

**POLICY RE1 - CRITERIA FOR URBAN RECREATIONAL FACILITIES  
PROPOSAL RE2 - LAND FOR NEW RECREATIONAL FACILITIES  
PROPOSAL RE3 - NEW NEIGHBOURHOOD INDOOR SPORTS FACILITIES  
Written Statement Paragraphs 9.15 and 9.16  
Omission of Provision in the Heswall/Pensby and Eastham/Bromborough areas**

**OBJECTIONS:** 056/1 Pensby Boys School 059/1 West Wirral Trust for Sport  
070/48, 070/49 GO-M 090/4 Mr D I Maurice Jones

**Summary of Objections**

9.1 The word 'normally' should be deleted from Policy RE1/Proposal RE2 (070/48, 070/49). The UDP should clarify the need for community-based sports/recreational facilities in West Wirral, and identify the Pensby Schools site to meet that need (056/1, 059/1). The need for a facility in the Eastham/Bromborough area is of equal importance; the UDP should clarify this need and how it can be satisfied (090/4).

**Assessment and Conclusions**

9.2 Proposed changes to Policy RE1 and Proposal RE2<sup>1</sup> delete 'normally'. The Council confirm that planning permission was granted in 1996 for a sports hall, swimming pool and artificial pitch with floodlights on the Pensby High Schools site, which would satisfy the identified need in that area. The Objectors have not questioned that view. I accept that as permission has been granted, there is no need for the Pensby site to be allocated for such a purpose; the statement remains in Paragraph 9.16 of the Reasoned Justification for proposal RE3 that it is intended that this facility will be provided within the UDP Plan period.

9.3 The Council state that the need for a facility for Eastham/Bromborough has been reduced by facilities provided at the Village Leisure Hotel. I accept that there is now more doubt about early implementation of a public facility, the implication being that such a facility would be of lower priority than hitherto. The Council should consider available resources before the commitment of a land allocation in the UDP<sup>2</sup>. I conclude that at present such action is not justified. There is no intention however to delete Paragraphs 9.15 and 9.16 of Written Statement, and so the reference to a facility to serve Eastham/Bromborough would remain.

**Inspector's Recommendation**

9.4 I recommend that the UDP be modified by the amendment of Policy RE1 and proposal RE2 in accordance with ALT/RECREATION/002 and 003, but that no other modification be made in response to Objections 056/1, 059/1 and 090/4.

---

<sup>1</sup> ALT/RECREATION/002 (CD056, page 93) and ALT/RECREATION/003 (CD056, page 94).

<sup>2</sup> In accordance with the guidance in PPG12 *Development Plans and Regional Planning Guidance*, paragraph 5.20.

**POLICY RE5 - CRITERIA FOR THE PROTECTION OF PLAYING FIELDS  
PROPOSAL RE6 - SPORTS GROUNDS FOR PROTECTION FROM DEVELOPMENT**

OBJECTIONS: 013/1 The Greenalls Group plc 070/50, 070/51 GO-M  
093/4 The Leverhulme Estate

COUNTER-OBJECTION: 013/A The Greenalls Group plc

**Summary of Objections**

- 9.5 The word 'normally' should be deleted from Policy RE5 and Proposal RE6 (070/50, 070/51). The words 'normally refuse' should be replaced by a presumption in favour of development, subject to clearly specified criteria. Those criteria should relate to land use planning and be appropriately detailed and clearly set out. The reference to a target provision of playing fields per 1,000 population should be moved to the appropriate Part I policy and adequately explained in the text supporting that policy (013/1).
- 9.6 Policy RE5 does not lay down clear criteria as to whether or not planning permission would be granted for any proposal. The Policy only makes limited reference to relocation or the provision of alternative sites with similar community benefit according to the guidance in PPG17 *Sport and Recreation*<sup>1</sup>. The UDP does not include any survey of existing provision nor indicate whether or where local deficiencies exist (093/4).
- 9.7 It is illogical for Criterion (iii) of the revised form of Policy RE5<sup>2</sup> to distinguish between playing fields which happen to be in dual use and those which are not (013/A).

