APPENDIX 1: ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY FOR BUILT FACILITIES

1.1 The strategy considers the built facilities used by the community for sport and physical activity. The approach to this assessment and the development of the recommendations reflects the guidance contained in the Assessing Needs and Opportunities Guidance of Sport England of 2014 (Sport England, 2014).

1.2 The assessment of each facility type draws on a number of different elements:

- The findings from the site audits, including an assessment of the used capacity of the facilities and management considerations;
- The theoretical demand for facilities based on various modelling tools;
- The results of consultation;
- Issues associated with facility quality, accessibility for the community etc.;
- The future population characteristics;
- The Council’s policies on participation, and sports development objectives;
- The resources which may be available to meet the future requirements;
- The network of facilities and housing growth.

1.3 As each assessment is based on a number of factors which can change over time, the recommendations will need to be kept under review. Details of the methodology are provided below, and the consultation process with the national governing bodies of sport and clubs in the district is given in Appendix 2, with the club summary responses in Appendix 3.

Modelling tools

1.4 There is no one theoretical modelling tool which provides the answer to facility planning. A number of different tools need to be employed and the results of each synthesised together with the findings from consultation to provide a recommendation.

1.5 The following paragraphs provide a detailed explanation of each methodology.

Active Places Power

1.6 Active Places Power (APP) (Sport England, 2019) is a website developed by Sport England to help those involved in providing sport provision with a series of tools to guide investment decisions and develop sport provision strategies.

1.7 The website is underpinned by a single database that holds information on sports facilities and clubs (pilot data) throughout England. The data held on APP for each facility includes the type of facility, location, size, ownership and management, opening times, age, refurbishment date and access type. The tools within the website have a range of capabilities from quick searches and simple reports to a series of analytical tools.
In this assessment the APP database has been used to inform the strategy, for example as a source of information about facilities outside of Harborough district.

**Sports Facilities Calculator**

The Sports Facility Calculator (SFC) (Sport England, 2019) which is available as part of APP has been developed by Sport England to help local planning authorities quantify how much additional demand for the key community sports facilities (swimming pools, sports halls, indoor bowls and artificial grass pitches) is generated as a result of new growth linked to specific development locations.

In this strategy the SFC has been used to determine the overall demand for sports halls for Harborough District as a whole, for each of the strategy sub areas and for each of the strategic development areas’ planned populations.

As the SFC looks only at demand for facilities and does not take into account any existing supply of facilities, the next step is to look at the facilities which are available for community use and any issues associated with them.

**Catchment Profile**

This tool enables the assessment of a single point for a specific sports facility in relation the catchment area. The point can either be an existing facility or a new location. The catchment area can be set by travel mode (car or walking) and for either distance or time. The results can be shown as maps or by the population within the defined catchment.

This tool has been used to identify the driving and walking catchments of the main facilities, including Harborough Leisure Centre’s and Lutterworth Sports Centre’s current locations and their potential future locations.

This tool is not able to assess the impact of facilities with overlapping catchments, which is better done by the Sport England Facilities Planning Model.

**Access Analysis**

This tool provides an overview of access to specific facility types within a specific area. The maps produced by this tool are more difficult to interpret than some of the other mapping tools available, so these have not been used in the strategy report.

**Extrapolating current demand and current provision**

One way of assessing the likely future sporting requirements of the community for the facilities other than sports halls and swimming pools is to consider the current demand for each sports facility type and to extrapolate this demand to take account of the forecast growth in the population and the anticipated growth in participation.
This extrapolated figure can then be compared to the known supply of facilities, to assess the likely future balance in supply and demand.

1.17 This approach is a useful guide to the scale of the future provision which may be needed for facilities such as fitness gyms but does not take into account the quality or nature of the existing facilities, their opening hours, their location of facilities, or the impact of an ageing population. The findings therefore need to be reviewed within the context of the results from the other modelling together with feedback from consultation.

Facilities Planning Model

1.18 The Facilities Planning Model (FPM) has been developed as a planning tool by Sport England for the strategic assessment of the community needs for swimming pools, sports halls and large size artificial grass pitches (AGPs). The modelling provides an objective assessment of the balance between the supply of the sports facilities and the demand for them at “peak time”, which is in the evenings Monday-Friday, and during the daytime at weekends.

1.19 An FPM Local Report (June 2019) for swimming pools was undertaken in May/June 2019 for Harborough district. The modelling took into account key factors influencing participation at the local level, including; the age profile of residents, levels of deprivation, and levels of car ownership. The report considers the supply and demand for swimming pools up to 2031 and the findings are summarised within the swimming pool section of the main strategy report.

Comparator authorities

1.20 Comparing Harborough with its Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy (CIPFA) benchmark authorities as listed on the Active Places Power website, (Sport England, 2019) in terms of the scale of provision of a facility can be a helpful guide towards the overall amount of provision which might be expected. However the CIPFA comparison should be treated with some caution and not used as a justification in its own right for the amount of provision which there “should” be within the authority. Due to the differing size of authorities, this comparison needs to be on a provision of a sports facility per 1000 population basis.

1.21 The ‘Nearest Neighbour’ model was developed by CIPFA to aid local authorities in comparative and benchmarking exercises. It is widely used across both central and local government. The model uses a number of variables to calculate similarity between local authorities. Examples of these variables include population, unemployment rates, tax base per head of population, council tax bands and mortality ratios.

