy and Garibaldi College all offer unsecured use only and Berry Hill Park has also been considered unsecure, due to a lack of long term security of tenure from the trustees.

Excluding these sites, there would be no remaining spare capacity (-1 taking into account overplay) and just 1 match equivalent at peak time. Teams currently using these venues would however need to be relocated. This would equate to 5 match equivalents per week, creating a large shortfall in provision.

**Combining Adult and Youth Pitches**

The overlap in use between adult and youth pitches in the district means that it is also important to consider the adequacy of the stock of facilities as a whole. This is particularly important as the peak time is different for the two types of facilities.

When taking into account the overall stock of facilities and considering only the amount of pitches that are secured for community use, there is spare capacity for 23.5 match equivalents across the week (taking into account overplay). At peak time for junior play, spare capacity equates to 22 match equivalents, while there are 16 match equivalents available on a Sunday morning.

The role of unsecured pitches however remains clear, with spare capacity reducing to 19.5 (across the week) and 17 match equivalents on a Saturday morning, and just 10 on a Sunday morning if these pitches are no longer available.

As previously highlighted however, there are also concerns about the quality of the stock of the pitch and the ability of facilities to withstand play across the season without deterioration. Use of facilities by both adults and juniors would place greater pressures on this. This will be returned to later in this section.

**9 v 9 Pitches**

Table 10.10 summarises the use and spare capacity at 9 v 9 football pitches. As with youth football, there are relatively few individual 9v9 pitches, and much of the 9v9 activity takes
place at Manor Sports Complex as part of the Kickstart League. The key issues arising for 9v9 are:

- there is very little spare capacity overall, with just 3.75 match equivalents available across the week, although this increases to 6.25 at peak time (play is more split than other forms of the game). These figures take into account the overplay that is evident, with pitches at both Manor Park Complex and Brunts Academy heavily used. Games could however be played consecutively at peak time, leading to further theoretical capacity (where pitches are not already used across the week); and

- although pitch provision is much higher in Mansfield than in Warsop, spare capacity across the week is actually lower, with just 1 match equivalent available, although there are 4.5 at peak time.
### Table 10.10: 9 v 9 Football Pitches

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub Area</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Security of Community Use</th>
<th>Site Capacity (Match Equivalents Per Week)</th>
<th>Total Match Equivalents</th>
<th>Spare Capacity</th>
<th>Spare Capacity at Peak Time</th>
<th>Current Position</th>
<th>Spare Capacity</th>
<th>Spare Capacity at Peak Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mansfield Town</td>
<td>King George V</td>
<td>Secured</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Able to sustain additional play</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manor Sports Academy</td>
<td>Unsecured</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Able to sustain additional play</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manor Park Complex</td>
<td>Secured</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>-1.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Pitch overplayed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Queensway Park</td>
<td>Secured</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Able to sustain additional play</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Garibaldi College</td>
<td>Unsecured</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Able to sustain additional play</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brunts School</td>
<td>Unsecured</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Pitch overplayed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All Saints Academy</td>
<td>Unsecured</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Able to sustain additional play</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warsop Parish</td>
<td>John Fretwell Centre</td>
<td>Secured</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Able to sustain additional play</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Welbeck Colliery Welfare</td>
<td>Secured</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>Able to sustain additional play</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 4.5

2.75 1.75
10.128 There is no spare capacity on the AGP at Brunts Academy for 9v9 play on a Saturday, as this site is already used at peak time by junior teams, and on a Sunday for the Kickstart Youth League.

**Impact of Unsecured Pitches**

10.129 There is a particular reliance upon unsecured pitches for 9v9, with Garibaldi College, Manor Sports and Recreation Complex, Brunts School and All Saints Academy providing pitches.

10.130 Brunts Academy is one of two sites already overused, while there is spare capacity at the remaining facilities.

10.131 Excluding these sites, spare capacity remains the same, however there would be a need to relocate 3.5 match equivalents per week. This would mean that supply would match demand across the week, but that spare capacity at peak time would reduce to just 3 match equivalents.

**7 v 7 Pitches**

10.132 Table 10.11 summarises the use and spare capacity at 7 v 7 football pitches.
Table 10.11: Use and Spare Capacity at 7 v 7 Football Pitches

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub Area</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Security of Community Use</th>
<th>Site Capacity (Match Equivalents Per Week)</th>
<th>Total Match Equivalents</th>
<th>Spare Capacity</th>
<th>Spare Capacity at Peak Time</th>
<th>Current Position</th>
<th>Spare Capacity at Peak Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mansfield Town</td>
<td>Debdale Sport and Recreation Ground</td>
<td>Secured</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Able to sustain additional play</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manor Sports Academy</td>
<td>Unsecured</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Able to sustain additional play</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mansfield Colliery Welfare / FTA 1</td>
<td>Secured</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Able to sustain additional play</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brunts School</td>
<td>Unsecured</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Played to level pitch can sustain</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All Saints Academy</td>
<td>Unsecured</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Able to sustain additional play</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warsop Parish</td>
<td>John Fretwell Centre</td>
<td>Secured</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Able to sustain additional play</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10.133 Table 10.11 reveals that there is spare capacity on the existing 7v7 pitches with 14.5 match equivalents available across the week and 3 match equivalents at peak time. The majority of spare capacity is in Mansfield. Games could however be played consecutively at peak time, leading to further theoretical capacity.

10.134 There are no sites that are overplayed and all pitches are able to accommodate at least 2.5 match equivalents additional each week with the exception of Brunts Academy which is at capacity. This is due to the use of pitches at this site by the Kickstart league.

10.135 There is no spare capacity on the AGP at Brunts Academy for further 7v7 play, as this site is already used at peak time by the Kickstart league (U9) for 7v7 play.

10.136 There is however scope to introduce play on the small sized 3g pitch at Garibaldi College - there is currently no activity on this site at match times and as it is on the FA register, it could be considered for use.

**Unsecured Pitches**

10.137 As with pitches of other size, there is a reliance on unsecured pitches for 7v7 play and provision is limited without access to these pitches. There are 16 match equivalents available at secured sites and just 6.5 match equivalents at these facilities. A further 10.5 community match equivalents however take place at unsecured sites (primarily Brunts Academy) meaning that in total, there would be insufficient match equivalents available if access to unsecured pitches was removed. The 3g pitch at Garibaldi School is however of sufficient size to accommodate 7v7 play and could be used to address this demand as it is on the FA register.

**5 v 5 pitches**

10.138 Table 10.12 outlines the spare capacity that is available at 5 v 5 pitches. It reveals that across the three sites, all pitches have spare capacity, although there is no remaining capacity at Queen Elizabeth Academy at peak time.

10.139 In total, there are 14.5 match equivalents available (primarily in Mansfield) and 3.5 match equivalent at peak time. All facilities are used by the community.

10.140 It should be noted that Table 10.12 includes only formal pitches. There is evidence of 5v5 play taking place at many of the club sites on the side of other pitches and in some instances overmarked on other pitches. This is factored in to calculations for these pitches.
### Table 10.12: 5 v 5 Pitches

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub Area</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Security of Community Use</th>
<th>Site Capacity (Match Equivalents Per Week)</th>
<th>Total Match Equivalents</th>
<th>Spare Capacity</th>
<th>Spare Capacity at Peak Time</th>
<th>Current Position</th>
<th>Spare Capacity</th>
<th>Spare Capacity at Peak Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mansfield Town</td>
<td>Brunts School</td>
<td>Unsecured</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Able to sustain additional play</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Queen Elizabeth</td>
<td>Unsecured</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Able to sustain additional play</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warsop Parish</td>
<td>John Fretwell Centre</td>
<td>Secured</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Able to sustain additional play</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10.141 There is no spare capacity on the AGP at Brunts Academy for 5v5 play at peak time.

10.142 Again there is a particular reliance on unsecured pitches, with the facilities at the John Fretwell Centre in Warsop the only formal 5v5 pitches that are secured for community use. With a total of 17 match equivalents taking place at unsecured sites (10 of which are community use), there would be a significant lack of facilities if access to unsecured sites was lost.

10.143 The pitch at Garibaldi College is not used for competitive play currently, but as it is on the FA register could be used to meet demand for 5v5 games. The pitch could also be used for 7v7 fixtures and need for the two forms of the game should be balanced.

**Adequacy of Provision for Pyramid Clubs**

10.144 As outlined earlier in this section, there are three clubs playing within the National League pyramid and therefore having specific requirements. The adequacy of provision for these clubs is summarised in Table 10.13.

**Table 10.13: Adequacy of Provision for Pyramid Clubs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Club and Site</th>
<th>Issues Raised</th>
<th>Additional Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AFC Mansfield - Northern Counties East League Division 1 (Step 6);</td>
<td>Pitch quality meets requirements although changing accommodation would benefit from modernisation.</td>
<td>Non if promoted although further improvements would be required if the club reached the Evo Stick league.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clipstone FC - Northern Counties East League Division 1 (Step 6);</td>
<td>Pitches meet requirements but changing accommodation requires modernisation</td>
<td>None to meet league regulations but changing rooms require modernisation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherwood Colliery FC - Central Midlands League South (Step 7)</td>
<td>Meets with ground grading although requirement to improve floodlights and improve access to pitch from training if club are promoted. Improvements also to maintenance regime of pitch</td>
<td>Improved maintenance Access route to pitch Floodlights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welbeck Welfare FC - Central Midlands League South (Step 7)</td>
<td>Limited maintenance schedules due to cost and machinery issues</td>
<td>Improved maintenance and pitch quality</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Overall Spatial Picture**

10.145 Overall therefore, analysis has demonstrated that there is spare capacity across Mansfield District, with few examples of overplay and capacity to increase participation in all forms of the game both across the week and at peak time within the existing infrastructure. There are very few facilities that are not used at all (although as set out previously in Table 10.1 / 10.2 some sites have been closed by the Council to reflect a lack of demand) and a small amount of spare capacity at most sites in the district.

10.146 There is however relatively limited spare capacity remaining at many of the home venues for larger clubs, specifically Debdale Sport and Recreation Centre, Forest Town
Arena (who also use Queensway Park as an overspill venue), the John Fretwell Centre and Welbeck Colliery. The use of the central venues by the Kickstart league is instrumental in ensuring that teams affiliated to these clubs can be run as they do not need to accommodate them on home pitches.

10.147 There is however a particular reliance on unsecured pitches at school sites, particularly for facilities for the younger age groups and removal of access to these pitches would ensure that supply would be much more closely matched with demand.

10.148 Added to this, the quality of football pitches is relatively low and levels of maintenance are limited on many sites. Many pitches achieved site scores of below 60% relatively early in the season and issues with maintenance were confirmed in FA professional quality assessments. This raises concern about quality deterioration later in the season and the impact that this may have on pitch capacity.

10.149 The current quantitative picture with regards spare capacity is summarised in Table 10.14. It illustrates the number of spare match equivalent sessions for each form of the game. It excludes pitches that are not secured for community use.
### Table 10.14: Summary of Spare Capacity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub Area</th>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Adult Football</th>
<th>Youth Football</th>
<th>9v9 Football</th>
<th>7v7 Football</th>
<th>5v5 Football</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Peak Time</td>
<td></td>
<td>Peak Time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spare Capacity</td>
<td></td>
<td>Spare Capacity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mansfield District All accessible pitches</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Warsop All accessible pitches</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mansfield District All accessible pitches</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mansfield District Secured Community Use Only</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(taking into account displaced teams)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Impact of Poor Pitch Quality and Maintenance Longer Term

10.150 As outlined earlier in this section, the poor quality of some pitches and the potential for sites to deteriorate over the course of a season is a particular concern within Mansfield District. There is currently spare capacity on most sites currently suggesting that issues of overuse are not causing concerns about pitch quality.

10.151 Pitch quality does however directly impact capacity and if this is to reduce, a different picture of the adequacy of provision is created.

10.152 The focus of play at peak time (in the main) means that the capacity of pitches impacts less on the adequacy of provision than would be the case if games were hosted across the weekend (meaning that sites may be required to fulfil three or four fixtures) however there are many pitches that do accommodate teams in more than one time slot. As a result, and particularly on these pitches, the maintenance programme must be tailored to ensure that pitches are capable of sustaining higher levels of play, not just in the short term but also over longer periods of time. Many clubs, as well as Mansfield District Council, are faced with challenging budgets and must fit maintenance procedures into limited funds. Some clubs are also concerned that the levels of use on their pitches longer term will cause quality deterioration. It is therefore necessary to examine the impact if pitches were to decline over the course of the season and become poor.

10.153 As outlined earlier in this section, while in theory almost all pitches are of standard quality and able to sustain two games per week, the majority of pitches achieved scores very close to the border between standard and poor. Table 10.15 sets out the position if all pitches achieving scores of 60% or less (currently standard) became poor.