**Assessment and Conclusions**

9.8 The published changes to Policy RE5 and Proposal RE6<sup>3</sup> omit 'normally'. The proposed amendments to Policy RE5 represent a substantial change in the way that Policy's criteria are expressed; although the number of criteria is reduced I accept that they give clearer guidance than the deposit version of the Policy as to the likelihood of planning permission being granted and follow more closely the guidance in PPG17, including by reference to 'adequate provision of equivalent community benefit'.

---

<sup>1</sup> PPG17, paragraph 42.

<sup>2</sup> ALT/RECREATION/005 (CD056, page 96).

<sup>3</sup> ALT/RECREATION/006 (CD056, page 98).

9.9 The sports pitch standard is retained in the proposed revision of Policy RE5; it seems to me to be too detailed a provision to be easily accommodated in the relevant Part I Policy, REC1<sup>4</sup>. PPG17 advises that locally determined standards of playing field provision can helpfully be included in local plans<sup>5</sup>, and I therefore see no reason why an appropriate standard should not be included in Part II of the UDP. There is more supporting material (Reasoned Justification, revised Paragraphs 9.20 and 9.21) about the supply position and localised shortfalls.

9.10 Lastly, with regard to school playing pitches the Council refer to the views of the Sports Council and National Playing Fields Association<sup>6</sup> to support their view that as a general rule, school playing fields should not be counted against the UDP playing field standard, as they are specifically provided for use by school pupils rather than the wider community. The reference in Criterion (iii) to 'private and school facilities with secured community use' is therefore not in my view unreasonably included in Policy RE5; it allows for school playing fields which are clearly the subject of agreed use by the community to be included in the standard, whilst excluding land which is not. Reference is also made to this matter in paragraph 9.20 of the revised Reasoned Justification for Policy RE5. In conclusion I consider that the proposed changes to Policies RE5 and Proposal RE6 are a satisfactory response to the criticisms made by the Objectors.

### Inspector's Recommendation

9.11 I recommend that the UDP be modified by the amendment of Policy RE5 and proposal RE6 in accordance with ALT/RECREATION/005 and 006, but that no other modification be made in response to Objections 013/1 and 094/4 and Counter-objection 013/A.

---

<sup>4</sup> Policy REC1 - Principles for Sport and Recreation.

<sup>5</sup> PPG17, paragraph 16.

<sup>6</sup> Reference is made to the Sports Council's *The Playing Pitch Strategy* (CD194) and to the National Playing Field Association's *The Six Acre Standard (Minimum Standards for Outdoor Playing Space)* (CD195). CD194 suggests at paragraph 5.4 (page 42) that the method suggested for assessing local playing pitch requirements is designed only to cater for voluntary participation in competitive activity by adults and young people in the pitch sports, and excludes participation in those sports by young people within schools, and by anyone in a casual manner. The recommended standard is defined as including 'school facilities with secured community use' (Recommendation 3, page 52). CD195 suggests that education land should not count towards the standard unless it is specifically available for wider use (paragraphs 1.11 and 2.23).

**PROPOSAL RE6 - SPORTS GROUNDS FOR PROTECTION FROM DEVELOPMENT  
RE6/6 - Moreton Sports Ground, Moreton  
PROPOSAL HS1 - LAND ALLOCATED FOR RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT**

OBJECTIONS: 013/2, 013/4 Greenalls Group plc

**Summary of Objections**

9.12 The Objection site should be deleted from Proposal RE6 and allocated for residential development under Proposal HS1. The use of the site as a sports ground and for any related purpose has ceased, and the former sports ground is not of sufficient quality to justify its retention under proposal RE6. The site can only accommodate one football pitch which regularly becomes waterlogged. There are no spectator facilities and the ground does not satisfy the standards of the West Cheshire League. Proposal RE6/6 is also wrongly represented on the Proposals map as including the site of the former snooker club, associated car park and spare land around the playing area.

