



Green Space Audit
March 2024

Contents

Introduction	3
Policy Context	5
Methodology.....	6
Identifying Local Need	10
Audit of Existing Green Space	13
Setting Local Green Space Standards	21
Applying Local Standards: Area Based Summaries.....	24
Conclusions	34
Appendix A: Greenspace Assessment 2022.....	35
Appendix B: Amount of Green Space by Settlement.....	39
Appendix C: Committed Greenspace.....	97

The online interactive green space maps can be viewed [here](#).

Introduction

What is a Green Space Audit?

- 1.1 As the Local Planning Authority, Selby District Council has a duty to provide a policy framework for the protection and enhancement of existing green space, including recreational and sporting facilities, and for the creation of new spaces and facilities.
- 1.2 Paragraph 98 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that:

“...Planning policies should be based on robust and up-to-date assessments of the need for open space, sport and recreation facilities (including quantitative or qualitative deficits or surpluses) and opportunities for new provision. Information gained from the assessments should be used to determine what open space, sport and recreational provision is needed, which plans should then seek to accommodate”

- 1.3 The purpose of the Green Space Audit is to set out a comprehensive record of all existing green space in Selby District, in line with paragraph 98 of the NPPF. Whilst a predominantly rural District, not everyone has access to the countryside, and it is important that the District’s residents are able to access local parks and areas of recreational and amenity green space within their local communities.
- 1.4 The Audit maps the location of green space throughout the District; undertakes a quantitative and qualitative assessment of this provision; and has established local standards for the provision of green space to identify those areas which have a surplus or deficiency of such space. The Audit has informed the development of policy in the emerging Local Plan.

The Key Attributes of Open Space

- 1.5 The Companion Guide to PPG17, whilst now withdrawn, usefully sets out that there are five key attributes to all open spaces or sport and recreation facilities, which are as follows:
 - **Accessibility:** This is normally the most important attribute, given that if the green space is inaccessible, it will be irrelevant to those that may wish to use it. However, inaccessible green space can still contribute to the overall appearance and environmental quality of an area.
 - **Quality:** This relates to whether a space is fit for purpose, based on the needs and expectations of its users and includes whether the site is well maintained.
 - **Multi-functional:** Most spaces are likely to be multi-functional. For example, grass pitches might also be used for dog walking.
 - **Primary purpose:** The best way to deal with multi-functional space is through the identification of a primary purpose, so that it is only counted once in an audit of provision.
 - **Quantity:** Is usually measured by the amount of provision.

How will the Green Space Audit be used?

- 1.6 The Green Space Audit is part of the evidence base for the Selby District Local Plan. It sets out recommendations for where the quantity, quality and accessibility of provision should be improved.

- 1.7 It has also informed the preparation of relevant Local Plan policies which will then be used in the determination of planning applications. Proposed policy IC3 has been drafted to ensure that existing green space is protected and that a mechanism exists for the creation of new green space.

Relationship with other Strategies

- 1.8 Selby District Council has an up-to-date Indoor Sports Facilities Strategy; and Playing Pitch Strategy & Action Plan. These documents form part of the evidence base for the Local Plan and summarise the current supply of playing pitches and facilities in the District, along with outlining current and projected longer-term demand for such facilities. The Green Space Audit should be read in conjunction with these strategies.

Policy Context

- 2.1 This section sets out the policy context for the Green Space Audit.

National Planning Policy Framework (2019)

- 2.2 Paragraph 98 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that access to a network of high-quality open spaces and opportunities for sport and physical activity is important for the health and well-being of communities and can deliver wider benefits for nature and support efforts to address climate change. Planning policies should be based on robust and up-to-date assessments of the need for open space and recreation facilities (including quantitative or qualitative deficits or surpluses) and opportunities for new provision. Information gained from the assessments should be used to determine what open space, sport and recreational provision is needed, which plans should then seek to accommodate.

National Planning Practice Guidance (2014)

- 2.3 The Planning Practice Guidance states that open space can take many forms from formal sports pitches to open areas within a development, linear corridors and country parks. In addition to providing health and recreation benefits, open space also contributes to the landscape and setting of built development. It is for local planning authorities to assess the need for open space and opportunities for provisions in their areas. In carrying out this work, they should have regard to the duty to cooperate where open space serves a wider area.

Assessing needs & opportunities: Companion Guide to PPG17 (2002)

- 2.4 Whilst this document has been withdrawn, it continues to provide useful information on how to undertake a Green Space Audit, in the absence of any replacement guidance. The companion guide sets out a five-step process, which authorities can follow when undertaking local assessments of green space, which is based around identifying needs, setting standards, identifying deficiencies in provision and developing a strategy and related policies.

Methodology

3.1 This section sets out the methodology employed to undertake the Green Space Audit and is based upon the recommended methodology which is set out in the PPG17 Companion Guide and suggests the following 5 stage approach:

- Stage 1: Identify local needs
- Stage 2: Audit local provision
- Stage 3: Set provision standards
- Stage 4: Apply the provision standards
- Stage 5: Draft policies

3.2 Each stage of the methodology is set out below, along with a description of the green space typologies that the Green Space Audit has adopted to describe the different types of green space in the District.

Green Space Typologies

3.3 The PPG17 Companion Guide provides guidance in terms of the type of typologies of green space that should be included in an audit of provision and whilst not explicit requires that local authorities should consider the provision of open space, sport and recreational facilities. On this basis, the following typologies of green space have been identified by Selby District Council:

Table 2: Green Space Typologies

Green Space Typology	Comprising
Parks & Recreation Grounds	Parks Recreation grounds Informal playing fields
Areas of Equipped Play	LAPs LEAPs NEAPs Skate Parks MUGAs
Allotments	
Church Yards / Cemeteries	
Informal Green Space	Amenity green space Village greens Common land Wide grass verges Green corridors
Natural & Semi-Natural Green Space	Areas of woodland in built up areas Scrub Heathland Grasslands
Formal Outdoor Sports Provision	Pitches for football, cricket, rugby union, rugby league and hockey. Tennis courts Bowling greens

Parks & Recreation Grounds

- 3.4 Parks and recreation grounds are publicly accessible and offer high quality opportunities for informal recreation. They contain a variety of facilities and amenities and are likely to include areas designed primarily for play and social interaction involving children and young people, such as equipped play areas, ball courts, informal playing fields and skate parks.
- 3.5 Larger parks, such as Selby Park, can perform a range of functions. In this case, it provides a bowling green, a mini golf course, picnic area, along with a play area for children, and will therefore draw from a wider catchment area than a village recreation ground.

Areas of Equipped Play

- 3.6 Fields in Trust (previously the Playing Fields Association) have three categories of equipped play areas. The equipped play areas are commonly referred to as Local Areas for Play (LAPs), Local Equipped Areas for Play (LEAPs) and Neighbourhood Equipped Areas for Play (NEAPs), dependent on their size, the level and variety of facilities provided, and the age group that the facility is designed for.
- Local Areas for Play (LAP)
A LAP is a small area of open space specifically designated and laid out for very young children.
 - Local Equipped Areas for Play (LEAP)
A LEAP is a piece of open space that is designated and equipped for children who can play independently. Play equipment is an integral part of the LEAP and should be fenced off. For safety reasons, these sites should be visible from nearby houses or from well used pedestrian routes.
 - Neighbourhood Equipped Areas for Play (NEAPs)
A NEAP is a site that is designated and equipped mainly for older children but with opportunities for play for younger children too. A NEAP can be divided into 2 parts – the first comprising a range of playground equipment and the second an area intended for formal recreation uses (e.g. pitches, courts and greens).
- 3.7 In addition to the above, skate parks and Multi-Use Games Areas (MUGAs) are also categorised as areas of equipped play. A MUGA is usually an outdoor fenced area with built-in goal post units for various types of sports, including football, basketball or tennis.

Allotments

- 3.8 Allotments are valuable community assets that can help improve people's quality of life by promoting healthy food, exercise, and community interaction. There are a significant number of allotments throughout the District. Their protection as green space is important as once lost to development, they are difficult to replace.

Church Yards / Cemeteries

- 3.9 Although their primary purpose is for burials, church yards and cemeteries can provide a significant green space resource, particularly in built up areas, where they can provide quiet

spaces for peaceful reflection and contemplation. In addition, these sites can also have considerable wildlife conservation and biodiversity value.

Informal Green Space

- 3.10 The built framework of settlements includes areas of open space which fulfil a number of important roles, including providing the setting for buildings or contributing to the character and townscape of settlements. In many instances such areas also provide opportunities for recreation, such as children's informal play and dog walking.
- 3.11 Such spaces include village greens and common land, along with wide grass verges and green corridors. Green corridors often link built up areas with the surrounding countryside and not only do they improve the visual amenity of places, but they also promote sustainable modes of travel, such as walking, jogging and cycling.