Table 10.15: Impact of Declining Quality of Grass Pitches in Mansfield

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pitch Type</th>
<th>Current Position</th>
<th>Position Following Potential Quality Deterioration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adult Football 11v11</td>
<td>24 match equivalents available across the week. 12 at peak time</td>
<td>11.5 match equivalents available across the week. 8 at peak time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Football 11v11</td>
<td>-1 match equivalents shortfall. 1.5 at peak time</td>
<td>-5 match equivalents available across the week. 0.5 at peak time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9v9</td>
<td>3.75 match equivalents available across the week. 6.25 at peak time</td>
<td>-1.25 match equivalents available across the week. 4.75 at peak time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7v7</td>
<td>14.5 match equivalents available across the week. 3 at peak time</td>
<td>14.5 match equivalents available across the week. 3 at peak time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5v5</td>
<td>14.5 match equivalents available across the week. 3 at peak time</td>
<td>14.5 match equivalents available across the week. 3 at peak time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10.154 Table 10.15 therefore reveals that for adult football, while the spare capacity across the week declines significantly (suggesting that high numbers of adult pitches are in danger of becoming poor quality), there is minimal impact on the peak time demand. This is because the majority of the poorer quality pitches are only used at peak time.
10.155 The greater spread of play in the 9v9 and youth age groups however means that quality deterioration would have a particular impact on the adequacy of provision for these age groups.

10.156 There is relatively little impact on 5v5 and 7v7 pitches, with these pitches primarily comfortably of standard quality.

10.157 On a site specific level, the decline of pitches at Welbeck Colliery and Queensway Park would have perhaps the greatest impact, with spare capacity becoming very restricted and/or completely eliminated at these sites.

10.158 Although not scoring below 60%, one of the pitches at Debdale Sport and Recreation Club also suffers from poor drainage on occasion. If capacity at this site was to be reduced, overplay would also arise.

10.159 There are no other sites where pitch capacity would become insufficient if quality was to decline, but on almost all sites, spare capacity would be reduced.

10.160 Figure 10.7 illustrates the potential impact of poor pitches on the overall stock of facilities. It illustrates the cycle that may occur where pitches are used to a higher level than their quality dictates that they should be, and as a consequence, quality deteriorates further. The limited maintenance regime however means that this is not addressed and the cycle continues. While the spare capacity in Mansfield District means that this is not currently critical, if participation was to increase pitch supply would quickly become inadequate.

**Figure 10.7: Cycle of Overuse and Quality Decline**
It is clear however that in the short term, the reliance on pitches at unsecured sites, particularly for smaller sided games, places as big a threat to the facility stock as the condition of the existing pitches.

Adequacy of AGPs

FA Demand Modelling

AGPs are becoming increasingly important for football. The FA facility strategy (2013 – 2015) seeks to shift football usage away from sand based AGPs to pitches.

The recently released FA vision (November 2014) which is the result of extensive analysis on the facilities used for football (including grass roots) places greater emphasis on the benefits of pitches and their importance for the future delivery of football. The vision seeks to build a sustainable model to ensure that the development of significantly higher numbers of AGPs can happen. In particular, the FA cite the additional capacity that AGPs offer compared to grass and their ability to sustain play during periods of inclement weather, resulting in a reduced number of cancellations.

The vision sets several targets for 2020 including:

- the creation of football hubs in 30 cities – this will include increasing the number of top quality AGPs in urban areas by 130%. These hubs will be owned of managed by a new football organisation or trust;
- a 50% increase in the total number of full size, publicly accessible AGPs across England, to over 1000; and
- more than 50% of all mini soccer and youth football matches being played on the best quality AGPs.

FA data modelling evaluates the baseline requirement for pitches taking into account the training requirements of clubs. It assumes that one pitch is required per 42 teams and that based on FA policy, all football training should take place on pitches (as opposed to sand).

In Mansfield District, the FA modelling indicates that there is a requirement for 4.6 AGPs to meet current demand.

Although there is just one full sized AGP, the presence of smaller pitches at Garibaldi College, Mansfield Rugby and two at Mansfield Town go some way to meeting this demand and FA data suggests that there is a shortfall of just 31 training slots. A new small sided pitch is now open at West Notts College (September 2016), although this has no community access therefore suggests that the provision of pitches will be broadly in deficit by 1-1.5 full-sized pitch equivalents. It should be noted however that this does not take into account the poor condition of the pitch at Debdale Sport and Recreation Ground.

While this presents a theoretical perspective, it is also important to look at the use of facilities on the ground to determine the need for further AGP provision.

The Local Situation

Football demand for AGPs can be categorised into three areas:
• matchplay (requires use of a pitch that is included on the FA register) – this links with the requirement for grass pitches and it was outlined that the AGP at Brunts Academy is an important facility in the district;

• information / recreational use – pay and play or leagues; and

• training (The FA would like to see all clubs having access to a pitch – they discourage the use of sand based facilities).

Competitive use

10.170 The full size pitch at Brunts Academy is the only site currently used for competitive fixtures. There is scope to increase match play on a Saturday afternoon and Sunday afternoon, but the pitch is heavily booked on the mornings of both Saturday and Sunday, sustaining junior matches on a Saturday and fulfilling fixtures for the Kick Start Youth League on a Sunday U9).

10.171 The pitch at Garibaldi College is the only other facility on the FA register. This site is too small to accommodate competitive play (60 x 40m) except for 5v5. It is not currently used for this purpose and there is spare capacity at weekends so this could be accommodated.

10.172 The use of the pitch at Brunts Academy for competitive fixtures is essential for football in the district, with limited other alternative opportunities to accommodate the amount of matches that the facility is taking.

10.173 The current patterns of demand for football means that peak time is split between Saturday and Sunday morning and the pitch is used at both times already.

10.174 Based on current kick off times, there is no real scope to increase use for youth or 9v9 football, as the pitch is already used at the times when these games are played (except for girls, who play on a Sunday afternoon when demand is lower). It is at these age groups where the pressures on grass pitches are most prevalent and usage of AGPs would therefore have greatest benefit.

Informal Leagues

10.175 A new leisure league has recently been set up to take place at the new small pitches at Mansfield Town FC, playing on Wednesday and Mondays.

Training

10.176 The majority of training occurs on the pitch at Brunts Academy, as well as Garibaldi College and Mansfield Rugby Club. There is also evidence of teams travelling outside of the district to use facilities at Joseph Whitaker and Shirebrook College.

10.177 Football clubs are split with regards opinions on whether there are sufficient AGPs, with a slightly higher proportion indicating that they believe there to be insufficient AGPs. This is illustrated in Figure 10.8.
The key issues raised with regards the current stock of training facilities were that:

- there is a lack of pitches with availability in the desired 6pm - 8pm midweek training slots
- the cost of AGPs can be prohibitive to use.

Many of the large clubs were dissatisfied with the amount of pitches, indicating that they are having to spread teams across several sites in order to gain access to the training facilities that they require.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Suitability for Football</th>
<th>Hours Available at Peak Time</th>
<th>Spare Capacity</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALL SAINTS’ CATHOLIC ACADEMY</td>
<td>Small sand based pitch only - poor quality and of limited value for football.</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Yes, but not preferred surface for football</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHESTERFIELD ROAD RECREATION GROUND</td>
<td>Small sand based pitch only - poor quality and of limited value for football.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No spare capacity - currently closed due to poor condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEBDALE PARK SPORTS AND RECREATIONAL CLUB</td>
<td>Small pitch but of poor quality</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Site has spare capacity, but is so poor quality that even teams based at Dedbale Park travel to other facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANOR SPORT &amp; RECREATION</td>
<td>Site is full sized sand based pitch.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Use currently 60% football, 40% hockey although site is sand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site</td>
<td>Suitability for Football</td>
<td>Hours Available at Peak Time</td>
<td>Spare Capacity</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CENTRE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANSFIELD RUGBY UNION FOOTBALL CLUB</td>
<td>Small sized pitch</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Pitch in good condition, but usage restricted to rugby during peak hours of 6 - 9 Monday to Friday and is also used for rugby on a Saturday and Sunday. Spare capacity available in early / late slots only.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDEN SPORTS CENTRE</td>
<td>Small sized sand based pitch</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>10 (but casual use only so changes significantly weekly. Primarily recreational bookings)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THE BRUNTS ACADEMY</td>
<td>Full sized pitch</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2 hours</td>
<td>Registered on FA register. In good condition and relatively new. Clear line markings. Changing accommodation not supplied with AGP hire as standard. Site also has circa 6 to 8 week waiting list for access at peak times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garibaldi College</td>
<td>Small sized</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3 hours</td>
<td>Spare capacity midweek 5 - 6 Monday, 6 - 7 half and 8-9 Wednesday. Half also available 9-10. Much less use at weekends. On FA register and in good condition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mansfield Town</td>
<td>2 x small sized</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Pitches used by professional club and by local league 2 evenings per week.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 10.17 therefore demonstrates that there are 50 hours of spare capacity across the week (and at weekends). The majority of spare capacity is found outside the desirable midweek hours (6pm - 8pm) and on the small size sand based pitches which have limited role to play in football. This is summarised in Table 10.17 below.

Table 10.17: Summary of Availability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Type</th>
<th>Spare Capacity</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full Sized</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Spare capacity late evenings. 6 - 8 week waiting list</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Sized</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Influenced by spare capacity at Debdale, which is a poor quality facility and Mansfield Town (very small). Almost no availability at Garibaldi between 6 and 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Sized Sand</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Availability late evenings and Fridays. Not preferred surface</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Sized Sand</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Influenced by poor quality of facilities. Not preferred surface</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10.180 Analysis of current training patterns suggests that when taking into account the use of facilities outside of the district (Joseph Whitaker and Shirebrook College predominantly), Welbeck Colliery Miners Welfare (currently training on floodlit grass rugby pitch) are the only large club that do not access AGPs to train. Not all clubs access ideal facilities however - Manor JFC use the sand based pitch at Manor Sports and Recreation Centre which is not the preferred surface for football and several other younger teams train indoors. The majority of the remaining clubs choose not to train.

10.181 Taking into account just pitches, Mansfield Town (5v5 and with limited value for club training therefore) and Debdale Park is the only site with capacity at peak times and there is a waiting list for Brunts Academy.

10.182 This suggests that the creation of further AGPs may cause displacement of existing teams rather than meet need that is not currently fulfilled. It must however be acknowledged that not all clubs are happy with their current training arrangements, as they are dispersed across several venues and struggling to access facilities at their preferred time.

10.183 FA theoretical Demand modelling for AGPs supports this analysis, indicating that the recorded demand is equivalent to a requirement for 4.6 full size AGPs in Mansfield. When taking account of the smaller sided facilities and the role that they play however, unmet demand is circa 31 training slots. A new small sized facility at West Notts College is currently being created and it is likely that this will leave the need for a further 1-1.5 pitches to meet needs across the district.

Future Picture of Provision

10.184 The future requirement for football pitches will be impacted by several factors, including;

- population growth or change to the demographic profile of the population;
• changes in participation trends;
• club specific development plans and aspirations;
• changes to the current facility stock; and
• changes to the way in which football is played.

10.185 These issues are considered in turn in order to build an accurate picture of future demand for playing pitches.

Population Change

10.186 Analysis in Section 3 indicated that while the population of Mansfield District is likely to increase slightly, changes to the population profile mean that the proportion of people within the age groups most likely to play football (7-44) will increase at a much slower rate. Team Generation Rates (TGRs) indicate how many people in a specified age group are required to generate one team. They are used to project the theoretical number of teams that would be generated from population growth.

10.187 Table 10.18 summarises the current TGRs for football and uses them to evaluate the potential impact of projected population change on demand for football in Mansfield District. It reveals that by 2025:

• the number of adult football teams is likely to remain static, with a slight decline in residents falling into the 16 - 45 age range
• there will also be an increase in the number of youth teams (6) and 9v9 teams (1) placing significant extra pressures on the pitch stock. It is these pitches that are already most under pressure
• up to one additional 5v5 / 7v7 team is likely to be created.

10.188 On the whole therefore, population growth will serve to negate the impact of the ageing population, rather than generating additional demand.