**Assessment and Conclusions**

9.13 Guidance on the status of playing fields and the degree of protection which should be accorded to them is found in PPG17 *Sport and Recreation*<sup>1</sup>. Playing fields are described in the guidance as being of special significance, and the normal presumption is that they should be protected from development, except in clearly defined circumstances<sup>2</sup>. This important aspect of national planning policy must in my view be a key influence upon UDP policy relating to existing playing field provision and the extent to which it should be protected; indeed the 3 'exception' criteria in PPG17 relating to sports pitches are replicated and amplified in the proposed amendment to Policy RE5<sup>3</sup>.

9.14 Dealing first with the third and most generalised criterion (whether there is overprovision of pitches in the area), the Objector does not challenge the sports pitch standard of 1.21 hectare per thousand people referred to in Policy RE5. The Council's evidence on open space provision<sup>4</sup> relates to what are termed 'townships', Moreton being the relevant one in relation to the Objection site. Although townships are not officially recognised units of

---

<sup>1</sup> PPG17, paragraphs 41 and 42.

<sup>2</sup> Protection is to be given (PPG17 paragraph 42) except where sports and recreation facilities can best be retained and enhanced through the redevelopment of a small part of the site; alternative provision of equivalent community benefit is made available, or the (UDP) shows an excess of sports pitch provision and public open space in the area, taking into account the recreation and amenity value of such provision.

<sup>3</sup> Policy RE5 - Criteria for the Protection of Playing Fields; ALT/RECREATION/005 (CD056, page 96). I recommend that the UDP be modified by the amendment of Policy RE5 in accordance with this proposal, on page 233 of this report.

<sup>4</sup> Appendices 6 and 7 in Document WMBC/P/42a.

population I accept that they reflect coherent built-up areas and with their open space provision and associated catchment, are a reasonable basis on which to assess local open space provision. On the Council's quantitative assessment of available land there is no clear overprovision either of accessible public open space or sports pitches serving the Moreton township. The Objector's evidence did not in my perception challenge that evidence.

9.15 On the related issue of the extent to which alternative playing pitches are fully used, I accept that different interpretations may be made of the Council's evidence. However, I generally conclude that at the least, there is no obvious overall spare capacity and that if anything, the available pitches are put to more intensive use than is desirable if their condition is to be improved or even satisfactorily maintained. Indeed, the only site referred to by the Council as offering spare capacity is deficient in terms of its condition and the lack of changing facilities<sup>5</sup>.

9.16 Moreton has also in recent years accommodated a steady increase in new dwellings, and the development of allocated housing land would further advance that increase, with a consequent increase in the local population and potential demand for sports pitches<sup>6</sup>. This to my mind all serves to support the conclusion that there is no current overprovision of pitches in Moreton. The Council's evidence that the position is no better in the neighbouring townships of Greasby, Upton, Woodchurch and (so far as ancillary facilities are concerned) Leasowe emerged largely intact from the inquiry.

9.17 Turning secondly to the question of partial development of the Objection site the Council do not appear to rule out the principle of the development of a small part of the Objection site in a manner which would ensure the retention and enhancement of the sports facilities on the site. However no proposals have been put forward in evidence which are both demonstrably capable of achieving that objective and are likely to be acceptable in all other respects.

9.18 Dealing thirdly with the question as to whether alternative provision of equivalent community benefit is being made available, the Objector is not requesting the deletion of the RE6/6 allocation because alternative new provision is to be made for sports pitches or other open space in the area. The fact that some of the football teams which used the Objection site have been able to secure alternative existing pitches for their use elsewhere should not in my view confer exemption from that requirement. Although one of the teams has received a financial consideration from the Objector as relocation assistance, that falls clearly below the financial outlay required either to restore the playing pitch and its ancillary facilities on the Objection site or to make similar provision elsewhere. Neither does it come even near the circumstances referred to in the Hull, Bury or Warrington appeals, although I note that despite more substantial

---

<sup>5</sup>Upton Park (see Council proof WMBC/P/42, paragraph 5.11).