Natural and Semi-Natural Green Space

- 3.12 Areas of natural and semi-natural green space include areas of woodland, scrubland, heathland and grasslands. These spaces play a key role in nature conservation and biodiversity, however the recreational opportunities and amenity value that these spaces provide can also be significant.
- 3.13 In the District there are a number of large areas of natural and semi-natural green space, comprising Skipwith Common, Fairburn Ings, Hambleton Hough, Brayton Barff and Bishops Wood. Due to the size of these areas, they provide Districtwide opportunities for leisure and recreation. The majority of users of these spaces travel from a distance by car, as opposed to smaller areas of natural and semi-natural green space which draw from a much more local catchment area.

Formal Outdoor Sports Provision

- 3.14 Outdoor sports facilities are a wide-ranging category of open space, which includes both natural and artificial surfaces for sport and recreation that are either publicly or privately owned.
- 3.15 The Green Space Audit has not reviewed the quality of formal outdoor sports provision in the District as this has been addressed by a separate piece of evidence base, the Outdoor Sports and Playing Pitches Strategy which has assessed the number and quality of playing pitches (for football, cricket, rugby and hockey), synthetic turf pitches, tennis courts, athletics tracks and bowling greens in the district.
- 3.16 Whilst an important recreational resource in the District, the Green Space Audit does not take account of golf clubs or airbases which might accommodate private gliding and aviation clubs. These are invariably private clubs and given their size, their inclusion has the potential to distort the provision of green space in any one area.

Step 1: Identify local needs

- 3.17 In identifying local needs, an assessment of the District's demographic profile was undertaken to determine the proportion of young people in each parish, which has an implication on the demand for certain types of green space. In addition, Parish Councils were contacted and

asked for their views on whether there was any requirement for additional green space in the parish.

Step 2: Audit local provision

- 3.18 In auditing the level of local provision, an initial desk-based assessment was undertaken, using the Selby District Local Plan Proposals Map to identify areas of designated Recreational Open Space and Amenity Green space, as the initial baseline position. Following this, a search of all residential planning permissions since the Local Plan base date of 2005 was undertaken to pick up all schemes where onsite green space was approved subsequent to the adoption of the Local Plan. A map showing all areas of green space was then sent to all Parish Councils, to ask whether the boundaries of the green space that had been identified were correct and whether there were any additional areas of green space that had been missed. Furthermore, the draft version of this document was consulted upon in September 2021 and provided a further opportunity for the identification of additional sites from Parish Councils, residents, and other interested parties.
- 3.19 Site visits were then undertaken across the District in order to check the boundaries of each site and specifically to make a qualitative assessment of each green space identified with equipped areas of play. A copy of the site visit proforma can be found at Appendix A. An assessment was made as to the accessibility of the site (including for disabled people), the cleanliness and maintenance of the site, the perception of safety and the use of the site. The type of facilities available at each site, including play equipment, courts and pitches, car parking, public toilets, lighting and bins, were also noted.

Step 3: Set provision standards

- 3.20 Once the audit of local provision had been undertaken, provision standards were set, using national standards as a baseline and taking into account local circumstances in order to determine localised standards.

Step 4: Apply the provision standards

- 3.21 By applying the provision standards, those areas which have a deficiency of green space were identified and have been taken into account as part of the emerging Local Plan, through policy formulation.

Step 5: Draft policies

- 3.22 The final step does not form part of this study but has been undertaken as part of preparation of the Local Plan and this document has been used to guide policy development. Policy IC3 has been drafted to ensure that existing green space is protected and enhanced and that a mechanism exists for the creation of new green space.

Identifying Local Need

- 4.1 As a predominantly rural District, it is well served in terms of open countryside and farmland. Even in Selby Town, as the largest settlement, the open countryside is visible and accessible within a short walk. However, this assessment is specifically concerned with the level of more formal and accessible green space which exists within the District's settlements, rather than in the open countryside.
- 4.2 The identification of local need has been undertaken in the following ways:
- Consideration of the demographic profile of the District, which may impact on the levels of demand for different types of green space; and
 - In order to obtain the views of local communities a survey was delivered to each Parish Council in the District which asked about, amongst other things, the satisfaction with existing provision and the identification of local needs and deficiencies. In addition to this, further comments were received during consultation on the Draft Green Space Audit in Autumn 2021.

Demographic profile of the District

- 4.3 The demographic profile of the District provides an indication of the level of demand there is likely to be for green space in each settlement. Whilst green space is important for the health and well-being of all sections of the community, the proportion of young people in each settlement can provide an indication of which settlements are likely to have a more pressing need for areas of equipped play.
- 4.4 Table 3 sets out the population by parish, including the proportion of under-16 year olds in each parish. Analysis of the data shows a significant variation between parishes, ranging from Little Smeaton where under-16s account for only 11% of the overall population of the parish to Newton Kyme where 0-16 year olds account for 32% of the total population.

Table 3: Population by Parish (mid 2020 estimate)

Parish	Total population	0-16 year olds	% of 0-16 year olds
Acaster Selby	403	96	24%
Appleton Roebuck	908	212	23%
Balne	255	48	19%
Barkston Ash	363	75	21%
Barlby with Osgodby	5620	1036	18%
Barlow	808	139	17%
Beal	769	126	16%
Biggin	150	38	25%
Bilbrough	399	82	21%
Birkin	129	17	13%
Bolton Percy	350	76	22%
Brayton	5389	969	18%
Brotherton	729	138	19%
Burn	462	65	14%
Burton Salmon	401	55	14%
Byram cum Sutton	1464	276	19%
Camblesforth	1530	236	15%
Carlton	2034	377	19%
Catterton	240	48	20%

Cawood	1687	316	19%
Chapel Haddlesey	218	30	14%
Church Fenton	1502	350	23%
Cliffe	1439	255	18%
Colton	197	38	19%
Criddling Stubbs	164	28	17%
Drax	460	90	20%
Eggborough	2338	497	21%
Escrick	1138	258	23%
Fairburn	859	126	15%
Gateforth	243	37	15%
Grimston	162	35	22%
Hambleton	2084	402	19%
Healaugh	240	48	20%
Heck	219	43	20%
Hemingbrough	1974	365	18%
Hensall	821	132	16%
Hillam	701	116	17%
Hirst Courtney	342	49	14%
Huddleston with Newthorpe	451	70	16%
Kelfield	438	78	18%
Kellington	894	165	18%
Kirkby Wharfe with North Milford	162	35	22%
Kirk Smeaton	404	51	13%
Lead	582	99	17%
Little Fenton	373	70	19%
Little Smeaton	288	33	11%
Long Drax	131	25	19%
Monk Fryston	1061	236	22%
Newland	227	42	19%
Newton Kyme cum Toulston	631	204	32%
North Duffield	1357	262	19%
Oxton	291	51	18%
Riccall	2421	405	17%
Ryther cum Ossendyke	261	42	16%
Saxton with Scarthingwell	582	99	17%
Selby	17348	3589	21%
Sherburn in Elmet	8069	1682	21%
Skipwith	274	40	15%
South Milford	2860	597	21%
Stapleton	333	46	14%
Steeton	197	38	19%
Stillingfleet	402	81	20%
Stutton with Hazlewood	969	146	15%
Tadcaster	5926	1044	18%
Temple Hirst	161	29	18%
Thorganby	390	90	23%
Thorpe Willoughby	3343	656	20%
Towton	229	30	13%
Ulleskelf	1232	337	27%
Walden Stubbs	170	29	17%
West Haddlesey	248	47	19%
Whitley	1196	291	24%
Wistow	1304	253	19%
Womersley	503	75	15%

Community Consultation

- 4.5 As part of the audit of existing provision, a questionnaire was sent to all Parish Councils which asked whether there were any additional requirements for additional green space in the parish. A further opportunity for comment was provided during consultation on the Draft Green Space Audit. The following responses were identified:

Table 4: Deficiencies in provision identified by Parish Councils

Burton Salmon Parish Council	There is a requirement for a children’s play area in the village and the Parish Council believe that the best location would be at the Beech Grove garage area, next to the village hall.
Kelfield Parish Council	There is a requirement for children’s play space in the village
Kellington Parish Council	There is a shortage of football and rugby pitches in the south of Selby District, including in Kellington. The Parish Council has actively searched for suitable land. The loss of facilities at Eggborough Power Station (sports club, cricket pitch, football pitch, golf course, outdoor bowling) has had a significant impact on the local community.
Stillingfleet Parish Council	There is a deficiency of areas for children to play in the village. The need to identify green space to develop a children’s playground persists and the Parish Council are hoping to acquire land behind the village hall. The former mine should be designated as informal green space (potential for a nature reserve).
Ulleskelf Parish Council	There is a requirement for a children’s play area at the airbase.

- 4.6 The information in Table 4 above, along with the demographic data in table 3 have fed into the Area Based Summaries in Section 7 to help inform those areas where there are deficiencies in provision.

Audit of Existing Green Space

5.1 In auditing the provision of existing green space in the District, the following data resources were utilised:

- The Selby District Local Plan (2005): Designated areas of Recreational Open Space and Local Amenity Space;
- A search of all residential planning permissions since the Local Plan was adopted to identify those sites that proposed on-site green space provision;
- Information and records from other Council departments, including the Asset Management Team;
- GIS and aerial photography data;
- Local knowledge;
- A survey to all Parish Councils asking them to confirm green space identified by the Council; and
- Consultation on the Draft Green Space Audit which provided information on green space that had previously been missed.