Table 10.18: TGRs for Football in Mansfield District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sport and Age Groups</th>
<th>Number of teams within the area</th>
<th>Current Population in Age Group</th>
<th>Current TGR</th>
<th>Population in Age Group (2025)</th>
<th>Population Change in Age Group</th>
<th>Potential Change in Team Numbers in Age Group (Number of Teams) Current – 2025</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Football Adult Men (16-45yrs)</td>
<td>49 18670</td>
<td>381 18450</td>
<td>-220</td>
<td>-0.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football Adult Women (16-45yrs)</td>
<td>3 18670</td>
<td>6223 18450</td>
<td>-220</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football Youth Boys (12-15yrs)</td>
<td>40 2170</td>
<td>54 2490</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football Youth Girls (12-15yrs)</td>
<td>3 2170</td>
<td>723 2490</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>0.449</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football 9v9 Boys (10 and 11 yrs)</td>
<td>21 1060</td>
<td>50 1100</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0.799</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football 9v9 Girls (10 and 11 yrs)</td>
<td>2 1060</td>
<td>530 1100</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0.0759</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football 7v7 and 5v5</td>
<td>40 4960</td>
<td>124 5040</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10.189 Population growth would therefore have relatively limited impact on the adequacy of provision, with the only changes taking place in the youth / 9v9 age groups. The additional growth will generate up to 3 match equivalents (youth pitches) and 1 (9v9 pitches). This would mean that:

- there is likely to remain sufficient capacity for adult football;

- spare capacity for youth teams would reduce to -4 across the week and -1.5 at peak time. There would however remain sufficient pitches if adult 11v11 pitches were to be used (this would place greater emphasis on the quality of facilities);

- spare capacity on 9v9 pitches would reduce to 2.75 across the week and 5.25 at peak time; and

- pitch capacity on 5 v5 and 7v7 pitches would remain sufficient.

10.190 Pitch quality issues and the reliance on unsecured pitches therefore remain greater threats to participation than the population growth.

**Spatial Distribution of Population Growth**

10.191 Population growth will however not occur evenly across the district and as already highlighted, the key areas of growth are southern Mansfield, Forest Town and The Abbots Road area.

10.192 The impact of growth is likely to place greater pressures on pitches in these areas, in particular in close proximity to Abbots Road Playing Fields, Berry Hill Park, King George Park, Forest Town Arena / Queensway Park.

**Aspirations of Clubs and the FA**

**FA Aspirations for Growth**

10.193 The FA Football Participation Report (2013 – 2014) indicates that when comparing participation against similar authorities, Mansfield District ranks 9/30 authorities in terms of participation levels. This is the most up to date comparative data that is currently available. Based upon this, it is suggested that there is only minimal latent demand in the area equivalent to the following:

- Adult teams – potential to increase by 2 female teams (1 match equivalent)

- Youth teams – potential to increase by 2 female teams (1 match equivalents)

10.194 The Nottinghamshire FA are currently prioritising the retention of existing teams and identify this as a big challenge for Mansfield District moving forwards. In particular, the FA are seeking to improve the transition between youth and adult football (potentially through the creation of a floodlit league) as well as to grow female and disability participation in the game.

10.195 The achievement of these aspirations are likely to see peak time demand remain broadly similar (female teams play outside existing peak hours, while disability teams primarily use AGP and indoor facilities) to current levels. Growth of these forms of the game will however mean that pitches may be used more frequently across the weekend and this will place greater emphasis on pitch quality being sufficient to sustain this.
While the FA has an overall policy of retention, many clubs in the district have aspirations for growth, primarily in relation to youth teams and teams in the younger age groups. Added to this, several clubs are currently discussing mergers between senior and youth clubs, linking with FA priorities and with a view to improving the transition between clubs and addressing the drop out that occurs aged 16 - 19. These aspirations could have a medium term positive impact on participation in Mansfield District and consequently increase demand.

In the main, clubs with growth and development aspirations are all large clubs who already have their own home grounds. In particular, Sherwood Colliery FC, Welbeck Welfare, AFC Mansfield, Woodhouse Colts and Mansfield Town Youth have all indicated that they intend to increase the number of teams that they are running.

To support this club growth, many of these clubs (in partnership with site owners) have aspirations for the development of their facilities. While many would have only a local impact on the club in question, some may have a wider district wide impact (for example the development of a new AGP).

The growth plans of key clubs, as well as any known aspirations for facility development are summarised below.

- AFC Mansfield and Woodhouse Colts are seeking to merge and to increase the number of teams run at all levels within the club. The clubs use facilities at the Arena, as well as the nearby Council owned venue of Queensway Park. Site specific calculations demonstrate that the pitches are approaching capacity particularly at peak time, and there will be very limited remaining spare capacity at Queensway Park if quality deterioration occurs over the season. There is little scope for increased participation at the club base (only capacity on 11v11 pitch and at Queensway Park assuming quality is retained).

- In partnership with the Welfare, the clubs are keen to expand their venue (which currently includes a premier pitch for AFC Mansfield, as well as a second 11v11 pitch, a 7v7 pitch and a 5v5 pitch) by reconfiguring the existing site and extending into land currently designated as allotments directly adjacent to the existing site borders. This land is owned by Welbeck Estates. Initial plans drawn up by the clubs and welfare would see the site include a training pitch (small size) as well as three additional grass pitches. While the clubs would anticipate the grass pitches being solely for their use, they would hope to widen the use of the AGP to other clubs, as well as to Forest Town Primary School who are located opposite and do not have access to any outdoor sports facilities. The club would also be keen to lease the pitches at Queensway Park in order that they could manage and maintain these themselves.

- Sherwood Colliery FC and Sherwood Colliery YFC are also looking to merge. The clubs currently use Debdale Park Sports and Recreational Club which is owned by the Duke of Portland Estate and leased by CISWO. The site is also home to Sherwood Wolf Hunt (Rugby League) and Sherwood Colliery CC. The club are looking to redevelop existing facilities including the creation of a new pitch (to replace an existing grass pitch that suffers with poor drainage) as well as to create a new 2 storey clubhouse using the existing facilities as a base but demolishing areas where repair works are required to include coach education facilities, storage and launderette as well as changing accommodation. The club are also looking to improve the condition of existing grass pitches following a recent FA pitch inspection. The club are looking to create additional teams, but there is no remaining spare capacity at peak time on this site. Added to this,
there are concerns about the quality of the second pitch and if quality deterioration occurs, overplay would be evident

- Welbeck Welfare are also looking to increase the number of teams that they run and to create an additional pitch at the front of the Welbeck Colliery Welfare site (potentially through the release of some brownfield land for development). The greatest threat to the existing site is the quality of the facility, with maintenance limited due to pressures on club finance. There is currently capacity to sustain additional participation, however if quality declines over the course of the season (pitches are currently on the border between standard and poor), this spare capacity is eliminated

- Mansfield Town are also looking to expand their youth section and hope to develop the former Woburn Road Playing Fields as a training ground for their professional team as well as a club base for younger and female teams. Plans include 3g provision. The youth teams are currently playing at a variety of venues (including central venue leagues, Brunts School, and travelling out of the district, while the ladies and girls teams are also displaced, playing at Joseph Whitaker School. The creation of a new site would free up capacity at these other facilities for other clubs.

Other Facility Aspirations

10.200 In addition to those of key clubs (above), several other aspirations for new and improved facilities have also been recorded, specifically:

- there is planning permission for a new AGP at Samworth Church Academy; and

- West Notts College are currently installing a new small sized AGP which will be ready in September 2016 but only offers limited community use.

Changes to the Way in Which Football is played

10.201 Across the country, the FA are undertaking pilot projects to relocate 5v5, 7v7 and sometimes 9v9 football onto AGPs, particularly those currently played on Council pitches. Several games can be sustained at any one time and this therefore reduces the need for grass pitches and ensures a consistently better quality of surface which supports skill development.

10.202 In Mansfield, peak time for 5v5 and 7v7 football is at the same time, while 9v9 differs between Saturday and Sunday. This means that a greater number of AGPs would be required to accommodate these forms of the game. Added to this, the district is host to a central venue league (some of which already plays on) that attracts teams from outside the district and therefore increases the number of pitches that would be required.

10.203 There is relatively little age group play on Council pitches, with the majority of this focused on single teams playing on a Sunday.

10.204 Analysis demonstrates that the majority of pressures on grass pitches arise either through the quality of facilities (senior) or the reliance on unsecured school sites and that almost all overplay is caused by the heavy use of grass pitches by the kickstart league.

10.205 Table 10.19 below therefore illustrates the number of pitches that are required to accommodate all football in the kickstart league for 9v9, 7v7 and 5v5 football. The
provision of additional AGPs for this purpose would reduce the reliance upon grass pitches (and unsecured sites). It takes into account all teams playing within the kickstart league (not just those based in Mansfield).

10.206 The other leagues running in Mansfield offer home and away format (differentiating from Kickstart) and operate across wider geographical regions and it is therefore unlikely that they would be played at central venue sites.

### Scenario Modelling of Requirements for AGPs if all Kickstart Leagues took place on Grass

10.207 Table 10.19 therefore reveals that to accommodate all Kickstart football, a high number of pitches would be required up to 10). This is a high quantity of pitches that is unlikely to be commercially viable within the district.

**Table 10.19: scenario modelling**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Format of the game</th>
<th>Number of teams</th>
<th>Fixture Equivalents</th>
<th>Matches per full size AGP</th>
<th>Number of match sessions</th>
<th>Duration of session (inc. changeover)</th>
<th>Hrs of play on AGP</th>
<th>Programme Hours Available</th>
<th>Pitches Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5v5</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7v7</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9v9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10.208 In response to the decline in adult participation and to improve the transition between junior and adult play, the Nottinghamshire FA are also seeking to introduce midweek floodlit leagues which could be played on AGPs. This would add additional demand.

### Summary

10.209 The key issues for football in Mansfield District are summarised in the summary section in Section 12.
Introduction

11.1 This section evaluates the adequacy of pitches for rugby union. It provides:

- An overview of the supply and demand for pitches
- An understanding of activity at individual sites
- A picture of the adequacy of current provision to meet current and projected future demand.

Overview – Supply and Demand

Pitch Supply

11.2 There are ten rugby union pitches in Mansfield District. Table 11.1 summarises the distribution of grass pitches and outlines the level of access that is available.

Table 11.1: Rugby Pitches across Mansfield District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub Area</th>
<th>Sites</th>
<th>Total Rugby Pitches</th>
<th>Number of Floodlit Pitches</th>
<th>Level of Community Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mansfield urban area</td>
<td>Mansfield Rugby Club</td>
<td>3 senior pitches</td>
<td>3 senior pitches</td>
<td>Secured Community Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lords Ground</td>
<td>1 senior rugby pitch</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Secured Community Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manor Academy</td>
<td>1 senior pitch</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Secured community use (although site is academy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Samworth Church Academy</td>
<td>1 senior pitch</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Academy site - unsecured community use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Brunts School</td>
<td>1 senior pitch</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Academy site - unsecured community use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Queen Elizabeth Academy</td>
<td>1 senior pitch</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Academy site - no existing access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warsop Parish (sub-area 2)</td>
<td>Welbeck Miners Welfare</td>
<td>1 senior pitch</td>
<td>1 senior pitch</td>
<td>Secured community use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meden School</td>
<td>1 senior pitch</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Unsecured community access</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11.3 Table 11.1 summary:

- Eight of the ten pitches are located in the greater Mansfield. Welbeck Miners Welfare and Meden School are the only sites in Warsop Parish.

- There are three sites in the district with fully secured community use - Mansfield Rugby Club, Welbeck Miners Welfare and the Lords Ground and these contain more than half of the pitches in the district. The remainder of pitches are all located at school sites and while most are currently available, the status of these facilities as academies means that there is limited control over long term access to these sites.
There are only two sites containing floodlit rugby pitches - all three pitches at Mansfield Rugby Club are floodlit and the pitch at Welbeck Miners Welfare is also floodlit.
11.4 In addition to the above pitches, there is a small sized AGP at Mansfield Rugby Club. This pitch is World Rugby compliant and can therefore be used for rugby training as well as small sided matches (up to U12). The facility is also let out to other clubs (primarily football) and provides the club with a source of income.

**Management and Maintenance**

11.5 There is a greater emphasis on the club sector in rugby than in football, and 50% of pitches are managed by clubs. Unlike football where Mansfield District Council is the most significant provider, the Council manages just one pitch (The Lords Ground) and at the time of the study this was rented to a club, the Woodhouse Giants.

11.6 Mansfield RUFC own their own ground and therefore have security of tenure. Meden Vale RUFC however lease their pitch from Welbeck Colliery Welfare (CISWO). There are ongoing discussions about the lease of this facility and the RFU believe that ongoing access is not guaranteed.

**Pitch Quality**

11.7 Table 11.2 explores the community use pitches that are available in more detail. It highlights the pitches that are provided at each site, the level of floodlighting and the key issues relating to site quality that were identified through both site visits and club and key stakeholder consultation.

11.8 Assessments of pitch quality for rugby are based on guidance produced by the RFU and Sport England (http://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/planning-for-sport/planning-tools-and-guidance/playing-pitch-strategy-guidance/). As well as recording key characteristics of the site, including pitch condition and available ancillary facilities, the assessment also evaluates the frequency and type of maintenance, and the drainage that is installed on the site.