<sup>6</sup> These include Proposals HS1/2, HS1/5 and the allocation of land at Fender Farm for housing which I recommend on page 135 of this report.

offers being made by the developers towards satisfying the 'alternative provision' requirement, those appeals were still dismissed<sup>7</sup>.

9.19 I accept that the 'recreational value' of the Objection site has diminished since the playing pitch was last used. The Council confirm that the club and changing room accommodation which I saw in a dilapidated state on my site visit, has now been demolished<sup>8</sup>. The budget estimates obtained by the Objector confirm that cost of reinstating the pitch and building ancillary accommodation would be significant<sup>9</sup>. However, it seems to me that it would be wrong to say that merely because a former sports pitch has become overgrown and the changing accommodation demolished, the policy obligations of PPG17 to take into account the long-term needs of the community for recreation and open space<sup>10</sup> can be set aside.

9.20 I have no doubt that the task of finding a new occupier for a facility such as used to exist on the site has not been an easy one, and that the task may not become easier. If there was evidence that all reasonable efforts had been made to find an occupier prepared to use the site for sporting purposes and that no interest existed, this would be a material consideration favouring the release of the site for some other purpose. However I am not convinced from the correspondence between the Objector, the Council and potential occupiers put forward in evidence that there is no further interest<sup>11</sup>.

9.21 No evidence was put to me that the Objection site would be unsuitable for residential purposes in the event of a decision being made that it need not remain as a sporting/recreational facility. I recommend elsewhere that the UDP's overall housing requirement should be increased from 9500 to 10500 dwellings<sup>12</sup>. The Objection site would usefully contribute towards satisfying that requirement. However I am satisfied that sufficient land can be found for such purposes without the use of the Objection site and the need for housing land does not in my view outweigh the need to retain the site as part of the Borough's recreational provision. I therefore conclude that Proposal RE6/6 should be retained.

### **Inspector's Recommendation**

9.22 I recommend that no modification be made to the UDP in response to Objections 013/2 and 013/4.

---

<sup>7</sup> See Appendices 18 to 20 to Council document WMBC/P/42a.

<sup>8</sup> See Council statement WMBC/W/HOUS/36, paragraph 2.2.

<sup>9</sup> See Appendix B to Objector's supplementary proof of evidence, 13/P/4.

<sup>10</sup> PPG17, paragraph 42.

<sup>11</sup> In particular I have had regard to the letter from the West Cheshire League dated 16 May 1996 (Appendix 22, Council Document WMBC/P/42a).

<sup>12</sup> See pages 18-35 of this report.

**POLICY RE7 - CRITERIA FOR THE PROTECTION OF SCHOOL PLAYING FIELDS**  
**POLICY RE8 - CRITERIA FOR ARTIFICIAL PLAYING PITCHES**

OBJECTION: 013/3 The Greenalls Group plc 070/52, 070/53 GO-M

**Summary of Objections**

9.23 The word 'normally' should be deleted from the Policies (070/52, 070/53). Policy RE7 should be deleted, and development proposals affecting school playing fields treated in the same way as proposals affecting other playing pitches. The supporting text should be incorporated into the explanatory text accompanying a combined Policy RE5, RE6 and RE7. Reference should be made in the text to the guidance in PPG17 *Sport and Recreation* which seeks to encourage the dual use of school playing fields<sup>1</sup> (013/3).