Quantity of Green space

5.2 Table 5 shows the scale of provision of green space (in hectares) in the District, by typology and broken down for Selby, Tadcaster, Sherburn and the Tier 1, Tier 2 and Smaller villages, as defined in the emerging Local Plan. Appendix B provides the full breakdown by individual settlement. In order to prevent the double-counting of green space, where green space could be defined as more than one typology (e.g. a recreation ground that includes formal football pitches) a decision has been made on the site's primary use. The Audit has identified a total of 1186.75 hectares of green space in District. However, a significant proportion of this overall figure comprises large areas of natural and semi-natural green space, including Bishops Wood, Skipwith Common, Fairbun Ings, Brayton Barff and Hambleton Hough which provide Districtwide opportunities for recreation and leisure.

Table 5: Quantity of existing green space (ha)

	Settlement						
	Selby	Tadcaster	Sherburn in Elmet	Tier 1 Villages	Tier 2 Villages	Smaller Villages	District Total
Green space Typology							
Parks & Recreation Grounds	20.65	1.57	8.06	26.04	14.41	19.79	90.52
Allotments	7.49	3.44	1.59	8.69	2.07	1.47	24.75
Churchyards / Cemeteries	4.69	3.14	1.37	6.99	3.97	6.87	27.03
Informal Green space	9.79	4.16	2.6	9.41	14.7	13.61	54.27
Natural & Semi Natural Green space	10.3	0	0	58.05	506.35	328.28	902.98
Formal Outdoor Sports	12.98	9.65	3.61	31.09	19.45	10.42	87.2
Total Ha	65.9	21.96	17.23	140.27	560.95	380.44	1186.75

5.3 Table 6 provides details of the number of equipped play areas in the District. This has been expressed as a number of facilities rather than overall hectareage to prevent double counting, given that these facilities are often located within parks or on recreation grounds. A total of 90 areas of equipped play are identified across the district. Appendix B provides a full breakdown of areas of equipped play by settlement.

Table 6: Number of areas of equipped play

	Settlement						
	Selby	Tadcaster	Sherburn in Elmet	Tier 1 Villages	Tier 2 Villages	Smaller Villages	District Total
Areas of Equipped Play (number)							
LAPs	3	0	2	10	4	0	19
LEAPs	10	3	4	9	3	9	38
NEAPs	5	0	1	9	9	7	31
Stand-alone skateboard park	1	0	0	0	1	0	2
Total Number	19	3	7	28	17	16	90

5.4 Tables 8 and 9 provide the results of the audit, expressed as an amount per 1,000 population. This allows for direct comparisons to be made between different types of settlements and again a full breakdown by settlement is appended at Appendix B.

5.5 These tables show that the smaller villages have the most provision of parks and recreation grounds, burial grounds and informal green space in the District, per 1,000 population. Tadcaster, however, has the highest levels of allotments and formal outdoor sports provision. The tier 2 villages have the highest amount of natural and semi-natural green space. It should be noted however that this figure is distorted by a number of particularly large areas of natural / semi-natural green space which perform a Districtwide function. In terms of equipped areas of play, the District's smaller villages have, on average, the highest levels of provision, whilst Tadcaster is least well-served.

Table 7: Population (ONS 2017 mid-year estimates)

Settlement	Population
Selby	17,348
Tadcaster	5,926
Sherburn in Elmet	8,069
Tier 1 Villages	31,452
Tier 2 Villages	16,433
Smaller Villages	12,133

Table 8: Green space provision per 1,000 population (ha)

	Settlement					
	Selby	Tadcaster	Sherburn in Elmet	Tier 1 villages	Tier 2 villages	Smaller villages
Green space Typology						
Parks & Recreation Grounds	1.19	0.26	1.0	0.83	0.88	1.63
Allotments	0.43	0.58	0.2	0.28	0.13	0.12
Churchyards / Cemeteries	0.27	0.53	0.17	0.22	0.24	0.57
Informal Green space	0.56	0.7	0.32	0.3	0.89	1.12
Natural & Semi Natural Green space	0.59	0	0	1.85	30.81	27.06
Formal Outdoor Sports	0.75	1.63	0.45	0.99	1.18	0.86

Table 9: Number of equipped areas of play per 1,000 population

	Settlement					
	Selby	Tadcaster	Sherburn in Elmet	Tier 1 villages	Tier 2 villages	Smaller villages
Equipped Play Areas						
LAP	0.17	0	0.25	0.32	0.24	0.00
LEAP	0.58	0.51	0.5	0.29	0.18	0.74
NEAP	0.29	0	0.12	0.29	0.55	0.58
Stand-alone skateboard park	0.06	0	0	0.00	0.06	0
Total	1.10	0.51	0.87	0.89	1.03	1.32

Quality of existing green space

- 5.6 The PPG17 companion guide states that in assessing the quality of green space, a clear set of benchmarks are required and ideally some form of scoring system. A qualitative assessment of those areas of green space with equipped play areas has been undertaken and the quality has been assessed within the overall context of the green space that they are located in, for example as a park or local recreation ground.
- 5.7 A qualitative assessment of the remaining typologies has not been undertaken as whilst these typologies are considered to provide important amenity or recreational value, they often have an alternative primary purpose, for example as burial grounds or important natural habitats, or in the case of informal green space they provide incidental green space. In terms of formal outdoor sports provision, this is covered by the Council's Outdoor and Indoor Sports Strategies which should be read in conjunction with this Green Space Audit.

5.8 Site visits were undertaken of all areas of green space with areas of equipped play to make a qualitative assessment of each space. A copy of the Site Visit Proforma can be found at Appendix A and the assessment considered the following criteria:

- Access arrangements
- Disabled access
- Cleanliness
- Perception of safety
- General maintenance
- Use of site
- List of facilities provided on the site

Local Areas of Play (LAPs)

5.9 There are a total of 19 LAPs in the District, 1 of which is awaiting the installation of play equipment. The results are as follows:

Table 10: LAP Quality Assessment

ACCESS ARRANGEMENTS	NUMBER OF SITES
Access is prohibited	0
Limited access (access requires special arrangement e.g. school grounds / sports club)	0
Unrestricted (although may have dawn to dusk restrictions)	18 (100%)
DISABLED ACCESS	
None (e.g. there are steps which prevent disabled access to the site)	5 (28%)
Poor (e.g. there is a steep gradient)	2 (11%)
Reasonable (but it may be unclear or lacking in maintenance)	4 (22%)
Good (clearly defined and maintained)	7 (39%)
CLEANLINESS	
Significant evidence of litter, dog fouling or graffiti	1 (6%)
Limited evidence of litter, dog fouling or graffiti	1 (6%)
No evidence of litter, dog fouling or graffiti	16 (88%)
PERCEPTION OF SAFETY	
Poor (the site has no natural surveillance, is not well lit and has areas which are hidden)	0
Moderate (the site has some natural surveillance and the majority of the site feels open and safe)	5 (28%)
Good (the site has good natural surveillance, is well lit and feels open and safe)	13 (72%)
GENERAL MAINTENANCE	

Site is in a serious state of disrepair and falling into a serious state	0
Site has marked evidence of disrepair but not to a critical level	0
Site has signs of degradation but generally in good order	6 (33%)
Highly maintained. Site is very tidy with well-maintained equipment	12 (67%)
USE OF SITE	
Mainly passive (passing through the site rather than stopping)	0
Mainly casual (sitting, walking, informal play)	18 (100%)
Mainly organised (formal play e.g. football fixture)	0

5.10 All of the LAPs in the District have unrestricted access, however disabled access is much more variable with nearly 40% of LAPs having either poor or no access for disabled people. The vast majority of sites score highly in terms of cleanliness and natural surveillance. Sites were found to be generally well-maintained, and all sites performed a mainly casual function (e.g. informal play). In terms of facilities, all sites had some play equipment for young children along with the provision of a litter bin. 15 of the 18 sites also had some seating and one site had on-site lighting.