11.9 Table 11.2 reveals that the key issues for quality in relation to club based pitches in Mansfield District are:

- a requirement for additional and improved maintenance, in particular decompaction
- the impact of overuse of pitches
- a lack of appropriate changing facilities and
- a lack of available training floodlights.
### Table 11.2: Quality of Community Use Sites in Mansfield District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Senior Pitches</th>
<th>Floodlit Pitches</th>
<th>Ancillary Provision</th>
<th>Site Assessment Comments</th>
<th>Quality Issues identified through consultation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mansfield</td>
<td>Mansfield Rugby Club</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6 changing rooms with communal shower and toilets and 2 separate ensuite changing rooms. Site also benefits from a kitchen and full clubhouse facilities, including bar. The club also offers disabled access.</td>
<td>Three good quality pitches that appear well maintained. Grass left slightly long to enable greater wear and tear, evidence of chafer beetle as reported by club. Ancillary facilities good overall and site is well managed and maintained. No evidence of poor drainage etc at time of site visits, but visit followed a period of reasonable weather. Parking likely to become an issue at peak periods, particularly when the AGP is also in use.</td>
<td>No specific issues were identified with the club ancillary provision. In terms of future aspirations, the club believe that more changing rooms would enable the club to run more teams, especially if changing rooms were provided for girls. There are also aspirations to provide a seated viewing area which could also accommodate disabled spectators. Club indicate that programming of existing changing facilities can be challenging during busy periods. While pitch maintenance is perceived to be good, the high levels of use experienced on the pitches mean that quality has deteriorated slightly. All groundsman are experienced but voluntary. The back pitch suffers from waterlogging (inadequate natural drainage) and the first and second team pitches suffer from chafer bug. Overall however, the first and second team pitches are considered good and the third team pitch standard. All three pitches suffer from issues with dog fouling and litter. Only the first team pitch has full pipe and silt drainage installed. The natural drainage on the top pitch is however considered to be adequate. Regular venue for the Schools competitions and festivals as all pitches are floodlit to a good standard with evening matches regularly played.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mansfield District Council: Playing Pitch Strategy Assessment Report
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Senior Pitches</th>
<th>Floodlit Pitches</th>
<th>Ancillary Provision</th>
<th>Site Assessment Comments</th>
<th>Quality Issues identified through consultation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mansfield</td>
<td>Lords Ground</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>None on site - club use ex serviceman’s club that is located down the road.</td>
<td>Located on public site, the pitch is weed infested and uneven meaning that playing surface is compromised. Grass was cut too short at the time of site visit although coverage was acceptable and there was evidence of dog fouling on the pitch. Posts were stable. The pitch quality on site does not reflect the level of maintenance currently undertaken by the Council. The pitch sward is weed infested and compacted and uneven. The pitch would benefit from a programme of intensive maintenance to ensure the grass sward is less weed infested and the compaction and uneven playing surface is improved.</td>
<td>Club required to put out corner flags themselves and pitch is of poor quality, with uneven surfaces. There is a lack of changing accommodation even though this is charged for and the club facility is poor overall.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mansfield</td>
<td>Manor Academy</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Good ancillary facilities available as part of leisure centre complex.</td>
<td>Pitch quality reasonable although slightly undulating. Overmarked with 9v9 football</td>
<td>There is no community use of the rugby pitch (although it has been used in the past). Pitch of adequate quality but also overmarked with football which results in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>Site</td>
<td>Senior Pitches</td>
<td>Floodlit Pitches</td>
<td>Ancillary Provision</td>
<td>Site Assessment Comments</td>
<td>Quality Issues identified through consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samworth Church Academy</td>
<td>1 0</td>
<td>School changing accommodation available</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pitch adequate but community access has recently been restricted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Brunts School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not accessible at time of site visit - pitch not available for community use currently</td>
<td></td>
<td>No feedback received and pitch.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queen Elizabeth Academy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not accessible at time of site visit - pitch not available for community use currently</td>
<td></td>
<td>No feedback received and pitch.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welbeck Miners Welfare</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Specific ancillary provision for club was lost following closure of mine. Club now share with</td>
<td>Grass coverage adequate and grass length good, all equipment safe at time of site visit.</td>
<td>Pitch quality and capacity impacted by heavy use of rugby pitch for football and rugby training (due to status of pitch as only floodlit pitch). Pitch quality has deteriorated over the last season due to a lack of maintenance. Waterlogging is one of the main reasons for cancellations. Pitch is of standard quality overall, but there is lots of dog fouling. There are also some issues with moles. Regular chalking is recommended. Maintenance on pitch is very limited. Greatest issues for club are quality of pitches and club house. Aspirations for training pitch with improved lighting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meden School</td>
<td></td>
<td>School changing accommodation available, but of average standard only</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pitch condition standard, reasonably flat and appear to</td>
<td>Poor drainage on site. Pitch condition average overall, although maintenance is</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>Site</td>
<td>Senior Pitches</td>
<td>Floodlit Pitches</td>
<td>Ancillary Provision</td>
<td>Site Assessment Comments</td>
<td>Quality Issues identified through consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Leisure centre facilities also available</td>
<td>have little use.</td>
<td>very limited.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Demand

11.10 There are three rugby clubs in Mansfield District running a total of 20 teams, 90% of which play at Mansfield RUFC.

11.11 Table 11.3 summarises the clubs and provides a breakdown of teams that they are running as well as their recent participation trends. It indicates that participation overall has grown. Mansfield RUFC is however the only team that offers a full range of teams from midi through to senior teams. The other clubs all offer opportunities for senior players only.

Table 11.3: Rugby Clubs in Mansfield District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Club</th>
<th>Adult</th>
<th>Colts</th>
<th>Youth</th>
<th>Midi</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Trends</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mansfield urban area</td>
<td>Mansfield RUFC</td>
<td>5 (inc Vets)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(6 including two girls teams)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>02 touch</td>
<td>Senior, youth and midi participation all increasing, while the number of colts teams run has remained static (although player numbers are becoming more difficult to maintain). Recent increase in senior participation to 4th team and Vets team. Growth in youth participation has been stimulated by new coaches, as well as an increase in the number of girls teams. New coaches with an expertise in Tag Rugby have enabled the development of U7 and U8 squads. Club also host 02 touch base weekly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodhouse Giants RUFC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Increasing number of players has led to start of development XV. There are only 25 - 30 members within the playing membership, but a small increase will see an additional team created.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warsop Parish</td>
<td>Meden Vale Rugby Club</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>Senior participation has remained static</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11.12 Mansfield RFC is a key focus club for the RFU.

Training Needs

11.13 Club training takes place as follows:

- Mansfield RUFC – the club use the onsite small sized AGP for some training sessions, as well as both the back pitch and the top of the hill. On average, the grassed areas are used for two training sessions per evening (at least 2 hours or a minimum of 1 match equivalent) while the remainder take place on the AGP. All three pitches are floodlit enabling training activity to take place. Overspill venues
are however also required, particularly when pitches at Mansfield RUFC begin to suffer from overuse. This season the club have used Joseph Whitaker School (Rainworth) as well as Berry Hill Park

- Meden Vale Rugby Club have floodlights on their pitch at Welbeck Colliery Welfare and the club use this pitch for training on a Wednesday evening (0.5 match equivalents). It should be noted however that this pitch is also used for football training on a Tuesday and Thursday (juniors) as well as by seniors on a Wednesday

- Woodhouse Giants RUFC – training takes place at Lords Ground, Mansfield (0.5 match equivalents). Club also access indoor facilities at The Brunts Academy for training as well as Manor Complex.

**Educational Demand**

11.14 The strong club base is underpinned by activity in secondary schools. While only Samworth Church Academy (two teams at U15 level) regularly play in competitive rugby in national competitions, several of the secondary schools do however have rugby pitches for school use and Mansfield RFC are working with the RFU’s All Schools Programme (with Manor Academy, Queen Elizabeth & The Brunts Academy) targeting U13+ age group and supporting the school with coaching and education. It is hoped that this will support the development of rugby union in the district and create a direct pathway to the club. Local central venue competitions are also organised as part of the Mansfield School Games programme and these are well attended. Mansfield Rugby Club is a regular venue for schools competitions and festivals.

11.15 The club also have strong links with West Notts College, linking players from the college to the club. Building upon the rugby world cup, coaches from Mansfield Rugby Club have recently been working with primary schools to run Tag and Touch themed lessons with a view to stimulating further interest in the sport. The club however are at capacity for youth teams and therefore struggle to convert any interest into club membership.

11.16 The low levels of school activity suggest that there is scope to stimulate further interest in rugby as a sport.

**Other demand**

11.17 Mansfield RUFC is also used as a base for Nottinghamshire, Lincolnshire and Derbyshire RFU sessions, and pitches are also hired on occasion to schools and colleges. This use is equivalent to circa 12 sessions per annum (potentially 0.5 - 1 match equivalent per week).

**Assessing the Supply and Demand Information and Views**

11.18 The adequacy of pitch provision for rugby is measured through the use of match equivalents. The ability of the pitch stock to service both training needs and competitive requirements is taken into account. To fully understand activity on a site, consideration is given to both:

- the adequacy of pitch provision over the course of a week; and
- capacity of a site to meet additional demand at peak time.

11.19 For rugby, this analysis is based upon the following principles;

  *Capacity over the course of a week*
11.20 The RFU sets a standard number of match equivalent sessions that natural grass pitches should be able to sustain without adversely affecting their current quality (pitch carrying capacity). This is based upon the drainage system installed at the site and the maintenance programme used to prepare the pitches. The guideline theoretical capacity for rugby pitches is summarised in Table 11.4.

Table 11.4: Theoretical Pitch Capacity Ratings (RFU)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drainage</th>
<th>Maintenance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poor (M0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Inadequate (D0)</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Adequate (D1)</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pipe Drained (D2)</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pipe and Slit Drained (D3)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11.21 Demand from each rugby club is converted into match equivalent sessions. This takes into account of both the requirement of pitches to accommodate competitive fixtures, and also the impact that training sessions will have on the capacity of pitches.

Peak Time Demand

11.22 To identify spare capacity at peak time, the number of match equivalent sessions at peak time is measured against the number of match equivalent sessions available.

- Senior men’s rugby union - Saturday PM;
- Youth rugby union - Sunday AM;
- Mini/midi rugby union - Sunday AM; and
- U18-U19 yrs ‘Colts’ rugby union –Sunday AM (male) and Sunday PM (female).

11.23 Table 11.5 therefore provides a summary of activity at each site that is available for community use and the adequacy of provision to meet demand. Further detail is provided in the spreadsheet accompanying this assessment of need.

11.24 The text that follows then explores the issues identified for each club in more detail, highlighting the areas of key concern based upon the calculations undertaken.
Table 11.5: Site Overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Club</th>
<th>Mainten ance / Capacit y Rating</th>
<th>Capacity (Senior Pitches)</th>
<th>Play on Senior Pitches</th>
<th>Match Equivalent s per week (other play)</th>
<th>Spare Capacity (Match Play)</th>
<th>Spare Capacity at Peak Time - Senior Pitches</th>
<th>Spare Capacity at Peak Time (Sun AM - Midi Pitches)</th>
<th>Pitch capacity including training Senior</th>
<th>Capacity including training (midi)</th>
<th>Overview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mansfield RUFC</td>
<td>M1/D3, M1/D1 Pitch and M1/D0 Pitch 3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>Overview</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pitches have a good maintenance programme and the first team pitch has drainage meaning site capacity is high. Despite this, high participation means pitches are overused, even when taking into account the AGP which covers much of the training activity, as well as matches up to U12 (split into two). Calculations present a best case scenario, assuming that all midi matches are played on AGPs and in this instance, grass pitches are overplayed by 4 match equivalents. Where midi matches or additional training is transferred onto grass, overplay therefore becomes even greater. Added to this, training activity is concentrated onto two of the three grass pitches (to retain quality for the first team), meaning that there is particularly extensive use on these pitches. These pitches therefore have lower capacity but receive higher use. The club indicate that recruitment is now limited by pitch capacity and availability and this is borne out by the calculations undertaken. Even if grass pitches were just used for matches, the number of pitches available to accommodate match play remains low for the number of teams.

| Lords Ground | M1/D1 based | 1 | 0.5 - 1.5 | 0.5 | 0 | 0.5 | 0 | 1 | 0.5 | Pitch quality currently does not reflect maintenance programme. Pitch capacity |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Club</th>
<th>Maintenance / Capacity Rating</th>
<th>Senior Pitches</th>
<th>Capacity (Senior Pitches)</th>
<th>Play on Senior Pitches</th>
<th>Match Equivalent(s) per week (other play)</th>
<th>Spare Capacity (Match Play)</th>
<th>Spare Capacity at Peak Time - Senior Pitches</th>
<th>Pitch capacity including training Senior</th>
<th>Capacity including training (midi)</th>
<th>Overview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Welsby Colliery Miners Welfare</td>
<td>on specification) Actual quality of pitch M0/D1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-1.5</td>
<td>therefore limited to between 0.5 and 1.5 matches per week. At best, spare capacity therefore equivalent to 0.5 matches but lack of floodlights means site cannot be used for training in winter period. The lack of on site changing facilities and medical room further reduces the attractiveness of the facility to clubs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The quality of the facility is basic but adequate, however the use of the pitch for both football and rugby match training, as well as rugby match play means that the pitch is overplayed. There are no dedicated changing facilities for the rugby team (they now share with football) meaning that capacity at the site restricts any aspirations for club growth and development.
Current Picture of Provision

11.25 Table 11.5 therefore indicates that:

- There is no community use of any of the school sites by rugby clubs – all of these facilities just accommodate curricular use. This means that there are four rugby pitches in the district that are available but not used. Until recently, Samworth Church Academy has been used by Mansfield RFC. Access to the facility has however since become more restricted and the pitch has not been used this season. Taking into account the impact of curricular use (as well as the overmarking of the rugby pitch at Manor Academy with football) spare capacity at school sites is equivalent to 4 match equivalents. One of these is located within Warsop Parish while the remainder are in Mansfield.