**Assessment and Conclusions**

9.24 Published changes to Policies RE7 and RE8<sup>2</sup> omit 'normally'. Although one of the proposed amendments to Policy RE7 results in Criterion (iv) of that Policy in the removal of the express reference to Policy RE5<sup>3</sup>, I do not consider that this or any other aspect of the Policy as proposed to be amended puts school playing fields into any different category of consideration from other sports pitches. The community need for sports pitches, and any shortfall in the existing provision, are required under Policy RE7 to be considered before decisions are made on the development of any school pitches.

9.25 Whilst it would be possible to combine Policy RE7 with Policy RE5, I see no objection to Policy RE7 remaining a separate policy. The role that school pitches can exercise in relation to wider community needs is referred to in Paragraph 9.27 of the Reasoned Justification, and there is in my view no need for any further change or explanation.

**Inspector's Recommendation**

9.26 I recommend that the UDP be modified by the amendment of Policies RE7 and RE8 in accordance with ALT/RECREATION 013 and 014, but that no further modification be made in response to Objection 013/3.

---

<sup>1</sup> PPG17, paragraph 43.

<sup>2</sup> ALT/RECREATION/013 (CD056, page 105) and ALT/RECREATION/014 (CD056, page 106).

<sup>3</sup> Policy RE5 - Criteria for the Protection of Playing Fields. Policy RE5 is proposed to be amended under ALT/RECREATION/005 (CD056, page 96).

---

**POLICY RE9 - CRITERIA FOR FLOODLIGHTING AT SPORTS FACILITIES**  
**Written Statement Paragraph 9.35**

OBJECTION: 070/54 GO-M 080/9 Cheshire Wildlife Trust 127/10 Wirral Wildlife

COUNTER-OBJECTION: 080/A Cheshire Wildlife Trust

**Summary of Objections**

- 9.27 The word 'normally' should be deleted from the Policy (070/54). The Policy should take into consideration disturbance to known nocturnal wildlife sites, such as those providing habitats for bats and owls (080/9, 127/10).
- 9.28 Paragraph 9.35 of the Reasoned Justification as proposed to be amended<sup>1</sup> should be further amended to incorporate the words 'and other' after 'importance to nocturnal' (080/A).

**Assessment and Conclusions**

9.29 A published change to Policy RE9<sup>2</sup> omits 'normally' and introduces the reference to wildlife in Criterion (iii) of the Policy. A further change to the reasoned Justification<sup>3</sup> deals with the point made in the Counter-objection.

**Inspector's Recommendation**

9.30 I recommend that the UDP be modified by the amendment of Policy RE9 and its reasoned Justification in accordance with ALT/RECREATION/015 AND ALT2/RECREATION/001.

---

<sup>1</sup> ALT/RECREATION/016 (CD056, page 108).

<sup>2</sup> ALT/RECREATION/015 (CD056, page 107).

<sup>3</sup> ALT2/RECREATION/001 (CD057, page 16).



**POLICY RE10 - CRITERIA FOR COMMUNITY CENTRES AND FACILITIES**  
**POLICY RE12 - CRITERIA FOR CHILDREN'S PLAY FACILITIES**

OBJECTIONS: 017/1 Mr R T Steele, (for various congregations of Jehovah's Witnesses)  
070/55, 070/56 GO-M

**Summary of Objections**

9.31 The word 'normally' should be deleted from Policies RE10 and RE12 (070/55, 070/56). The UDP does not make adequate provision for meeting the needs of new places of worship. It should contain a policy indicating that suitable sites will be identified and allocated for such purposes (017/1).

**Assessment and Conclusions**

9.32 Published changes to Policies RE10 and RE12<sup>1</sup> omit 'normally'. PPG12 *Development Plans and Regional Planning Guidance* states that development plans should make provision for land for schools and higher education, for places of worship and other community facilities<sup>2</sup>. The Council maintain that this does not place an imperative upon them to allocate specific sites for places of worship. I accept that it would be generally impractical to make specific allocations for every type of development. Whilst I accept that some commercial or industrial areas may be unsuitable locations for places of worship, there is no evidence from Objector 017 that there is such a shortage of land in areas which may be acceptable for such development in policy terms<sup>3</sup> that a specific allocation is necessary.