Local Equipped Areas of Play

5.11 There are a total of 38 LEAPs in the District, of which 2 are awaiting the installation of play equipment and have therefore not been subject to a qualitative assessment. The cumulative results of the qualitative assessment of each site is provided below:

Table 11: LEAP Quality Assessment

ACCESS ARRANGEMENTS	NUMBER OF SITES
Access is prohibited	0
Limited access (access requires special arrangement e.g. school grounds / sports club)	2 (6%)
Unrestricted (although may have dawn to dusk restrictions)	34 (94%)
DISABLED ACCESS	
None (e.g. there are steps which prevent disabled access to the site)	9 (25%)
Poor (e.g. there is a steep gradient)	4 (11%)
Reasonable (but it may be unclear or lacking in maintenance)	13 (36%)
Good (clearly defined and maintained)	10 (28%)
CLEANLINESS	
Significant evidence of litter, dog fouling or graffiti	0

Limited evidence of litter, dog fouling or graffiti	8 (22%)
No evidence of litter, dog fouling or graffiti	28 (78%)
PERCEPTION OF SAFETY	
Poor (the site has no natural surveillance, is not well lit and has areas which are hidden)	1 (3%)
Moderate (the site has some natural surveillance and the majority of the site feels open and safe)	13 (36%)
Good (the site has good natural surveillance, is well lit and feels open and safe)	22 (61%)
GENERAL MAINTENANCE	
Site is in a serious state of disrepair and falling into a serious state	0
Site has marked evidence of disrepair but not to a critical level	0
Site has signs of degradation but generally in good order	16 (44%)
Highly maintained. Site is very tidy with well-maintained equipment	20 (56%)
USE OF SITE	
Mainly passive (passing through the site rather than stopping)	1 (3%)
Mainly casual (sitting, walking, informal play)	34 (94%)
Mainly organised (formal play e.g. football fixture)	1 (3%)

5.12 The vast majority of LEAPs have unrestricted access, whilst access for disabled people is much more limited (e.g. less than 65% of sites are considered to have good or reasonable access for disabled people). The majority of sites have good levels of cleanliness and equipment is considered to be in good order. In terms of safety, sites vary with only 61% of sites being considered to have good natural surveillance. The majority of sites were identified as being used in a casual manner, i.e. for informal play, although it should be noted that given the size of some of the LEAPs and the variety of provision, some will also cater for more formal play e.g. football matches.

5.13 In addition to play equipment, the majority of LEAPs also have litter bins and seating provision. Other facilities include goal ends / football pitches (4 sites), basketball nets / courts (6 sites), teen shelters (3 sites), trim trails (1 site), a skate park (1 site), a MUGA (1 site), car parking (3 sites) and parking for cycles (1 site).

Neighbourhood Equipped Areas of Play

5.14 There are a total of 31 NEAPs across the District. A qualitative assessment of each one was undertaken, the results of which are shown in Table 12 below.

Table 12: NEAP Quality Assessment

ACCESS ARRANGEMENTS	NUMBER OF SITES
Access is prohibited	0
Limited access (access requires special arrangement e.g. school grounds / sports club)	1 (3%)
Unrestricted (although may have dawn to dusk restrictions)	30 (97%)
DISABLED ACCESS	
None (e.g. there are steps which prevent disabled access to the site)	7 (23%)
Poor (e.g. there is a steep gradient)	7 (23%)
Reasonable (but it may be unclear or lacking in maintenance)	13 (42%)
Good (clearly defined and maintained)	4 (12%)
CLEANLINESS	
Significant evidence of litter, dog fouling or graffiti	0
Limited evidence of litter, dog fouling or graffiti	4 (13%)
No evidence of litter, dog fouling or graffiti	27 (87%)
PERCEPTION OF SAFETY	
Poor (the site has no natural surveillance, is not well lit and has areas which are hidden)	2 (6%)
Moderate (the site has some natural surveillance and the majority of the site feels open and safe)	13 (42%)
Good (the site has good natural surveillance, is well lit and feels open and safe)	16 (52%)
GENERAL MAINTENANCE	
Site is in a serious state of disrepair and falling into a serious state	0
Site has marked evidence of disrepair but not to a critical level	0
Site has signs of degradation but generally in good order	2 (6%)
Highly maintained. Site is very tidy with well-maintained equipment	29 (94%)
USE OF SITE	
Mainly passive (passing through the site rather than stopping)	0
Mainly casual (sitting, walking, informal play)	31 (100%)
Mainly organised (formal play e.g. football fixture)	0

- 5.15 The majority of NEAPs have unrestricted access, however over 40% of all NEAPs are considered to have poor or no access to disabled people. The cleanliness of sites is generally good, with the majority of sites also considered to be highly maintained. Only just over a half of sites are considered to have good natural surveillance. All sites are considered to serve a casual informal play purpose. In addition to a good variety of play equipment which generally caters for a range of age groups, most sites also provide areas of seating and bins. Sites also had a range of other recreation and sporting facilities including goal end / football pitches (19 sites), basketball hoops / courts (11 sites), cricket pitches (4 sites), bowling greens (2 sites), tennis courts (3 sites), rugby pitch (1 site), MUGAs (3 sites), skate parks (3 sites), teen shelters (2 sites), zip wires (2 sites), outdoor gym equipment (5 sites), trim trails (3 sites), a ping pong table (1 site) and a bandstand (1 site).

Skate Parks

- 5.16 In addition to those parks and recreation grounds that incorporate skate parks, there are two further stand-alone skate parks in the District, in Selby and Fairburn. Both sites have unrestricted access and provide opportunities for casual informal play. The Fairburn site has no access to disabled people and disabled access at the Selby site is considered to be reasonable. The level of cleanliness and maintenance is considered to be either good or reasonable at both sites. The Fairburn site has moderate natural surveillance and can be seen from the main road, the Selby site however is located to the rear of the leisure centre with no natural surveillance.

Qualitative Summary

- 5.17 The qualitative assessment of sites has found that the vast majority of areas of equipped play within the District are highly maintained with very good levels of cleanliness. Safety and natural surveillance are generally considered to be excellent for the District's smaller sites (LAPs), whilst natural surveillance of LEAPs and NEAPs are generally less good. Whilst access to the sites is generally unrestricted, access for disabled people is often considered to be poor or non-existent. This will need to be addressed by any future improvements to existing sites, along with ensuring that disabled access is incorporated into the design of new areas of equipped play.
- 5.18 Selby District Council have had capital funding for improvements to six play areas that they own in the District. Works have been completed at Grange Road, Tadcaster. Works on the remaining sites will be complete by March 2023:
- Charles Street, Selby
 - Petre Avenue, Selby
 - Volta Street, Selby
 - Parkland Drive, Tadcaster
 - Woodlands Avenue, Tadcaster

Setting Local Green Space Standards

- 6.1 Following the assessment of local needs and an audit of Districtwide provision, it is necessary to set locally determined provision standards.
- 6.2 In setting local green space standards, there are two important components as follows:
1. Quantitative standards: Taking into account the different green space typologies, how much green space should there be across the District to serve the local community?
 2. Accessibility standards: What are the maximum distances that the local population can expect to be from different types of green space provision?

Quantitative Standards

- 6.3 The PPG17 Companion Guide states that the easiest way to express a quantity standard is through the area of provision required per 1,000 population. However, it states that a better approach for pitches is along the lines of 1 football or cricket pitch (for example) per 1,000 population.
- 6.4 Fields in Trust (formerly the National Playing Fields Association) have set out national standards for outdoor sport and play which are shown in Table 13 along with the quantitative standards utilised by neighbouring local authorities. However, it should be noted that the need for open space is largely influenced by the population of any given area and therefore additional factors should be taken into account such as:
- Age and social structure of the local population, along with population density
 - The amount of private green space in the District, for example public green space is more critical in densely built-up areas (e.g. areas of flats which don't have any private gardens).

Table 13: Benchmarking against Fields in Trust and Neighbouring Authority Quantitative Standards

	Fields in Trust	Leeds City Council	East Riding Council	City of York Council	Doncaster Council
Parks & Recreation Grounds	0.8 ha per 1,000	1 ha per 1,000	0.18 ha per 1,000	0.18 ha per 1,000	0.69 ha per 1,000
Equipped Play Areas	0.25 ha per 1,000	2 facilities per 1,000	11.6 sqm per child in urban 9.3 sqm per child in rural	Kids – 0.48 ha & Teens – 0.21 ha per 1,000	0.8 ha per 1,000
Allotments	--	0.24 ha per 1,000	0.3 ha per 1,000	0.29 ha per 1,000	0.125 per 1,000
Informal Green space	0.6 ha per 1,000	0.45 ha per 1,000	0.6 ha per 1,000	1.45 ha per 1,000	--
Natural / Semi Natural Green space	1.8 ha per 1,000	2 ha per 1,000	2 ha per 1,000	2.13 ha per 1,000	2 ha per 1,000

- 6.5 The Fields in Trust standards, along with existing levels of green space that have been identified through the Green Space Audit (shown in Tables 8 & 9 of this report) have been used as the basis for determining standards, along with community views on any local deficiencies and benchmarking against standards from neighbouring districts. The standards have also been set taking into account the fact that the District is predominantly rural and as such residents cannot realistically expect to have the same level of access to the full range of different types of green space and recreational / sports facilities normally available in more densely populated areas, such as large cities.
- 6.6 Table 14 provides the Districtwide green space standards that have been set. No standards have been set for formal outdoor sports provision as this is covered by the Outdoor Sports and Playing Pitches Strategy. Similarly, no quantitative standard has been set for the level of church yards and cemeteries required, as it is considered that these primarily perform a burial function, and any amenity or recreational function is ancillary.

Table 14: Districtwide Quantitative Green space Standards

	Standard per 1,000 population
Parks & Recreational Grounds	0.8 ha
Equipped Areas of Play	1 area of equipped play
Allotments	0.25 ha
Informal Green space	0.6 ha
Natural & Semi Natural Green space	1.8 ha

Accessibility Standards

- 6.7 Accessibility standards are required to ensure that local communities have access to green space and that they are accessible by means other than the private car. These standards have been locally-set considering the unique nature of the District, along with Fields in Trust standards and those employed by neighbouring authorities which are illustrated in Table 15.