- There is no remaining spare capacity at Mansfield RUFC, even with the use of the AGP for both training and midi matches. Pressures on the need to realise a commercial return on the AGP increase pressure on rugby usage. The need to gain additional grass pitch or AGP access for the club is evident. The quality of maintenance is good (although could be improved with increased regularity of some techniques) and while enhancing it and installing drainage in the third pitch would increase the amount of matches that could be sustained; this alone would be insufficient to address the capacity issues. This lack of capacity is evident through the club use of additional facilities both in and outside the district (Joseph Whitaker School as well as Samworth Church Academy) and through the current freeze on recruitment due to a lack of pitches. To ensure continued growth, access to additional pitches is therefore required either through use of the school facilities that are not currently used or through the creation of new pitches.

- There is also a lack of spare capacity at Welbeck Miners Welfare (Meden Vale Rugby Club). This is caused not by match play however (there is spare capacity at peak time) but by the training that takes place on the rugby pitch by both the rugby club as well as two football training nights per week. This occurs because the rugby pitch at the club is the only pitch to offer floodlights (although they are poor). Relocation of football training would remove this capacity issue and would mean that the one pitch would be sufficient for the rugby club needs (without taking into account any aspirations for growth). The maintenance of this pitch is also particularly influential, with the poor maintenance regime limiting the starting capacity of the pitch.

- While there is sufficient capacity at the Lords Ground based upon the specification of maintenance, the actual appearance of the pitch indicates that overall capacity is lower, potentially down to 0.5 match equivalents. The use of the pitch for one match equivalent per week therefore means that pitch is at or approaching capacity. The poor quality of the facility is therefore restricting usage and again there are no opportunities for the growth of the club within the existing facility infrastructure. Although there are no permanent floodlights to support onsite training there is access to mobile floodlights (and no on site changing accommodation), pitch quality means that in its current capacity, additional use may not be sustained.

11.26 Although there are unused facilities at school sites, it should be noted that rugby is primarily a club focused sport and facilities are an essential part of the way a club is run. Use of facilities that are outside of the club base is therefore avoided as far as possible.
**Displaced and Latent Demand**

11.27 There is no evidence of displaced demand for rugby. It is however possible that latent demand exists, with the lack of pitches inhibiting the further development of Mansfield RUFC. Although the club are building relationships with primary aged children, the lack of capacity within the club (and the waiting list) means that the benefits of this cannot be maximised and that there is limited transition between school based learning and the club.

**Future Picture**

11.28 The future requirement for rugby pitches will be impacted upon by changes to the population profile, as well as club specific aspirations and changing participation trends. These issues are considered in turn in order to build an accurate picture of future demand.

**Population Change**

11.29 Team Generation Rates (TGRs) indicate how many people in a specified age group are required to generate one team. The application of TGRs to population projections enables the projection of the theoretical number of teams that would be generated from population growth and provides an understanding of future demand.

11.30 Table 11.6 summarises the current TGRs for rugby and projects the impact of population growth. It indicates that:

- There will be small decline in the number of people aged 19 - 45. The reduction in people will however have no impact on the overall demand for rugby in terms of team numbers

- the number of people aged between 13 and 18 will increase slightly but this will not be sufficient to create an additional team

- the number of players in the midi rugby age group will also increase, but again this will be insufficient to create an additional team.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sport and Age Groups</th>
<th>Current population in age group within the area</th>
<th>Current TGR</th>
<th>Future population in age group within the area</th>
<th>Potential Change in Team Numbers in Age Group Current – 2030</th>
<th>Potential Change in Team Numbers in Age Group (Number of Teams) Current - 2026</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rugby Union Senior Men (19-45yrs)</td>
<td>16930</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1693</td>
<td>-280</td>
<td>-0.165386887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rugby Union Senior Women (19-45yrs)</td>
<td>16930</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-280</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rugby Union Youth Boys (13-18yrs)</td>
<td>3380</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>845</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>0.331360947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport and Age Groups</td>
<td>Current population in age group within the area</td>
<td>Number of teams in age group within the area</td>
<td>Current TGR</td>
<td>Future population in age group within the area</td>
<td>Potential Change in Team Numbers in Age Group Current – 2030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rugby Union Youth Girls (13-18yrs)</td>
<td>3380</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1690</td>
<td>3660</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rugby Union Mini/Midi Mixed (7-12yrs)</td>
<td>6900</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1150</td>
<td>7080</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Locational Impact of Growth**

11.31 The location of growth in the district, as well as the status of the club, means that any impact is likely to be felt by Mansfield Rugby Club. The club are already at capacity and have a cap on recruitment.

**Changes in Participation Trends and club development plans**

11.32 Rugby across the district has recently increased, with all three clubs maintaining or increasing the number of teams that they are running. Further growth, as already highlighted is however now restricted by facilities at Mansfield RUFC.

11.33 While TGRs provide an indication of the potential impact of club growth directly attributable to increases in the population, the RFU believe that this is less indicative of the likely growth as a whole for rugby, with clubs having development plans in place to drive increases in the number of teams, supported by RFU development officers. Mansfield RUFC in particular is a key focus club, delivering the All Schools Programme and has also been identified for the 2016 / 2017 season as a Holding on Club Focus, where the local delivery team will work to support age groups between U16 and U18 in the transition to the adult game. In addition to the use of TGRs therefore, consideration has also been given to club aspirations for growth and the deliverability of these.

11.34 Table 11.7 therefore draws upon the information outlined above, as well as the aspired levels of growth at each club, based upon club aspirations and RFU targets to evaluate the degree to which existing pitches at the club bases are able to accommodate the projected increase in demand, and the issues that would need to be addressed to ensure that growth can be accommodated. It should be noted however that growth plans are over a shorter term than the strategy period and should therefore be reconsidered as part of the monitoring process.

**Table 11.7: Adequacy of Existing Provision to Meet Projected Future Demand**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Club</th>
<th>Current Position</th>
<th>Impact of Population Growth</th>
<th>Likely from Growth Club (Club / RFU)</th>
<th>Ability of Site to sustain growth</th>
<th>Issues to address to ensure growth can be accommodated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mansfield RUFC</td>
<td>Overplay equivalent to 4 match. Lack of spare capacity at peak time for junior / midi and</td>
<td>No definitive additional number of teams.</td>
<td>Club looking to increase number of girls teams, as well as adult teams and additional U7</td>
<td>Capacity of the existing site is insufficient to accommodate the level of current play.</td>
<td>Additional capacity required through use of additional sites or extension of existing site (or</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Club | Current Position | Impact of Population Growth | Likely from Development (Club / RFU) | Growth Club | Ability of Site to sustain growth | Issues to address to ensure growth be accommodated
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | ---
AGP also full accommodating existing teams. Three floodlit pitches and AGP allow some spread of training, but pitch quality suffering from overuse. | and U8 tag teams. RFU initiatives to sustain players at older youth age may also see further requirement for pitch. | Growth aspirations cannot be accommodated and changing facilities would also be insufficient. | further provision). If current and projected future demand was to be met, to future proof the club, at least 2 further grass pitches would be needed. Ideally these would be floodlit to reduce demand on other pitches.

### Woodhouse Giants RUFC
Existing provision inhibited by quality. If maintenance was improved, spare capacity equivalent to 1 match equivalent | n/a | Club have aspirations for second team. No known plans for junior or midi team creation | One pitch sufficient for existing aspirations | Maintenance regime improvements Floodlights Improvement of existing drainage

### Meden Vale RUFC
Existing provision sufficient to meet demands of current teams for both matches and training. Overplay (2 match equivalents) however generated by use of rugby pitch for training by football club. | n/a | Club looking to create an additional senior male team as well as start a junior section with a youth team. | Assuming issues with overplay addressed, capacity sufficient to sustain additional adult team. Creation of junior / midi teams would require further pitch provision longer term. | Pitch quality improvements - improved maintenance regime Improved capacity for football (to reduce use of rugby pitch for training)

---

**Forthcoming Changes to Supply**

11.35 There are no confirmed changes to the supply of rugby pitches in Mansfield District area. Reflecting the capacity issues identified however, Mansfield RUFC are looking to secure additional pitches to support training activity and are currently working with the Trust to extend their site.

11.36 Welbeck FC (Welbeck Colliery Welfare) are also exploring opportunities to increase their facilities for football. This may have a positive knock on impact for rugby if it results in a reduction of the use of the rugby pitch for football training. Meden Vale RFC (playing at this site), in conjunction with football, are looking to develop a training facility which would reduce the use of the rugby pitch.
11.37 It should also be noted that Sherwood Wolf Hunt Rugby League club are currently considering the establishment of a rugby union element. The club play at Debdale Park and would seek to house any play at this site. This may be a longer term goal and may be difficult to achieve, as pitch provision is already relatively constrained during the winter months at Debdale Park Sport and Recreation Centre.

**Key Issues**

11.38 The key issues to address for rugby union are summarised in the summary section in Section 12.
12: Summary

Introduction

12.1 This assessment of relevant pitch based sports (football, rugby league, rugby union, cricket and hockey) and non-pitch sports (bowls, tennis and athletics) within Mansfield district fulfils the Council’s need to plan positively for the future in relation to its sports provision now and into the future. It was carried out in accordance with Sports England’s Playing Pitch Strategy Guidance: An approach to developing and delivering a playing pitch strategy (October 2013). Please see Appendix C for a completed checklist demonstrating the requirements of this guidance have been met.

12.2 Through this assessment, accessibility including the availability of community use, quality, existing supply and demand, and future projected demand have informed options for addressing future need. This is the start and not the end of the process for improving the provision of outdoor sports facilities. The strategy will need to be kept up to date, as per Sport England guidance, in order to ensure that it remains relevant and robust. The guidance states that:

• ‘Ideally the PPS could be reviewed on an annual basis from the date it is formally signed off by the steering group. This will help to maintain the momentum and commitment that would have been built up when developing the PPS.

• Taking into account the time to develop the PPS this should also help to ensure that the original supply and demand information is no more than two years old without being reviewed.’

12.3 This assessment informs the Mansfield District Playing Pitch Strategy which provides SMART actions for meeting identified needs. These will be carried out through a partnership approach between Mansfield District Council, Sports Bodies (National Governing Bodies or NGBs), clubs and other relevant organisations.

12.4 Both the assessment and the strategy have been informed through consultation with relevant sports bodies, clubs, Council officers, and schools. This consultation has involved feedback through wider steering group engagement sessions, surveys and questionnaires, and one-to-one meetings.

12.5 This requires that key partners to work together to share and pool resources (e.g. financial, expertise, equipment, people, etc.), where possible, to maximise the benefits to the community. The finding in the assessment should help shape and direct specific plans.

Key Priorities

12.6 The following table summarises strategic priorities identified through some of the key issues and opportunities for sports provision in the district, as expressed in this playing pitch assessment. These help to highlight where actions should be prioritised.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key priorities</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maximise the potential for sports development to provide positive contributions towards further regenerating in the district.</td>
<td>The district is has been heavily influenced by its industrial past, with coal mining and textiles thriving until their decline in the 1980’s. Residents are proud of the district’s industrial and textile past but also share a need to look positively to the future. There is a strong identity and legacy of sports in the district with it being home to Olympic and other top athletes, Mansfield Football. Partnership working is essential for improving the quality of the district’s sporting resources and creating a positive regeneration focus.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Use sport to help support the health and well-being benefits for residents, including increasing participation in sports. | Overall, there is a strong need to improve health and wellbeing and address deprivation inequalities in the district, with local health indicator being lower than regional and national averages. Residents have good levels of participation in sports and club membership which offers a positive starting point to draw from. This need to improve health and wellbeing is supported through Mansfield District Council’s strategic vision and priorities, the emerging Local Plan and the vision and objectives of this playing pitch strategy. Key themes include:  
  - supporting people to live longer through healthier lifestyles  
  - encouraging active lifestyles through increased participation in sport  
  - protecting, maintaining and enhancing green and open spaces  
  - support access to community green and open spaces |
| Maintain and improve access to good quality community accessible sports provision and open space for residents. | Overall, the district’s residents have adequate access to a range of sports provision. There are some good examples of high quality provision which needs to be maintained but improvements are still required to ensure sites area used to their full potential and that all demand is met. There are some recognised areas for improvements to quality and access. These include:  
  - A need to enhance the quality of football pitches as well as maintenance procedures used on key sites  
  - A requirement for further AGP provision to support the growth of the game  
  - A need to secure long term access to important sites for |
**Key priorities**

- A need to maintain and improve the quality of cricket pitches across the district, both for match play and training.
- The need for an additional cricket pitch to support the needs of a new team.
- A need to provide additional grass rugby pitches to support the needs of Mansfield RUFC and further floodlit pitches to improve facilities for other clubs.
- A need to invest in the AGP at Manor Sports Complex to provide ongoing facilities for hockey.
- A need to improve the quality of public tennis courts.
- A requirement to provide structured access to school sites for tennis.
- Improvements to signage and changing for Mansfield Tennis Club.
- Improvement of bowling green surfaces and changing accommodation.