9.33 Policy RE10 directs uses which are likely to generate significant levels of traffic, which are intended to serve a wider than local catchment area or which would give rise to a level of disturbance incompatible with a Primarily Residential Area, towards urban commercial locations. Whilst market forces may make the acquisition of land in such areas for the erection of places of worship more difficult, I am not convinced that the formal allocation of land would change that position. In conclusion therefore I do not consider that there is a compelling case for the identification of specific sites for the development of places of worship.

**Inspector's Recommendation**

9.34 I recommend that the UDP be modified by the amendment of Policies RE10 and RE12 in accordance with ALT/RECREATION/017 and 019, but that no modification be made in response to Objection 017/1.

---

<sup>1</sup> ALT/RECREATION/017 (CD056, page 109) and ALT/RECREATION/019 (CD056, page 111).

<sup>2</sup> PPG12, paragraph 5.49.

<sup>3</sup> The Council give as examples key town centres, primarily residential areas or primarily industrial areas, as provided for by Policy RE10.

## **POLICY RE14 - CRITERIA FOR SPORTS FACILITIES IN THE GREEN BELT**

### **Informal Recreation**

### **The Needs of Retired People**

### **Nuisance Sports**

### **Golf Courses**

### **Written Statement Paragraphs 9.45 to 9.47**

OBJECTION: 070/57 GO-M 093/5, 093/17 The Leverhulme Trust  
121/10 MAFF 127/11 Wirral Wildlife  
215/9, 215/22 to 215/25 Wirral Green Belt Council

### **Summary of Objections**

- 9.35 The word 'normally' should be deleted from Policy RE14 (070/57). National guidance in PPG2 *Green Belts* is that outdoor sport is in principle an appropriate development in the Green Belt<sup>1</sup>; this is stated in Paragraph 9.45 of the Reasoned Justification, but it should also be stated in the Policy itself. To the extent that all proposals will have an impact on the local landscape, reference would better be made in Criterion (iii) to an 'overly intrusive' effect rather than simply 'intrusive' (093/5, 093/17). Criterion (iv) should be supplemented by the addition of the words 'including recognised sites of importance to wildlife' (127/11).
- 9.36 The fifth line of Paragraph 9.45 should refer to 'appropriate' outdoor sport as being appropriate in the Green Belt. The words 'generally excludes' in the fourth line of Paragraph 9.46 should be replaced by 'will exclude'. No reference is made in the Policy to informal recreation and the role that this has in society. The Policy should include a criterion acknowledging the needs of retired people. There should be a separate policy directed at the prevention of nuisance sports (215/9, 215/22 to 215/25). The Policy could be expanded to include proposals for golf courses (121/10).

### **Assessment and Conclusions**

9.37 A published change to Policy RE14<sup>2</sup> omits 'normally'. The amendment also deletes the qualification 'which would be appropriate' to acknowledge that in principle sporting and recreational activities are appropriate in the Green Belt. I agree with the Council that not all outdoor activities are intrusive; besides, the adjective 'intrusive' implies a degree of harm, and I do not consider that it need be further defined by reference to 'overly'. The proposed amendment to the Policy also introduces a reference to wildlife in Criterion (iv).

---

<sup>1</sup> PPG2, paragraph 3.4.

<sup>2</sup> ALT/RECREATION/020 (CD056, page 112).

---

9.38 There is no need in my view further to clarify 'outdoor sport' in Paragraph 9.46 of the Reasoned Justification. The fact that such activity might be deemed appropriate in policy terms would not prevent the Council from considering any effects a particular activity might have if considered harmful for reasons other than those relating to Green Belt policy. The word 'generally' is proposed to be deleted from Paragraph 9.46<sup>3</sup>. The Council refer to the reference, either directly or by implication, to informal recreation in Policy GRE1, Proposal GR2, Policies TL9, TL11 and TL14 and Policies CO1, CO2, CO3 and CO4<sup>4</sup>. These provisions appear wide-ranging; I see no need for a separate policy.