Table 15: Benchmarking against Fields in Trust and Neighbouring Authority Accessibility Standards

	Fields in Trust	Leeds City Council	East Riding Council	City of York Council	Doncaster Council
Parks & Recreation Grounds	710m	15 mins walk	10km	City park: 20 mins walk Local park: 15 mins walk	<2ha: 400m 2ha+: 1.2km 20ha+: 3.2km
Equipped Play Areas	LAP: 100m LEAP: 400m NEAP: 1km MUGA / Skateboard park: 700m	15 mins walk		Kids facilities - 10 mins walk Teens facilities- 15 mins walk	<1600 sqm: 240m >1600 sqm: 600m
Allotments	--	15 mins walk	--	15 mins walk	1km
Informal Green space	480m	480m	2km	5 mins walk	--

Natural / Semi Natural Green space	720m	15 mins walk	4km	15 mins walk	2ha+:500m 100ha+: 5km 500ha+: 10km
------------------------------------	------	--------------	-----	--------------	------------------------------------------

6.8 Fields in Trust use the distance of 800m to represent an average of a 10 minutes walk. Therefore:

- 5 minutes walk = 400 metres
- 10 minutes walk = 800 metres
- 15 minutes walk = 1.2 km
- 20 minutes walk = 1.6km

6.9 The locally-set distance thresholds are shown in Table 16 and have been use to map buffers on all areas of green space in the District which are shown on the [accompanying map](#). These maps illustrate which settlements are well-served or deficient in particular types of green space.

Table 16: Districtwide Green space Distance Buffers

	Distance
Parks & Recreational Grounds	1.2km (15 mins walk)
Equipped Areas of Play	LAP: 400 metres (5 mins walk) LEAP: 800 metres (10 mins walk) NEAP: 1.2km (15 mins walk)
Allotments	1.2km (15 mins walk)
Informal Green space	400 metres (5 mins walk)
Natural & Semi Natural Green space	Local provision: 1.2 km (15 mins walk) Districtwide provision ¹ : 10km

6.10 The local quantitative and accessibility standards, along with the overall quantity of green space in each settlement (Appendix B) and green space buffers ([see maps](#)) have informed the area-based summaries in Chapter 7.

¹ Districtwide provision describe those larger sites which people might be expected to drive to and comprises Skipwith Common, Fairburn Ings, Hambleton Hough, Brayton Barff and Bishops Wood.

Applying Local Standards: Area Based Summaries

- 7.1 By applying the locally set quantity and accessibility standards set out in Section 6 to each settlement in the District, areas of surplus and deficiency can be identified. This will ensure that settlements which do not meet the minimum provision requirements can be identified and can assist in any future policy decisions. It is important to note that a surplus of green space in any settlement does not justify the removal of the site's protection as the standards only provide a minimum target and green space should be considered in the context of its accessibility, quality, the amount (or deficit) of similar green space in neighbouring areas and any future development which may create pressures on existing green space.
- 7.2 As previously stated, local standards have not been applied to burial grounds, as whilst these can offer nature conservation value and areas of peace and tranquillity, their primary purpose is not for recreation or amenity. Similarly, standards have not been applied to formal outdoor sports provision as this is covered by the Outdoor Sports and Playing Pitches Strategy. These areas of green space have been plotted and can be found on the [accompanying map](#).
- 7.3 Area based summaries are provided below for Selby, Tadcaster, Sherburn in Elmet, the Tier 1, 2 and Smaller Villages. These summaries should be read in conjunction with Appendix B which sets out the amount of green space which exists in each individual settlement and the [accompanying map](#) which show the location of the different typologies of green space across the District, with the accessibility buffers applied.
- 7.4 It should be noted that green space has not been mapped beyond the District boundary. Therefore, there may be some settlements close to the border which show as not being located close to existing green space but are in fact within a reasonable distance of existing green space located beyond Selby District.

Selby

Table 17: Selby summary (ha per 1,000 population)²

	Parks / Recreation grounds	Allotments	Burial grounds	Informal green space	Natural / semi natural	Formal outdoor sports
Districtwide standard	0.80	0.25	--	0.60	1.80	--
Selby	1.19	0.43	0.27	0.56	0.59	0.75

- 7.5 The audit found that there is a total of 20.65ha of parks and recreation grounds in Selby which equates to 1.19ha per 1,000 population, an amount which is considered to exceed the minimum standard. The distribution of provision ensures that all of the population of the town are within a 15 minute walk (1.2km) of a park or recreation ground. In terms of equipped areas of play, the town contains a good selection comprising 3 LAPs, 10 LEAPS, 5 NEAPs and one standalone skateboard park. The distribution of these areas is good and ensures that all residents are both within a 10 minute walk (800m) of a LEAP and within 15

² Cells are highlighted red or green to indicate whether the amount of green space per 1,000 population is above or below the locally-set standard. Standards have not been set for burial grounds or formal outdoor sports provision for reasons explained in Section 6.

minutes walk (1.2km) of a NEAP. LAPs are much smaller areas of equipped play which have a limited catchment and because of this, the coverage of these facilities is much less comprehensive.

- 7.6 The audit identified a total of 7.49ha of allotments within Selby, which equates to 0.43ha per 1,000 population, therefore significantly exceeding the districtwide standard of 0.25ha per 1,000 population. The majority of the town is within a 15 minute walk of an allotment, excluding the very western edge of Leeds Road. Informal green space in the town totals 9.79ha and at 0.56ha per 1,000 population falls short of the Districtwide standard for this typology. Furthermore, the distribution of informal green space is skewed to the south east of the town and parts of north, west and central Selby are not within a 5 minute walk (400m) of this provision.
- 7.7 Natural and semi-natural green space provision within the town totals 10.3ha and is perhaps not surprisingly, given that Selby is the most built-up settlement in the district, is significantly below-standard for this typology (0.59ha per 1,000 population). The distribution of this green space, however, ensures that the whole of the town is within a 15 minute walk (1.2km) of local provision. In addition, all residents are also within 10km of a large area of natural / semi-natural green space which is considered to serve a districtwide function. Additionally, the town also contains 4.69ha of burial grounds and 12.98ha of outdoor sporting facilities.
- 7.8 The overall quantity and accessibility of green space provision in Selby is fairly well placed to meet the needs of the existing local population and should be maintained and protected as such. In addition, Appendix C sets out those areas of committed green space, where work has already started on site, so there is a high degree of confidence that the green space will be delivered. This identifies that a further park / recreation ground with equipped play will be delivered in the town (0.41ha), along with 0.28 of additional informal green space. However, the level of existing and committed green space does not negate the requirement for future provision and as additional pressure is placed on existing facilities through the delivery of new homes, new green space will be required. The following bullet points provide Selby-specific recommendations:
- Maintain the overall level of parks, recreation grounds and equipped play areas;
 - Protect existing allotments;
 - Ensure that opportunities are taken to address the deficit in informal green space particularly in areas of northern, western and central Selby; and
 - Investigate mechanisms for increasing the amount of natural / semi-natural green space within or on the edge of the town.

Tadcaster

Table 18: Tadcaster summary (ha per 1,000 population)

	Parks / Recreation grounds	Allotments	Burial grounds	Informal green space	Natural / semi natural	Formal outdoor sports
Districtwide standard	0.80	0.25	--	0.60	1.80	--
Tadcaster	0.26	0.58	0.53	0.70	0.00	1.63

- 7.9 The audit identified a total of 1.57ha of parks and recreation grounds in Tadcaster which equates to 0.26 per 1,000 population, an amount which is significantly below the minimum standard. The distribution of provision, however, ensures that the vast majority of the town is within a 15 minute walk (1.2km) of a park or recreation ground. The provision of equipped play areas is fairly limited, with only 3 LEAPs present. The distribution of these play areas means that parts of the town west of the river are not within an acceptable distance, including the Tower Crescent / Kelbar Close, Westfield Crescent and Edgerton Drive areas.
- 7.10 There are 3.44ha of allotments in the town which provides over double the Districtwide standard at 0.58ha per 1,000 population. The distribution of facilities is reasonably good, however given 3 of the 4 allotments are located east of the river, the southwestern edge of Tadcaster (the Woodlands Avenue area) is not within a 15 minute walk. Informal green space totals 4.16ha and at 0.7ha per 1,000 slightly exceeds the standard for this typology. The distribution of informal green space means that the majority of the population are within a 5 minute walk, however there is an area of deficit in the north of the town (Hudson Way).
- 7.11 The audit did not identify any natural or semi-natural green space in the town and furthermore the population are not located within 10km of one of the areas of large districtwide provision. The town provides 3.14ha of burial grounds and 9.65ha of outdoor sporting facilities.
- 7.12 Based on the above, it appears that there are some deficiencies in provision of green space in Tadcaster, particularly in terms of the provision of parks, recreation grounds and areas of equipped play. Similarly, residents of the town currently have no access to natural and semi-natural green space within a reasonable distance. This need is likely to be exacerbated by the delivery of new dwellings over the Plan period. Existing green space should therefore be maintained and protected, and opportunities should be taken to address the Tadcaster-specific recommendations, where possible:
- Ensure that opportunities are taken to improve the quantity of parks, recreation grounds and equipped play areas, taking into account those areas of the town which are less accessible to existing facilities;
 - Protect existing allotments;
 - Protect existing areas of informal green space; and
 - Investigate mechanisms for increasing the amount of natural / semi-natural green space within or on the edge of the town.