**Support the shared connections for provision between neighbouring local authority areas such as, Ashfield district, Newark and Sherwood district and also areas slightly further afield such as Worksop and Chesterfield.**

**Summary**

Demand for playing pitches does not stop at local authority boundaries and as illustrated in this assessment, there is cross boundary movement with teams from Mansfield using facilities in neighbouring authorities and other teams travelling to Mansfield. This playing pitch assessment considers the usage patterns of clubs and demonstrates that pitch provision in Mansfield is important to teams in other authorities, many of whom travel into the district to play. Likewise, teams based in Mansfield use facilities in neighbouring authorities. Such cross boundary usage includes:

- Local football leagues running on a single venue basis for each age group, and venues are located in different authorities.
- Football clubs travelling to nearby authorities to access suitable 3g training facilities.
- A hockey club based in Mansfield travelling into Ashfield District to play.

Shared connections between authorities are therefore essential if resources are to be maximised and pitch provision is to meet supply and demand. This playing pitch assessment therefore takes into account the role that facilities and clubs in neighbouring authorities play, and seeks to promote integrated provision across local authority boundaries.
12: Summary

Key priorities

| Better understand and support the multi-use of grass and artificial grass pitches | This assessment outlines the role that grass and artificial pitches currently play across Mansfield and demonstrates that there is scope to increase use of some sites, while others are already at capacity. Many sites are home to clubs of more than one sport, which maximises the use of resources, but brings with it challenges (for example lack of time for out of season maintenance and more limited opportunities for pitches to rest).

Some gaps in provision are identified and multi-use of some pitch sites will both enable these deficiencies to be met, but will also maximise the sustainability of pitch provision across the district.

| Explore how sites be better sustained into the future through a partnership approach. | A variety of issues are identified that contribute towards running a successful pitch site. Pitch quality is as important as quantity, and this is demonstrated through extensive club feedback, as well as analysis on the impact that quality has on capacity. Budgets are however becoming more restricted and there are greater pressures on maintenance and other resources. Cross partnership working can maximise the use of resources, improve access to funding pots and most importantly, ensure that all available skill sets are utilised.

Inclusive Sports

12.7 In addition to the above, it will be important to plan positively for sports provision and programmes that encourage inclusivity for people with disabilities.

12.8 This assessment takes account of any known use of facilities included in this assessment by disabled people and any issues associated with this usage are raised.

12.9 Current and also future strategy work will aspire to improve accessibility to sports provision, through partnership.

Identifying needs, deficits and surpluses

12.10 This playing pitch assessment and strategy adequately addresses the National Planning Policy’s requirement to identify needs, deficits and/or surpluses of sports provision in the district. These needs are summarised in Table 12.2 below.

12.11 It is important to note that the Mansfield District Playing Pitch Assessment and Strategy should be read alongside the Mansfield District Community Open Space Assessment (2017), Strategic Green Infrastructure related background documents or their relevant replacements. Together these documents provide the evidence to support the protection, enhancement and, where appropriate, rationalisation of community accessible open space and sports provision in the district.
Summary of individual sports assessed needs

12.12 Table 12.2 brings together the findings for each sport set out in Sections 4 – 11 and summarises the key issues emerging for each sport. These in turn form the basis of the Action Plans set out in the separate report.
### Summary

#### Assessment Findings

**RUGBY LEAGUE**

**Supply**
- There is just one rugby league pitch in Mansfield District, at Debdale Park Sports and Recreation Club.
- The pitch is secured with perimeter fencing and is of standard quality, with a flat surface and good grass coverage. There have however been some issues with compacting and the pitch is wet with holes in parts. Improving maintenance procedures are seeing this be addressed and rapid improvements are experienced. The pitch is also accompanied by strong ancillary facilities, including full changing provision and a bar.

**Demand**
- Sherwood Wolf are the only rugby league club in the district, based at the pitch at Debdale Sports and Recreation Centre. The club have been running for 2 years and currently have a senior team, playing in the Midlands League (Senior team) as well as a development team.
- There is limited participation in schools, with no schools entering RFL school competitions, but the club have significant aspirations for development, including the creation of a junior section as well as further senior teams. The club are working with other midlands clubs to develop strong foundations for junior rugby league across the region.
- The club are currently happy with their existing facilities and the RFL believe that the site creates a strong foundation for the future development of rugby league in the town.

**Adequacy of Provision**
- With just two teams using the pitch for competitive play, there is spare capacity both at peak time and across the week. Taking into account training activity which also takes place during the summer months on the pitch, as the pitch is standard quality, additional match equivalents could be accommodated during the week, but just 0.25 at peak time (the existing development team play twice monthly). The existing pitch stock is therefore sufficient to accommodate current demand.
- Population growth will have no impact upon the demand for rugby league, with a decline in the number of people in age groups to play adult forms of the game and no existing junior teams. Future growth in the sport is therefore likely to be driven by the efforts of the club to spread interest in rugby league in Mansfield.

---

**Specific Facility Needs**

- Retention of existing pitch for use by Sherwood Wolf Hunt RLFC.
- Ongoing maintenance of pitch to retain existing quality.
- Pitch provision currently adequate, but possible future requirement for additional pitches if significant club growth was to be generated.
**Assessment Findings**

- **CRICKET**
  - There are five sites containing grass facilities for cricket and a total of 6 pitches provided. All are available for community use. There are also five sites containing non turf wickets but no grass pitches.
  - There are also two disused grass pitches, at The Racecourse and Forest Road. Both have previously contained grass cricket pitches but have not been maintained as such for several years. Both also contain old non turf wickets which are no longer functional for cricket. The non-turf wicket at Manor Sports Complex is also unusable. The strategy document will need to consider the future of these sites for cricket.
  - Pitch quality is a key component of successful cricket provision and there is a consensus that there has been a recent improvement in the standard of facilities. Mansfield and District Cricket league attribute this to the time and effort taken to maintain the facilities provided.
  - Reflecting this, assessments indicate that the overall quality of current cricket pitches in Mansfield District is fair to good. None of the pitches within the district have been the subject of feedback relating to poor or unsuitable cricket pitches this year during the league season. The pitches at the John Fretwell Sporting Complex are the highest quality pitches in the district, with both pitches

**Specific Facility Needs**

- Training facilities - Clipstone CC, non turf wicket, replacement of facility at Chesterfield Road
- Improvement to pavilion - Chesterfield Road (leak) and Clipstone Miners Welfare - club prioritising extension to existing facilities
- Declining adult participation and static junior participation
- Provision adequate to meet demand currently, although constrained at peak time. New site potentially needed for team
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- There are relatively few quality issues identified, with the only concerns raised in relation to the actual pitch quality relating to the evenness of the outfield. This reflects the league assessments, which indicate that all pitches are adequate to meet current requirements. It should be noted however that with the exception of pitches at the John Fretwell Centre (good) all facilities are standard, and functional but relatively basic in comparison to some other areas. The pitches belonging to some clubs in neighbouring authorities are also significantly higher quality than those in Mansfield.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- There are also few concerns with the training opportunities provided. This contrasts with the current picture of cricket nationally, where facilities for training are often a key issue. All clubs have access to mobile training nets and only Clipstone CC require a non turf wicket. The non turf wicket at Chesterfield Road Recreation Ground is however also poor and in need of reinstatement works if it is to remain functional.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The availability of changing facilities is also good, with all sites having a minimum of changing rooms and separate rooms and all are heated. All clubs also have access to social facilities although some minor improvements are required (Chesterfield Recreation Ground / Clipstone Miners Welfare).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- There are 22 cricket teams currently playing in Mansfield District in total. Of these, 15 are adult teams. 32% of teams (7) are therefore junior teams. Half of these teams are based in the Warsop Sub area at the John Fretwell Centre, while the remainder are in Mansfield.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Reflecting the lower levels of participation just two of the clubs have junior sections. The junior section at Mansfield CC recently folded - this was attributed to players going elsewhere in search of better facilities for matches and training and a higher standard of play. Mansfield Youth League has also experience significant decline, with significantly fewer teams than 10 years ago.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- In addition to the teams based within Mansfield, the John Fretwell Centre also hosts higher standard cricket. The site is now home to the Nottinghamshire Ladies Cricket Team, as well as the Nottinghamshire Male second team and is also a host ground for county age group fixtures. As well as adding extra demand for cricket facilities in the district, these high level games also raise the profile of the sport and could be a positive tool to support increases in participation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- There has been a recent decline in adult male cricket, with the total number of adults playing reducing. Mansfield CC, Sherwood Colliery CC have both lost teams this season and playing numbers at Welbeck CC are also declining. The Bassetlaw and District Cricket league are also experiencing starting in 2016 season. Role of disused pitches at the Racecourse and Forest Road in providing for this team to be considered.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
decline and their research demonstrates that key barriers to participation are the length of the game, finish times, costs and travel distances. They are currently looking at removing some of these barriers, as well as relaxing quality requirements in the lower divisions to stimulate play

- There is limited participation in secondary schools although the ECB Chance to Shine programme has been delivered in several primary schools. Clubs indicate that there has been relatively limited transition from school to club.

### Adequacy of Provision

- Adequacy of provision for cricket is measured across the season rather than weekly as with other sports. All in the district have capacity for additional play across the season

- There is only limited spare capacity at Debdale Park Sport and Recreation Centre (Sherwood Colliery CC) although site visits indicate that further strips could be prepared on this square if required. Spare capacity at the John Fretwell Centre is influenced by the use of the facility by representative teams, but there is also spare capacity at Clipstone CC, as well as at Chesterfield Road Recreation Ground and Queen Elizabeth Academy

- Across the district as a whole, spare capacity equates to circa 17 strips, which could accommodate around 8 further adult teams (or equivalent junior teams)

- Spare capacity at peak time is more restricted, with just 1 match equivalent available on the currently active sites (at Queen Elizabeth Academy, due to the loss of the fourth team in Mansfield CC). Both Racecourse Park and Forest Road have however previously contained cricket pitches and are no longer used for this purpose. Reinstatement of these facilities would add additional capacity to the existing stock of facilities within the district

- Changes to the population profile alone will have no clear impact on the demand for cricket, with a slight decline in the number of people in the age groups most likely to play senior cricket and only a very small increase in the number of junior residents. This is likely to only contribute towards improving player numbers rather than creating additional teams

- None of the cricket clubs within Mansfield District indicate that they are actively looking to increase participation currently and instead, most are seeking to remain stable and / or reverse the decline that they have recently experienced. The only known aspirations relate to a new team that are hoping to start playing in 2016. The requirement for new pitches will therefore be dictated by any increases in participation that can be driven through sports development initiatives, whether through the current
### Key Issues to Address - Summary

- Adult participation in cricket in the district is declining and foundations for junior cricket are also limited. Local research demonstrates that there is a need to explore opportunities to remove barriers and to develop alternative opportunities for cricket to attract a new demographic for the sport. There is little appetite for growth within the existing club structure however, with most clubs focused on sustainability and the retention of existing players.

- The quality of existing cricket pitches is adequate, although there is an ongoing requirement to ensure that maintenance procedures are retained to ensure pitch quality.

- There is no non-turf wicket at Clipstone Cricket Club and the existing facility at Chesterfield Road Recreation Ground is in poor condition. This impacts on ability to grow and develop and can also create extra demand on grass squares.

### Summary

#### Assessment Findings

**HOCKEY**

**Supply**

- There is one full sized AGP in the district suitable for hockey, located at Manor Sports and Recreation Centre. The pitch at Brunts Academy cannot be used for hockey.

- The pitch at Manor Sports and Recreation Centre is of standard quality, having been through a rejuvenation process in 2013 including the replacement of the sand based surface. The pitch is currently in good to standard condition with few issues identified and is located to the north of the district in Mansfield Woodhouse.