1.22 The local authorities that are considered to be ‘similar’ to Harborough District by CIPFA are: Ribble Valley, South Northamptonshire, Maldon and Daventry District.
Growth in participation per annum

1.23 An important consideration in the modelling to assess future facility needs is to determine what the likely growth in participation each year will be. This will impact upon the overall level of demand for each facility type. Participation rates in adult sport (16 years and over) was previously monitored nationally by Sport England through their Active People Survey (Sport England, 2017) and now by its successor survey, Active Lives. This is the mechanism which Harborough District Council also uses to assess the success of its policy objectives of getting more people active.

1.24 The Active People Survey (APS) up to mid-2016 has effectively shown limited change in the rates of overall participation in sport and active recreation between 2005 and 2016 in Harborough and this is mirrored by the fact that very few national governing bodies have seen an increase in their sport’s rate of participation.

1.25 The rates of participation in “fashionable” sports activities using built facilities will fluctuate from year to year as the activities gain popularity then reduce again. However most of these use activity room or studio type spaces, or programmed time in the pools, rather than taking up much more pool or hall time, so the overall strategic planning for facilities tends to be largely unaffected.

1.26 There has been a gradual decline in both swimming and across the main sports hall sports over the last few years. The modelling in the strategy has therefore been based on the assumption that the rates of participation per 1000 population will broadly remain steady over the next few years. Generally, there will higher rates of facility demand from younger families and lower overall demand from older people.

1.27 The rates of participation across all sports and consequently the demand for facility space will be kept under review and will be a key consideration when this strategy is fully reviewed in approximately 5 years.

Assessing the capacity of facilities

1.28 The assessment of the capacity of the existing facility network is largely based on the site audit findings and discussions with site managers, plus feedback from the clubs’ consultation and that with the national governing bodies.
Travel times and travel modes to facilities

1.29 The travel time and mode of travel to sports halls and swimming pools is based on Sport England research, as set out in the FPM Local Assessment Report of June 2019.

Overall, [national] surveys have shown that the majority of visits made to swimming pools, sports halls and AGPs are made by car, with a significant minority of visits to pools and sports halls being made on foot.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Car</th>
<th>Walking</th>
<th>Public transport</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Swimming Pool</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports Hall</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGP Combined</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hockey</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The model includes a distance decay function; where the further a user is from a facility, the less likely they will travel. The set out below is the survey data with the % of visits made within each of the travel times, which shows that almost 90% of all visits, both car borne or walking, are made within 20 minutes. Hence, 20 minutes is often used as a rule of thumb for catchments for sports halls and pools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minutes</th>
<th>Car</th>
<th>Walk</th>
<th>Car</th>
<th>Walk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-10</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-20</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-40</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.30 These FPM parameters have been checked against the feedback from the clubs’ consultation for Harborough and it is clear that for both swimming and sports hall sports a 20 minute travel time catchment (either by car or walking) is generally appropriate.

1.31 The travel time and modes to other facility types used in the assessments are primarily based on advice provided the relevant national governing body of sport but this has again been checked against the feedback from clubs.
Community priorities for participation

1.32 This report draws on the extensive consultation with the community, stakeholders and partners undertaken as part of the strategy development process. The findings from this consultation which relate to specific facilities are included within the relevant facility sections and summarised in Appendix 5.

1.33 The detailed responses from stakeholders, the national governing bodies and clubs have proven very informative to the strategy process, and all of the specialist sports sections’ findings and recommendations have been confirmed with the relevant sport’s national governing body.

National Governing Body Strategies

1.34 Sport England and UK Sport have a formal recognition process for both activities and for National Governing Bodies (NGBs). The latest list of both sports and NGBs for England can be found on Sport England’s web site (Sport England, 2019).

1.35 The NGB picture is complex as some sports will have different NGBs for England, Great Britain or the UK (for example athletics), some have different NGBs for different disciplines (for example shooting), some have specialist interests (for example disability specific sport organisations), and some sports will be “recognised” but have no officially “recognised” NGB in England (for example Gaelic Football). There are also other activities which are not officially recognised as sports by Sport England, examples being general fitness and gym activities, and parkour.

1.36 The assessment for each facility type includes relevant NGB strategy reviews and priorities where these are appropriate. Where a facility such as a sports hall is used by a number of different sports, there will be more than one NGB strategy reviewed. Similarly, where a sport has more than one relevant NGB, more than one NGB may be referred to in the assessment.

1.37 It should be noted that many of the small-medium NGBs do not have specific facility strategies, and even the larger ones such as the Swim England rarely make specific reference to Harborough.

1.38 A further general issue is that where facilities strategies have been produced previously, several are close or beyond their end date, and in many cases new priorities have yet to be set. Where a previous strategy is still relevant, the key points are identified.
Costs of facility development

1.39 The costs of the proposals are primarily addressed in the Implementation section of this Strategy. The costs are based on Sport England’s regularly updated list of facilities and their development costs, which are largely based on typical schemes funded through the Lottery, with layouts developed in accordance with Sport England Design Guidance Notes.

1.40 As and when new facilities are proposed Harborough District Council will refer to the current Sport England guidance on the expected costs (Sport England, 2019)

1.41 Where the facility issues are ones of improvement rather than new provision, the costs of the works required will need to be based on a condition survey of each individual facility.
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