Sherburn in Elmet

Table 19: Sherburn in Elmet summary (ha per 1,000 population)

	Parks / Recreation grounds	Allotments	Burial grounds	Informal green space	Natural / semi natural	Formal outdoor sports
Districtwide standard	0.80	0.25	--	0.60	1.80	--
Sherburn in Elmet	1.00	0.20	0.17	0.32	0.00	0.45

- 7.13 The audit found that there is a total of 8.06ha of parks and recreation grounds in Sherburn in Elmet which equates to 1.00ha per 1,000 population, an amount which exceeds the minimum standard. The distribution of this type of green space ensures that all of the local community are within a 15 minute walk (1.2km) of a park or recreation ground. Sherburn in Elmet has 2 LAPs, 4 LEAPs and 1 NEAP and in terms of coverage, the majority of the settlement is within a 10 minute walk (800m) of a LEAP and all of the town is within a 15 minute walk (1.2km) of a NEAP. Because LAPs are much smaller areas of equipped play, they have a limited catchment area and coverage of these facilities is much less comprehensive. A further 1.26ha of recreation grounds (all with proposed equipped play) have been identified as commitments, as shown in Appendix C.
- 7.14 The audit identified 1.59ha of allotments in the town, equating to 0.20ha per 1,000 population. This is just short of the Districtwide standard, however all of the settlement is within a 15 minute walk of an allotment. Informal green space totals 2.6ha and at 0.32ha per 1,000 population is significantly below standard. The distribution of this type of green space means that the eastern and western edges of the town are not within a 5 minute walk (400m) of informal green space. However, Appendix C identifies that nearly 9ha of additional informal green space will be delivered as part of new housing developments in the town which will address this current deficiency.
- 7.15 The audit did not identify any natural or semi-natural green space in the town, but all residents are within 10km of a large area of natural / semi-natural green space which is considered to serve a districtwide function. The town also contains 1.37ha of burial grounds and 3.61ha of outdoor sporting facilities.
- 7.16 Whilst the town is well served by parks, recreation grounds and play areas, the green space audit has identified quantitative deficiencies in the other types of green space. Furthermore, residents of the town currently have no access to local areas of natural and semi-natural green space within a reasonable walking distance. This need is likely to be exacerbated by the delivery of new dwellings over the plan period. Existing green space should therefore be maintained and protected, and opportunities should be taken to address the Sherburn-specific recommendations, where possible:
- Maintain the overall level of parks, recreation grounds and equipped play areas;
 - Protect existing allotments and take opportunities for additional provision;
 - Protect existing areas of informal green space; and
 - Investigate mechanisms for increasing the amount of natural / semi-natural green space within or on the edge of the town.

Tier 1 Villages

Table 20: Tier 1 Villages summary (ha per 1,000 population)

	Parks / Recreation grounds	Allotments	Burial grounds	Informal green space	Natural / semi natural	Formal outdoor sports
Districtwide standard	0.80	0.25	--	0.60	1.80	--
Barlby / Osgodby	0.68	0.93	0.09	0.27	1.88	0.71
Brayton	0.49	0.00	0.31	0.28	6.69	0.64

Byram / Brotherton	1.32	0.25	0.56	0.05	1.28	1.66
Carlton	0.38	0.11	0.43	0.06	0.00	1.95
Eggborough / Whitley	0.95	0.00	0.00	0.22	0.00	0.26
Hambleton	0.00	0.00	0.27	0.66	4.15	2.80
Hemingbrough	1.20	0.00	0.46	0.16	0.00	0.21
Riccall	2.73	1.09	0.24	0.62	0.00	2.16
South Milford	0.39	0.02	0.22	0.51	0.00	1.29
Thorpe Willoughby	0.74	0.00	0.00	0.21	0.00	0.00

- 7.17 Collectively the audit has identified a total of 26.04ha of parks and recreation grounds in the Tier 1 Villages which equates to 0.89 per 1,000 population, an amount which is above the minimum standard. This is complemented by 28 areas of equipped play, comprising 10 LAPs, 9 LEAPs and 9 NEAPs. However, there is a significant difference between individual villages as shown in Table 20, with Riccall vastly exceeding the Districtwide target. However, the distribution of sites means that there is good coverage of provision across the Tier 1 villages. Furthermore, commitments (as shown in Appendix C) illustrate that there is further provision of recreation grounds coming forward in Carlton, Eggborough and Thorpe Willoughby.
- 7.18 The audit found that within the Tier 1 Villages there is a total of 8.69ha of allotments which equates to 0.28ha per 1,000 population which overall is above the minimum standard. The [accompanying map](#) shows that coverage is quite limited, with no provision in Brayton, Eggborough/Whitley, Hambleton, Hemingbrough and Thorpe Willoughby. However, some villages, such as Barlby and Riccall, provide over double the minimum standard.
- 7.19 Informal green space across the Tier 1 villages totals 9.41ha and at 0.30ha per 1,000 population falls significantly short of the minimum standard. Only Riccall is well-provided for and whilst all the Tier 1 villages have some coverage, parts of individual villages (e.g. Brotherton, the southern part of Eggborough, the north part of Thorpe Willoughby, and the eastern side of Osgodby) are not within a 5 minute walk (400m) of provision. A new area of informal green space is currently being provided as part of a housing development in Carlton.
- 7.20 Overall natural and semi-natural green space provision in the Tier 1 villages totals 58.05ha which equates to 1.85ha per 1,000 population, just above the minimum standard. All of the Tier 1 villages are located within 10km of a major Districtwide site; however a number of the villages have no local provision that is within a 15 minute walk (1.2km), including Carlton Eggborough / Whitley, Hambleton, Hemingbrough, Riccall, South Milford and Thorpe Willoughby. Brayton has a significant surplus of this type of green space, due to its proximity to Brayton Barff which provides recreational opportunities for a much larger catchment area. Collectively the Tier 1 villages also contain 6.99ha of burial grounds and 31.09ha of outdoor sporting facilities.

7.21 Notwithstanding the deficiency identified in informal green space provision, the Tier 1 villages are considered collectively to be relatively well placed to meet local green space needs particularly given that they also benefit from access to the open countryside. However, as these villages are likely to see a reasonable amount of housing development over the Plan period, there will be a future requirement for new green space provision, along with an exacerbation of existing deficiencies. Specific recommendations for the Tier 1 villages are as follows:

- Maintain the overall level of parks, recreation grounds and equipped play areas and prioritise new provision in Brayton and South Milford both of which have existing deficiencies coupled with no outstanding commitments for new provision;
- Protect existing allotments and ensure that opportunities are taken to provide allotments in those Tier 1 villages with no provision;
- Protect existing areas of informal green space and ensure that opportunities are taken to increase this amount of green space; and
- Protect existing areas of natural and semi-natural green space and investigate mechanisms for the provision of local natural green space in those Tier 1 villages identified as deficient.

Tier 2 Villages

Table 21: Tier 2 Villages summary (ha per 1,000 population)

	Parks / Recreation grounds	Allotments	Burial grounds	Informal green space	Natural / semi natural	Formal outdoor sports
Districtwide standard	0.80	0.25	--	0.60	1.80	--
Appleton Roebuck	0.42	0.00	0.43	3.60	0.00	0.18
Camblesforth	0.24	0.00	0.00	0.10	0.00	0.00
Cawood	1.59	0.49	0.46	3.81	0.00	1.59
Church Fenton	0.85	0.55	0.45	0.19	0.00	2.64
Cliffe	1.44	0.00	0.00	0.29	0.00	0.00
Escrick	1.26	0.11	0.62	1.63	5.18	0.09
Fairburn	2.06	0.00	0.49	0.00	202.49	0.00
Hensall	0.69	0.00	0.65	0.00	0.00	3.02
Kellington	0.26	0.00	0.00	0.11	0.00	0.00
Monk Fryston / Hillam	0.21	0.00	0.09	0.14	0.79	2.32
North Duffield	2.10	0.21	0.00	0.42	0.00	0.00