**Demand**

- There are two hockey clubs associated with Mansfield District running a total of 13 adult teams and a junior section. North Notts Hockey Club are based in the district at Manor Sports Centre and operate male and female teams, as well as a junior section, meaning that there are opportunities for progression in hockey in the district. Mansfield Hockey Club are displaced, playing at Kingsway Park in Ashfield District.

- Both clubs are happy with the quality of their existing facilities (both have received recent investment) but Mansfield HC are seeking relocation back into Mansfield due to the affiliation of the club with the league channels or through changing formats to the game.

#### Specific Facility Needs

- Retention of existing pitch for use for Hockey
- Ongoing maintenance of pitch to retain existing quality
- Existing pitch at capacity and club displaced - Potential requirement for additional pitches, although the sustainability of such a new facility should be questioned given the relatively low levels of midweek use.
area and would ideally wish to be located in the West Notts College area

- Both clubs however believe that a shortage of facilities is now starting to inhibit demand, and in particular, the requirement for Mansfield Hockey Club to travel is detrimental to the clubs opportunities to recruit and retain players. North Notts HC also use some facilities outside of the district (in Worksop) due to a lack of capacity within the district itself.

- There is limited participation in hockey in schools currently, with no engagement with Mansfield clubs, meaning that any transfer of interest is likely to be to clubs in Worksop. This means that the foundations for the growth of hockey in the district are currently minimal.

- Similarly, there are no JAC / JDC taking place in the district and no evidence of demand currently. Previous attempts to host such sessions in Mansfield have been unsuccessful.

- Adequacy of Provision

  - There is some spare capacity at Manor Sports Complex however this is primarily on a Sunday, and in earlier or late slots midweek. This means that there is limited scope to increase the amount of activity that takes place on this site. The use of the facility for football as well as hockey midweek provides further pressure. If training requirements were to increase significantly, capacity to accommodate this increase would be limited.

  - England Hockey indicates that an AGP should be considered able to sustain a maximum of four games per day. As peak time demand from North Notts Hockey Club is equivalent to 4.5 match equivalents, this means that the pitch at Manor Sport and Recreation Complex is already at capacity. This is reflected in the use of the overspill pitch in Worksop by the club. The club have also negotiated with the league this season to play some fixtures on a Sunday morning in order to ensure that all required matches can be accommodated on the club pitch.

  - If Mansfield HC are also to be accommodated within the district there is insufficient capacity, and unmet demand equivalent to circa 2 match equivalents taking into account displacement for both Mansfield HC and North Notts HC.

  - Population growth will have no impact upon the demand for hockey, with a decline in the number of people in age groups to play adult forms of the game and insufficient junior foundations to generate growth. Future growth in the sport is therefore likely to be driven by the efforts of the clubs and their success in achieving development aspirations.

  - As existing provision is already insufficient to meet demand (2 match equivalents) within the district,
further growth in participation would see this exacerbated.

Key Issues to Address - Summary

- There is a need to retain the existing sand based AGP to maintain a level of provision for North Notts HC
- The existing sand based pitch will require update and further resurfacing work over the course of the strategy period
- Mansfield HC are displaced and looking to relocate back into the district and North Notts HC are also at capacity at their existing site. Across the district, there is a deficit of 2 match equivalents and this will increase further if club development aspirations are achieved. Further growth in hockey is likely however to be required if any additional provision can be sustained.

Summary Assessment Findings

OUTDOOR BOWLS

Supply

- There are 9 active greens on eight sites across Mansfield. Of these, two are located in Warsop Parish and the rest in Mansfield town. Five greens have recently been shut (two converted to petanque), two abandoned and one converted to a football pitch
- The quality of greens is wide ranging but all sites are serviceable. In particular, site visits revealed particular issues with maintenance. These impact upon the quality of the surface and are likely to cause degeneration over the course of a season. Generally, the greens are compacted and several exhibited thatching of the grass sward and moss and weed species within. Some investment in aeration, weed killing, fertilizer and verticutting is required. While this was particularly evident on Council greens, it was also found at private sites. The quality of greens at John Fretwell Centre and Mansfield Bowls Club was much higher than other sites
- Clubs expressed similar views although overall they were satisfied with facilities provided. General issues raised were the requirement for improved maintenance during both the off season and during the bowling season itself, issues with vandalism and graffiti, and the negative impact that youths congregating around the greens have on perceived safety and required improvements to the toilets, changing and clubhouse facilities. Several site specific issues were identified.

Specific Facility Needs

- Scope to increase use of existing sites - no further bowling greens required
- Playing surface / maintenance improvements; Racecourse Park, Queensway Park, John Fretwell Centre.
- Pavilion / clubhouse improvements - Longden Terrace Miners Welfare Bowling Green. Maintenance improvements at all sites.

Demand

- There are active clubs on all current sites
- Distances travelled by bowlers to greens in Mansfield vary, with 34% travelling less than one mile, 18%
### Summary

- Travelling between 1 and 3 miles and 26% travelling 3 to five miles. 21% travel more than five miles.
- Manor Park Bowls Club, Queensway Park Bowls Club and Clipstone Social Club have the most local catchments, while Tichfield and Soholme, Brierley Park Bowls Club and Mansfield Bowls Club have the highest proportion of members that are travelling greater distances. Notably, these are the higher quality facilities, suggesting that participants are travelling to reach better quality greens and clubs with social facilities.

### Assessment Findings

- All clubs have capacity for new members and are actively seeking new participants. Average membership is just 36 (optimum levels are 80 – 100), 24 when excluding the two clubs with high membership. The sharing of greens by some clubs means that membership per green is slightly higher, at 41 per green on average (33 when excluding Mansfield Bowls Club, which skews figures). This remains relatively low however. Higher levels of membership help maximise sustainability through increased income, which will be required to support the management and maintenance of greens. Bowls England indicates that a club should seek to have 80 - 100 members and that clubs with below 20 are unsustainable. Longden Terrace Bowls Club and Bull Farm Bowls Club both have below 25 members.

- The profile of participants is clearly skewed towards males, with 70% of members being male. This is unusual and suggests that there may be latent demand from female participants. There is also a lack of junior players.

- Locally in Mansfield, most clubs are not affiliated to Bowls England (just Queensway Bowls Club and Brierley Park Bowls Club are), instead being associated to the Nottinghamshire Bowls Federation, which is part of the English Bowling Federation or England Women’s Bowling Federation. This is an organisation which has less stringent laws of the game with regard to the condition of bowling greens. Nottinghamshire is currently identified as a hotspot area for the Bowls Development Alliance however (funding for 2014 - 2017) and there is a development officer working in the area. Funding is available to support clubs with recruitment and retention of players, as well as to support coach development. This initiative has led to successful increases in participation in clubs across Nottinghamshire, with increase of up to 50% of club membership seen.

### Specific Facility Needs

- Just over half of all clubs are dissatisfied with provision. There are no clear patterns to the dissatisfaction (with clubs using both public and private greens responding in both ways, although some refer to grounds they must play on away from home) but all clubs that are dissatisfied attribute this to the perception that there are not enough greens of appropriate quality. This also links with the membership.

- Sports development initiatives to increase membership of existing...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Assessment Findings</th>
<th>Specific Facility Needs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>statistics, which suggest that players are travelling to facilities deemed to be higher quality</td>
<td>clubs and improve sustainability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• There is therefore no demand for additional facilities based upon current participation, with recent membership numbers declining and all clubs having spare capacity. The quality of greens and the recruitment of additional players to ensure sustainability of clubs is viewed as being of much greater priority by both clubs and providers</td>
<td>No requirement for additional greens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Population growth is likely to have a greater impact on the supply and demand for bowls than for other sports due to the ageing population. Low existing participation levels however means that this is only likely to increase by 6 players as a direct result of population growth. Assuming that membership of all greens is even, this would mean average membership remaining static. If higher participation rates were used (source: Active People), this growth would increase to 86 players per green and provision would still be sufficient to meet demand (optimum membership 80 – 100). The location of housing growth and/or changing patterns of membership are unlikely to cause one club to reach capacity, with the exception of Mansfield Bowling Green, which is already approaching capacity and is located in close proximity to large developments. This site is popular due to the quality of facilities and social opportunities provided</td>
<td>Site specific qualitative improvements needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Future participation in bowls is therefore only likely to grow significantly if a more aggressive approach to recruitment is taken by clubs. Most clubs do little marketing of existing opportunities outside of word of mouth and leafleting currently and there has been little growth in the sport, with some who have been involved in the sport in the area for years expressing concerns about the decline in the number of members, and in the number of teams entered into league and cup fixtures. Clubs also demonstrated an aspiration for support in this area and the Bowls Alliance are keen to work with proactive clubs to develop membership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Without participation increases, or in the event of further decline in participation, sustainability of existing club sites will remain the key challenge to address. Clubs highlight the importance of increasing support and the challenges that they face with sustainability and this will be a key issue moving forwards. The retention of existing bowling greens and increasing the usage of these facilities therefore represents the key priority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The quality of facilities is also a concern at some sites, in particular with issues relating to the maintenance of greens identified. It is clear that the number of members is higher at clubs with better quality facilities and offering social facilities and members are travelling further to reach these sites.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Summary

Assessment Findings

- Highlights the importance of improvements to other facilities to ensure that they are able to attract similar membership numbers.

### Key Issues to Address - Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specific Facility Needs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>While all bowling greens currently have active clubs, the number of players at each site is low. To ensure that this infrastructure remains sustainable, there is a need to increase participation and to raise awareness of opportunities that are available. While all clubs have capacity for new members, there is little targeted activity taking place other than flyers and leaflets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The importance of maintaining the quality of existing facilities is clear, with higher memberships evident at club sites where facilities are better. There are several quality issues that need to be addressed - these include improvements to the green surface and the toilet wash facilities. Improvements to the maintenance regimes are also required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no demand for additional bowling greens currently and if participation does not increase, the existing network of facilities may become unsustainable.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TENNIS

**Supply**

- There are 33 active tennis courts with community use. These courts are split between public (park) sites, schools and private clubs. Only a small proportion of these courts are floodlit (7) and there are no courts with public use available in the Warsop area.

- Parks courts (10 in total) are free to access. There is just one club (Mansfield Tennis Club, with 9 Courts) and the remainder of provision is at school sites. Just 10 courts are floodlit, a relatively small proportion. There has been a recent decline in the amount of tennis courts, with the loss of courts at Yeoman Hill Park following public consultation and reduction in provision at Racecourse and Carr Bank Park (equipment not up).

- All active sites are functional but quality varies significantly. Mansfield TC is the highest quality site, although some parts of the facility are tired and there is a requirement for an improved pavilion. Council and school sites are largely functional although there are some loose materials (Carr Bank) and paint wearing off some courts (Racecourse). Some school sites tired and of limited quality.

### Specific Facility Needs

- Scope to increase use of existing sites - no further courts required at public / school venues.

- Mansfield LTC improved pavilion. Some minor updates required to courts (including new posts etc). Club wish to floodlight further courts / add a covered area to enhance the number of participants.

- Public courts - improved surface.
although all are functional hard courts, often also containing netball markings

- The distribution of tennis courts is relatively poor, with no facilities to the south of the town and only All Saints Catholic School (which is not open to the public) to the west. While the town is compact and therefore accessible, local access may encourage more people to play. There is also a lack of access in Warsop.

- Demand

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demand</th>
<th>Adequacy of Provision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Existing participation takes place in many forms, including membership of the club, pay and play activity at school sites and more informal (free of charge) play in public parks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• While the unmonitored access to public parks means that exact levels of participation are not known anecdotally, there is significant scope to increase usage of the facilities. Linking with their new strategy, the LTA see increasing participation in public parks as a key priority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Like at public parks, responding schools reveal that there is scope to increase use of facilities, with all school courts underused outside of curricular hours</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Membership of the club has increased following recent decline and the club believe that they are effectively recruiting new members through offering a variety of opportunities, as well as creating links with secondary schools and West Notts College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reflecting the three forms of participation in the district, the LTA strategic plan seeks to get more people playing tennis more often through the delivery of initiatives in three strands, specifically</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Delivering service to clubs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Participation focus - delivery of strong local park and community tennis venues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Enhancing the tennis offer in education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• There are no formal models for evaluating supply and demand for tennis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| • LTA research indicates that on average 65% of those playing during the summer will use public facilities, while 50% playing all year round will choose to play at community sites rather than as part of a club. Based on this, and using indicative LTA court capacity parameters, analysis suggests that there is capacity within the existing club base to accommodate both current and projected participation, assuming that the proportion of residents playing tennis (0.3%) doesn’t change. The existing stock of (Carr Bank Park), improved markings and fencing (Racecourse Park) Opportunities to enhance school sites through improved line markings / surface (Manor Sport and Recreation Centre / Garibaldi College)
facilities can accommodate circa 1680 players, while existing participation equates to circa 310. There is also capacity in the existing club base, with space for up to 295 new members.