9.39 Objector 215 does not suggest *how* the needs of retired people could be provided for in the UDP. The Council refer to the UDP's Greenspace Provisions, to Policy TL11 and to the Tourism, Heritage and Conservation provisions. Parkland, areas accommodating formal and informal recreational pursuits and linear parks and walkways are protected under Policy GRE1; allotments are protected under Policy GR3, and Greenspace provided within new housing developments under Policy GR6<sup>5</sup>. Under Policies REC1 and RE1<sup>6</sup> sports and recreational facilities are to be located where they are easily accessible by public transport. Facilities for community use are generally permitted in Primarily Residential Areas under Policy RE10<sup>7</sup>. Rights of way and access to features of importance are safeguarded under Policy TL14, and features of architectural or historic importance under Policy CHO1<sup>8</sup>. In these circumstances I consider that the UDP makes reasonable provision for or safeguards features which contribute to the recreational needs of retired people, and that no further provision in the Plan is necessary.

9.40 The Council refer to Policies RE1 and RE14 as containing the appropriate criteria to control sporting activities which might cause nuisance or disturbance. Having regard to the specific attention required in these policies to be given to matters of noise or other disturbance and arrangements for car parking, I do not consider that it is necessary for the UDP to contain a separate policy relating to 'nuisance sports'.

---

<sup>3</sup> ALT/RECREATION/021 (CD056, page 113).

<sup>4</sup> Policy GRE1 - The Protection of Urban Greenspace. This policy refers to 'a range of formal and informal recreational pursuits' in Criterion (ii); Proposal GR2 - The Protection of Greenspace within the Urban Area; Policy TL9 - The Protection of Rural Tourist Attractions and Resources; Policy TL11 - Development at Countryside recreation Sites; Policy TL14 - Protecting and Extending Public Rights of Way; Policy CO1 - Development within the Developed Coastal Zone; Policy CO2 - Development within the Undeveloped Coastal Zone; policy CO3 - Tourism and Leisure in the Coastal Zone; Policy CO4 - Criteria for Coastal Protection and Sea Defence Works.

<sup>5</sup> Policy GR3 - The Protection of Allotments . Policy GR6 -Greenspace within New Housing Developments .

<sup>6</sup> Policy REC1 - Principles for Sport and Recreation. Policy RE1 - Criteria for Urban Recreation Facilities.

<sup>7</sup> Policy RE10 - Criteria for Community Centres and Facilities.

<sup>8</sup> Policy TL14 - Protecting and Extending Public Rights of Way. Policy CHO1 - The Protection of Heritage.

*Part II: Policy RE14 and supporting text -  
Criteria for Sports Facilities in the Green Belt  
Informal Recreation, the Needs of Retired Persons,  
Nuisance Sports, Golf Courses*

---

9.41 PPG17 *Sport and Recreation* contains no express guidance about the need for specific development plan land allocations or policies relating to golf courses<sup>9</sup>. New courses or extensions to existing ones should be considered against the guidance in PPG17 and the appropriate general policies of the UDP. The Council refer in particular to Policies RE14, AG2 and LAN1<sup>10</sup> as the relevant provisions. I do not therefore consider that it is essential that a policy dealing with golf courses should be inserted into the UDP.

**Inspector's Recommendation**

9.42 I recommend that the UDP be modified by the amendment of Policy RE14 and its Reasoned Justification in accordance with ALT/RECREATION/020 and 021, but that no modification be made in response to Objections 215/9, 215/22-25 and 121/10.

---

<sup>9</sup> The relevant general guidance may be found in PPG17, paragraphs 57 and 58.

<sup>10</sup> Policy AG2 - The Protection of the Best Quality Land; Policy LAN1 - Principles for Landscape.