Ulleskelf	0.33	0.00	0.00	0.78	0.00	3.17
Wistow	0.00	0.00	0.24	0.31	249.33	1.60

- 7.22 Collectively the audit has identified a total of 14.41ha of parks and recreation grounds in the Tier 2 Villages which equates to 0.88ha per 1,000 population, an amount which is just above the minimum standard. This is complemented by 17 areas of equipped play, comprising 4 LAPs, 3 LEAPs, 9 NEAP and 1 standalone skate park. However, there is significant difference between individual villages and Cawood, Cliffe, Fairburn and North Duffield, for example, far exceed the minimum standard for the provision of parks and recreation grounds. The distribution of sites means that there is good coverage of provision across the Tier 2 villages, with only the residents of Ulleskelf and Wistow not within a reasonable distance of a park or recreation ground. In particular, Ulleskelf Parish Council has identified a requirement for a children's play area at the airbase. Commitments, as shown in Appendix C, illustrate that there are further recreation grounds (with equipped play) coming forward in Ulleskelf.
- 7.23 The audit found that within the Tier 2 villages there is a total of 2.07ha of allotments which equates to 0.13ha per 1,000 population which overall is significantly deficient of the minimum standard. The accompanying map shows that coverage is limited, with no provision in Appleton Roebuck, Camblesforth, Cliffe, Fairburn, Hensall, Kellington, Monk Fryston / Hillam, Ulleskelf and Wistow. Cawood and Church Fenton provide significantly more than the minimum standard.
- 7.24 Informal green space across the Tier 2 villages totals 14.7ha and at 0.89ha per 1,000 population is collectively above the minimum standard. Villages such as Appleton Roebuck, Cawood, Escrick and Ulleskelf are well provided for and whilst the majority of Tier 2 villages have some coverage, some areas are not within a 4 minute walk (400 metres) of provision, including the villages of Fairburn and Hensall, alongside the eastern part of Church Fenton. A new area of informal green space is currently being provided as part of a housing development in Ulleskelf.
- 7.25 Overall natural and semi-natural green space provision in the Tier 2 villages totals 506.35ha which equates to 30.81ha per 1,000 population, far exceeding the minimum standard. This level of natural green space is distorted by a couple of large sites which provide districtwide opportunities for recreational opportunities, such as Fairburn Ings, Hambleton Hough and Bishops Wood. All of the Tier 2 villages are located within 10km of a major districtwide site, however many of the villages have no local provision that is within a 15 minute walk (1.2km), including Appleton Roebuck, Camblesforth, Cawood, Church Fenton, Cliffe, Hensall, Kellington and North Duffield. Collectively the Tier 2 villages also contain 3.97ha of burial grounds and 19.45ha of outdoor sporting facilities. Kellington Parish Council have identified a general shortage of football and rugby pitches in the south of the district and have stated that the loss of sporting facilities at Eggborough Power Station has had a significant impact on the local community.
- 7.26 Whilst collectively the Tier 2 villages are well provided for in terms of informal and natural / semi-natural green space, there are deficiencies in parks, recreation grounds and allotments. This need is likely to be exacerbated by the delivery of new dwellings over the Plan period. Existing green space should therefore be maintained and protected and opportunities should be taken to address the following specific recommendations:

- Maintain the overall level of parks, recreation grounds and equipped play areas and prioritise new provision in Appleton Roebuck, Camblesforth, and Wistow all of which have existing deficiencies and no existing commitments for further provision;
- Ensure that opportunities are taken to provide allotments in the Tier 2 villages;
- Protect existing areas of informal green space; and
- Protect existing areas of natural and semi-natural green space and investigate mechanisms for the provision of local natural green space in those Tier 2 villages identified as deficient.

Smaller Villages

Table 22: Smaller Villages summary (ha per 1,000 population)

	Parks / Recreation grounds	Allotments	Burial grounds	Informal green space	Natural / semi natural	Formal outdoor sports
Districtwide standard	0.80	0.25	--	0.60	1.80	--
Barkston Ash	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Barlow	3.85	0.00	0.00	0.07	40.78	0.00
Beal	1.86	0.34	0.00	0.46	0.00	0.00
Biggin	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Bilbrough	0.50	0.00	0.93	0.03	0.00	0.00
Birkin	0.70	0.00	2.33	0.23	0.00	0.00
Bolton Percy	0.00	0.29	1.63	0.57	0.00	5.77
Burn	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.04	0.00	1.67
Burton Salmon	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	4.11
Chapel Haddlesey	4.50	0.00	1.47	0.00	0.00	0.00
Colton	0.00	0.00	0.30	1.32	0.00	0.00
Cridling Stubbs	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Drax	1.78	0.00	2.35	0.00	0.00	3.54
Gateforth	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.51	0.00	0.00
Great Heck	2.05	0.00	0.00	0.18	0.00	0.00
Healaugh	0.00	0.00	2.96	0.04	0.00	0.00

Hirst Courtney	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.01
Kelfield	0.00	0.32	0.00	0.34	0.00	1.99
Kirk Smeaton	0.00	0.30	0.67	0.22	0.00	0.00
Little Fenton	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Little Smeaton	2.74	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Newland	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Newton Kyme	9.60	0.00	0.36	0.48	0.00	0.00
Ryther	0.00	0.00	1.92	7.09	0.00	0.00
Saxton	0.70	0.00	0.70	0.00	0.00	2.15
Skipwith	0.00	1.75	1.61	3.76	1077.85	0.00
Stillingfleet	0.00	0.00	1.39	18.23	0.00	2.99
Stutton	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.56	0.00	0.00
Thorganby	6.31	0.00	1.05	0.00	0.00	0.00
Towton	5.85	1.31	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
West Haddlesey	0.93	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Womersley	2.82	0.14	1.27	0.00	0.00	0.00

7.27 Collectively the audit has identified a total of 19.79ha of parks and recreation grounds in the Smaller Villages which equates to 1.63ha per 1,000 population, an amount which is over double the minimum standard. This is complemented by 16 areas of equipped play, comprising 9 LEAPs and 7 NEAPs. The ratio of provision to population is distorted by some villages significantly “over-providing”, while in fact a lot of villages have no provision at all. Villages such as Barlow, Beal, Chapel Haddlesey, Drax, Great Heck, Little Smeaton, Newton Kyme, Thorganby, Towton, West Haddlesey and Womerley have large recreation grounds including playing fields, which results in a good ratio of hectareage to population. In contrast, a lot of the Smaller Villages don’t have any provision and comprise Barkston Ash, Biggin, Bolton Percy, Burn, Burton Salmon, Colton, Cridling Stubbs, Gateforth, Healaugh, Hirst Courtney, Kelfield, Kirk Smeaton, Little Smeaton, Newland, Ryther, Skipwith, Stillingfleet and Stutton. In particular, Burton Salmon, Kelfield and Stillingfleet Parish Councils have identified a local need for children’s play space.

7.28 The audit found that within the Smaller Villages there is a total of only 1.47ha of allotments which equates to 0.12ha per 1,000 population which overall is significantly below the

minimum standard. [The accompanying map](#) shows that coverage is very limited, with no provision in most Smaller Villages. Beal, Bolton Percy, Kelfield, Kirk Smeaton Skipwith and Towton are the only Smaller Villages with allotment provision above the minimum standard.

- 7.29 Informal green space across the Smaller Villages totals 13.61ha and at 1.12ha per 1,000 population, provision is collectively significantly above the minimum standard. Villages such as Colton, Gateforth, Ryther, Skipwith and Stillingfleet are all well-provided for in terms of informal green space. A significant number of villages, however, are identified as having no informal green space provision and comprise Barkston Ash, Biggin, Burton Salmon, Chapel Haddlesey, Cridling Stubbs, Drax, Hirst Courtney, Little Fenton, Little Smeaton, Newland, Saxton, Thorganby, Towton, West Haddlesey and Womersley.
- 7.30 Overall natural and semi-natural green space provision in the Smaller Villages totals 328.3ha which equates to 27.06ha per 1,000 population, far exceeding the minimum standard. This level of natural and semi-natural green space is distorted by a couple of particularly large sites (Barlow and Skipwith Commons) which provide Districtwide opportunities for recreation. Whilst very few of the villages are within walking distance an area of natural / semi-natural green space the majority of the District is at least within 10km of one of the large sites, the only exception being the north west corner of the district. Collectively the Smaller Villages also contain 6.87ha of burial grounds and 10.42ha of outdoor sporting facilities.
- 7.31 Notwithstanding the deficiency identified in allotment provision, the Smaller Villages are considered collectively to be well placed to meet local green space needs and also benefit from easy access to the open countryside. However, it should be noted that large areas of parks, recreation grounds and natural / semi-natural green space in a number of settlements have distorted the overall figures and there are large numbers of villages that are deficient in one or more green space typology. Any new development that occurs in these villages may exacerbate existing deficiencies and contribute to a future requirement for further green space. Recommendations specific to the Smaller Villages are as follows:
- Maintain the overall level of parks, recreation grounds and equipped play areas and prioritise new provision in those villages identified as deficient. In particular, the Parish Councils of Burton Salmon, Kelfield and Stillingfleet have identified a requirement for children's play area for their villages;
 - Ensure that opportunities are taken to provide allotments in the Smaller Villages;
 - Protect existing areas of informal green space and ensure opportunities are taken to deliver further amenity space in those villages with none; and
 - Protect existing areas of natural and semi-natural green space and investigate mechanisms for the provision of local natural green space in the Smaller Villages, particularly those located in the north west of the district.