- Active People however indicates that there is significant latent demand for tennis, suggesting that there is an opportunity to increase participation above current levels. If this latent demand was realised, provision would fall below levels required. There is however no real evidence for the provision of additional tennis courts to meet current needs, as there is scope to increase activity levels within the existing infrastructure.

- The degree of spare capacity therefore indicates that there is no requirement for additional courts to meet current demand. Indeed, to ensure the sustainability of the existing network in facilities, there is a need to increase participation and maximise usage.

- Overall therefore, there is capacity to increase tennis activity across the district without new provision, with scope to increase usage of all types of facility. While there is significant capacity within the club, to ensure a balanced offer for tennis, it is important that a range of opportunities with different access arrangements are provided. Not all existing or potential players would wish to be in a formal club environment and this is reflected in the range of groups that are attracted to tennis according to Sport England Market Segmentation. Facilities at schools and parks are therefore a key component of the overall tennis infrastructure in the district.

- The quality of existing provision is however varied, and some quality issues are identified with public courts and school sites which may inhibit aspirations to grow the game. Mansfield LTC also identify some improvements that they believe are required to support increased activity.

---

**Key Issues to Address**

- There are sufficient tennis courts overall offering a variety of access arrangements and no evidence of a requirement for additional facilities. There is however insufficient awareness, promotion and use of many of these facilities and a need to drive tennis participation to ensure that facilities remain sustainable and that all sites within the existing infrastructure are valuable. Insight into tennis participation suggests that all three tiers of provision are required. There is particular scope to make better use of school facilities which are currently heavily underused.

- The condition of facilities in public parks is limited and the courts are underused. Quality of facilities is a key deterrent to usage. There are also some quality issues that need to be addressed at the club (new pavilion) as well as at school sites if use is to increase.

- The distribution of existing facilities is poor, with little provision to the south or west and no facilities in Mansfield Woodhouse.

- Tennis provides a strong opportunity to increase participation across the district, with a high quantity of latent demand evident. The key...
barriers to the development of tennis will need to be overcome if this is to be addressed. If participation does not increase, it may become more difficult to sustain the existing network of facilities.

### Summary Assessment Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RUGBY UNION</th>
<th>Specific Facility Needs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supply</strong></td>
<td><strong>Some capacity issues means more pitches are required - Increase capacity for Mansfield RFC</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are ten rugby union pitches in Mansfield District</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eight of the ten pitches are located in the Mansfield area of the district. Welbeck Miners Welfare and Meden School are the only sites in Warsop Parish</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are three sites in the district with fully secured community use - Mansfield Rugby Club, Welbeck Miners Welfare and the Lords Ground and these contain more than half of the pitches in the district. The remainder of pitches are all located at school sites and while most are currently available, the status of these facilities as academies means that there is limited control over long term access to these sites.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are only two sites containing floodlit rugby pitches - all three pitches at Mansfield Rugby Club are floodlit and the pitch at Welbeck Miners Welfare is also floodlit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In addition to the above pitches, there is a small sized AGP at Mansfield Rugby Club. This pitch is World Rugby compliant and can therefore be used for rugby training as well as small sided matches (up to U12). The facility is also let out to other clubs (primarily football) and provides the club with a source of income, which can restrict rugby use.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Demand** | Improve quality at Lords Ground |
| There are three rugby clubs in Mansfield District running a total of 20 teams, 90% of which play at Mansfield RUFC |
| Mansfield RUFC is the only team that offers a full range of teams from midi through to senior teams. The other clubs all offer opportunities for senior players only |
| Participation overall in rugby has grown. The location of growth in the district, as well as the status of the club, means that any impact is likely to be felt by Mansfield Rugby Club. The club are already at
• Rugby across the district has recently increased, with all three clubs maintaining or increasing the number of teams that they are running. Further growth, as already highlighted is however now restricted by facilities at Mansfield RUFC.

### Adequacy of Provision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Issues to Address - Summary</th>
<th>Address capacity issues at club sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Address quality issues, which include:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• There is no remaining spare capacity at Mansfield RUFC, even with the use of the AGP for both training and midi matches.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• There is also a lack of spare capacity at Welbeck Miners Welfare (Meden Vale Rugby Club). This is caused not by match play however (there is spare capacity at peak time) but by the training that takes place on the rugby pitch by both the rugby club as well as two football training nights per week. This occurs because the rugby pitch at the club is the only pitch to offer floodlights (although they are poor). Relocation of football training would remove this capacity issue and would mean that the one pitch would be sufficient for the rugby club needs (without taking into account any aspirations for growth). The maintenance of this pitch is also particularly influential, with the poor maintenance regime limiting the starting capacity of the pitch.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• While there is sufficient capacity at the Lords Ground based upon the specification of maintenance, the actual appearance of the pitch indicates that overall capacity is lower, potentially down to 0.5 match equivalents. The use of the pitch for one match equivalent per week therefore means that pitch is at or approaching capacity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The poor quality of the facility restricting usage and again there are no opportunities for the growth of the club within the existing facility infrastructure. Although there are no permanent floodlights to support onsite training there is access to mobile floodlights (and no on site changing accommodation), pitch quality means that in its current capacity, additional use may not be sustained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• There is no community use of any of the school sites by rugby clubs – all of these facilities just accommodate curricular use. This means that there are four rugby pitches in the district that are available but not used. Increased access would add to the supply and help to address capacity issues.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- a requirement for additional and improved maintenance, in particular decompaction;
- the impact of overuse of pitches
- a lack of appropriate changing facilities
- a lack of available training floodlights

- Seek to establish new joint-working / partnerships with schools to help address capacity issues

### Summary

#### Assessment Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FOOTBALL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### Supply

- There are 67 individual formal grass football pitches currently available for community use across Mansfield District.

- There is a spread of pitches of different sizes across the district, with 58% of pitches being 11v11 (adult or youth) and the remainder catering for younger age groups.

- Just 58% of grass pitches offer secured access, suggesting that the stock of facilities is subject to change. This is almost entirely due to the conversion of schools within the district to academy status, meaning that they have greater control of their own facilities.

- Within Mansfield District, there is one full sized pitch at The Brunts Academy included on the FA register as well as a smaller (60m x 40m) pitch. There are formal community use agreements for both of these pitches. Supplementing these pitches, are also smaller pitches at Mansfield Rugby Club, Debdale Park, Mansfield Town FC (2) and Garibaldi College. Planning permission has also been granted to develop a small sided pitch at West Notts College. While these cannot be used for matches, they do supplement the stock of full sized pitches as they can be used for training and more informal (leisure leagues) football fixtures.

- There are several sites that have formerly contained playing fields and a number of sites have fewer pitches than they have previously had or are not available for use this season. The strategy will consider

#### Specific Facility Needs

- Capacity generally sufficient overall, but increased capacity required at key hub sites and for some large clubs
- Improvements in quality and maintenance regimes across the pitch stock, including training support
- Improvements in pitch booking policies and procedures
- Working with academies to protect access to school sites
- Development of a Mansfield District Football forum
whether these pitches are required to address any of the identified issues

• In addition, several existing sites could potentially accommodate more pitches. These include Queensway Park, Racecourse Park (small pitch only) Bull Farm, Yeoman Hill (small pitch only), Carr Lane Park. There is significant scope for pitches at The Carrs (potentially 8 pitches).

• The majority of playing fields in Mansfield District are managed or owned by Mansfield District Council and schools. The Council therefore have a degree of control over the range, type and quality of facilities provided.

• The secondary school sector is however also a key provider of pitches for community use, although these are considered unsecured, as they are provided by academies and there are several recent examples of community use policies changing at schools managed as academies. There are also several former colliery welfare social clubs managed by Trusts / Community Organisations. These sites provide important bases for clubs.

• There are mixed views in relation to the overall pitch stock in Mansfield but that overall, more clubs are satisfied with the pitch stock than are dissatisfied. There remains however a reasonably high proportion of clubs that are dissatisfied however, meaning that there are still issues to be addressed

• The key reasons given by those responding clubs that are dissatisfied are;
  - pitch quality, including maintenance issues and dog fouling;
  - the cost of facility hire; and
  - a lack of access to appropriate facilities, particularly for younger age groups.

• Site visits reveal that the vast majority of pitches are categorised as standard (based upon the views of providers / users / site visits). There are few pitches of very high quality and site assessment scores range from 44% up to 90%.

• Site visits suggest that pitches are positioned towards the lower end of the standard range, with the average score achieved being 62% (a standard pitch is rated 50% - 75%) and 53% of all pitches visited achieving scores of below 60%.

• The maintenance procedure currently undertaken by the Council (based upon feedback given by
Maintenance officers suggest that pitches should be of a higher standard than the site inspections identify that they are. This indicates that there is either an underlying issue and a requirement for capital investment (drainage and decompaction) or that maintenance procedures need to be tailored more specifically to each site as there is little evidence of much of the work that has been undertaken.

### Demand

- There is also clear documented evidence of the decline in adult football, with the most local league, the Mansfield and District Sunday Football League experiencing a decline and now having capacity for a further two divisions (24 teams).

- If not reversed, the declining participation will result in a lower demand for pitch provision.

- For those responding to the club survey, participation has remained largely static, although more teams have seen an increase than a decline, particularly at youth and mini levels. Notably, it is the larger clubs that have seen an increase in participation, while others are struggling to maintain the number of teams that they are running.

- The FA nationally, and the Nottinghamshire FA locally are currently working with clubs to arrest the decline. The costs of participating (particularly since the closure of many local pubs and social clubs), as well as lack of volunteers and lack of interest are the key reasons given for the decline. The quality of pitches in Mansfield District is also thought by the league to be a contributing factor.

### Adequacy of Provision

- Overall analysis has demonstrated that there is spare capacity across Mansfield District, with few examples of overplay and capacity to increase participation in all forms of the game both across the week and at peak time within the existing infrastructure.

- There are very few facilities that are not used at all and a small amount of spare capacity at most sites in the district.

- Added to this as set out previously some sites have been closed by the Council to reflect a lack of demand. There are several sites that have reduced provision this season due to a lack of demand. With potential provision at the Carrs (8 pitches) as well as others including at Carr Lane Park, also in Market Warsop, the stock of facilities could be increased by at least 10 pitches without new sites.

- There is however relatively limited spare capacity remaining at many of the home venues for larger clubs, specifically Debdale Sport and Recreation Centre, Forest Town Arena, the John Fretwell Centre.
• There is also a reliance on unsecured pitches at school sites, particularly for facilities for the younger age groups and removal of access to these pitches would ensure that supply would be much more closely matched with demand.

• Added to this, the quality of football pitches is relatively low and levels of maintenance are limited on many sites. Many pitches achieved site scores of below 60% relatively early in the season and issues with maintenance were confirmed in IOG professional quality assessments. This raises concern about quality deterioration later in the season and the impact that this may have on pitch capacity.

• FA data modelling evaluates the baseline requirement for pitches taking into account the training requirements of clubs. It assumes that one pitch is required per 42 teams and that based on FA policy, all football training should take place on pitches (as opposed to sand). In Mansfield District, the FA modelling indicates that there is a requirement for 4.6 AGPs to meet current demand.

• Although there is just one full sized AGP, the presence of smaller pitches at Garibaldi College, Mansfield Rugby and two at Mansfield Town go some way to meeting this demand and FA data suggests that there is a shortfall of just 31 training slots. A new pitch planned at West Notts College (September 2016) therefore suggests that the provision of pitches will be broadly in deficit by 1-1.5 full-sized pitch equivalents. It should be noted however that this does not take into account the poor condition of the pitch at Debdale Sport and Recreation Ground.

• While the population of Mansfield District is likely to increase slightly, changes to the population profile mean that the proportion of people within the age groups most likely to play pitch sports will increase at a much slower rate. This alongside the participation trends suggests the future position will not change markedly and Mansfield has sufficient pitch stock to meet existing and future needs without the need to bring lapsed or disused sites back into use.

• There are pitch surpluses across the board and scope to increase capacity at all site. Participation trends show a decline. Sites which are not currently used have potential to increase supply, but there is little evidence of demand for this currently.

• A review demonstrates that existing lapsed or disused sites are therefore not required to meet current or future needs. The location (sites are not in areas where capacity pressures are currently or projected to be evident) and size of the sites (small single pitch sites, which are not sustainable and of insufficient size to be of benefit) contributes to this. Consultation with the FA on the sites has not revealed that any
have any sporting significance or football value.

Key Issues to Address

- Improvements in quality and maintenance regimes across the pitch stock, including training support
- Increasing capacity at key hub sites
- Development of increased pitch capacity in possible partnership with the larger clubs
- Improvements in pitch booking policies and procedures
- Working with academies to protect access to school sites
- Development of a Mansfield District Football forum