Conclusions

- 8.1 Access to a network of high-quality green space and opportunities for sport and activity is critical for the health and well-being of communities and the NPPF seeks to support strong, vibrant and healthy communities with accessible open spaces that reflect current and future needs to support the health and social well-being of communities. In addition, green space also contributes positively to the landscape and setting of the built environment.
- 8.2 The Green Space Audit has identified that whilst the quality of green space across the District has shown to be generally of a very high standard, there are some quantitative and accessibility deficiencies, particularly in some of the District's smaller settlements.
- 8.3 It is envisaged that the green space audit and the recommendations made in Section 7 should be used in the following ways:
 - Where appropriate, the findings should be used to formulate policy and inform site allocations and designations within the new Local Plan and any relevant Supplementary Planning Documents that may be prepared in the future. The Audit also serves as an important evidence base document for local communities preparing their own Neighbourhood Plans.
 - It is suggested that local communities should be provided with the opportunity to submit locally important areas of green space which may have been missed by the Audit for consideration through the Local Plan process.
 - The Audit should provide a useful starting point for negotiations with applicants on planning applications for housing development to ensure the provision of green space which meets the needs of local communities.

Appendix A: Greenspace Assessment 2022

Site ID _____

Site Size (ha) _____

Site Address _____

Ownership (if known) _____

Date of site visit _____

Site boundary correct? **Y / N**
(circle as appropriate & re-draw if required)

Officer Initials _____

ACCESS ARRANGEMENTS (tick one)	
Access is prohibited	
Limited access (access requires special arrangement e.g. school grounds / sports club)	
Unrestricted (although may have dawn to dusk restrictions)	
Comments:	
DISABLED ACCESS (tick one)	
None (e.g. there are steps which prevent disabled access to the site)	
Poor (e.g. there is a steep gradient)	
Reasonable (but it may be unclear or lacking in maintenance)	
Good (clearly defined and maintained)	
Comments:	
CLEANLINESS (tick one)	
Significant evidence of litter, dog fouling or graffiti	
Limited evidence of litter, dog fouling or graffiti	
No evidence of litter, dog fouling or graffiti	
Comments:	

PERCEPTION OF SAFETY (tick one)	
Poor (the site has no natural surveillance, is not well lit and has areas which are hidden)	
Moderate (the site has some natural surveillance and the majority of the site feels open and safe)	
Good (the site has good natural surveillance, is well lit and feels open and safe)	
Comments:	
GENERAL MAINTENANCE (tick one)	
Site is in a serious state of disrepair and falling into a serious state	
Site has marked evidence of disrepair but not to a critical level	
Site has signs of degradation but generally in good order	
Highly maintained. Site is very tidy with well-maintained equipment	
Comments:	
USE OF SITE (tick one)	
Mainly passive (passing through the site rather than stopping)	
Mainly casual (sitting, walking, informal play)	
Mainly organised (formal play e.g. football fixture)	
Comments:	

Specific Facilities within the Site

Facility	Tick for yes	Number	Public access (Y/N)	Comments on access (charges / booking system)
Children's play equipment				
Skate park				
Teenage shelter				
Outdoor gym equipment				
Football pitch				
Rugby pitch				
Artificial pitch				
Cricket pitch				
Bowling green				
Tennis court				
Basketball court				
Running track				
Goal end				
Toilets				
Car parking				
Cycle parking facilities				
On-site street lighting				
Flood lighting				
Litter bins				
Dog bins				
Seating				
Bandstand				
Boating lake				

Picnic area				
Buildings (e.g. sports hall, changing facilities, club house)	Details:			
Other	Details:			

Any other comments:

Appendix B: Amount of Green Space by Settlement

SELBY

Population (Mid 2020): 17,348

	Hectarage	Hectarage per 1,000 population ³
Parks & Recreation Grounds	20.65	1.19
Allotments	7.49	0.43
Churchyards / Cemeteries	4.69	0.27
Informal Greenspace	9.79	0.56
Natural / Semi-Natural Greenspace	10.3	0.59
Formal Outdoor Sports	12.98	0.75
TOTAL	65.9	

	Number of facilities	Number of facilities per 1,000 population
LAP	3	0.17
LEAP	10	0.58
NEAP	5	0.29
Skateboard Park	1	0.06
MUGA	0	0
Total	19	1.10

³ Cells are highlighted red or green to indicate whether the amount of greenspace per 1,000 population is above or below the locally-set standard. Standards have not been set for burial grounds or formal outdoor sports provision for reasons explained in Section 6 of the main report.

TADCASTER

Population (Mid 2020): 5,926

	Hectarage	Hectarage per 1,000 population
Parks & Recreation Grounds	1.57	0.26
Allotments	3.44	0.58
Churchyards / Cemeteries	3.14	0.53
Informal Greenspace	4.16	0.70
Natural / Semi-Natural Greenspace	0	0.00
Formal Outdoor Sports	9.65	1.63
TOTAL	21.96	

	Number of facilities	Number of facilities per 1,000 population
LAP	0	0.00
LEAP	3	0.50
NEAP	0	0.00
Skateboard Park	0	0.00
MUGA	0	0
Total	3	0.51

SHERBURN IN ELMET

Population (Mid 2020): 8,069

	Hectarage	Hectarage per 1,000 population
Parks & Recreation Grounds	8.06	1.00
Allotments	1.59	0.20
Churchyards / Cemeteries	1.37	0.17
Informal Greenspace	2.6	0.32
Natural / Semi-Natural Greenspace	0	0.00
Formal Outdoor Sports	3.61	0.45
TOTAL	17.23	

	Number of facilities	Number of facilities per 1,000 population
LAP	2	0.25
LEAP	4	0.50
NEAP	1	0.12
Skateboard Park	0	0.00
MUGA	0	0
Total	7	0.87

TIER 1 VILLAGES:**BARLBY / OSGODBY**

Population (Mid 2020): 5,620

	Hectarage	Hectarage per 1,000 population
Parks & Recreation Grounds	3.82	0.68
Allotments	5.21	0.93
Churchyards / Cemeteries	0.53	0.09
Informal Greenspace	1.50	0.27
Natural / Semi-Natural Greenspace	10.55	1.88
Formal Outdoor Sports	3.97	0.71
TOTAL	25.58	

	Number of facilities	Number of facilities per 1,000 population
LAP	2	0.36
LEAP	1	0.18
NEAP	2	0.36
Skateboard Park	0	0.00
MUGA	0	0
Total	5	0.89

BRAYTON

Population (Mid 2020): 5,389

	Hectarage	Hectarage per 1,000 population
Parks & Recreation Grounds	2.65	0.49
Allotments	0	0.00
Churchyards / Cemeteries	1.67	0.31
Informal Greenspace	1.53	0.28
Natural / Semi-Natural Greenspace	36.06	6.69
Formal Outdoor Sports	3.46	0.64
TOTAL	45.37	

	Number of facilities	Number of facilities per 1,000 population
LAP	1	0.19
LEAP	0	0.00
NEAP	1	0.19
Skateboard Park	0	0.00
MUGA	0	0
Total	2	0.37

BYRAM / BROTHERTON

Population (Mid 2020): 2,193

	Hectarage	Hectarage per 1,000 population
Parks & Recreation Grounds	2.89	1.32
Allotments	0.55	0.25
Churchyards / Cemeteries	1.23	0.56
Informal Greenspace	0.1	0.05
Natural / Semi-Natural Greenspace	2.8	1.28
Formal Outdoor Sports	3.63	1.66
TOTAL	11.2	

	Number of facilities	Number of facilities per 1,000 population
LAP	1	0.46
LEAP	2	0.91
NEAP	0	0.00
Skateboard Park	0	0.00
MUGA	0	0
Total	3	1.37

CARLTON

Population (Mid 2020): 2,034

	Hectarage	Hectarage per 1,000 population
Parks & Recreation Grounds	0.78	0.38
Allotments	0.22	0.11
Churchyards / Cemeteries	0.88	0.43
Informal Greenspace	0.13	0.06
Natural / Semi-Natural Greenspace	0	0.00
Formal Outdoor Sports	3.96	1.95
TOTAL	5.97	

	Number of facilities	Number of facilities per 1,000 population
LAP	0	0.00
LEAP	2	0.98
NEAP	0	0.00
Skateboard Park	0	0.00
MUGA	0	0
Total	2	0.98

EGGBOROUGH / WHITLEY

Population (Mid 2020): 3,534

	Hectarage	Hectarage per 1,000 population
Parks & Recreation Grounds	3.34	0.95
Allotments	0	0.00
Churchyards / Cemeteries	0	0.00
Informal Greenspace	0.78	0.22
Natural / Semi-Natural Greenspace	0	0.00
Formal Outdoor Sports	0.92	0.26
TOTAL	5.04	

	Number of facilities	Number of facilities per 1,000 population
LAP	1	0.28
LEAP	2	0.57
NEAP	2	0.57
Skateboard Park	0	0.00
MUGA	0	0
Total	5	1.41

HAMBLETON

Population (Mid 2020): 2,084

	Hectarage	Hectarage per 1,000 population
Parks & Recreation Grounds	0	0.00
Allotments	0	0.00
Churchyards / Cemeteries	0.57	0.27
Informal Greenspace	1.38	0.66
Natural / Semi-Natural Greenspace	8.64	4.15
Formal Outdoor Sports	5.83	2.80
TOTAL	16.42	

	Number of facilities	Number of facilities per 1,000 population
LAP	1	0.48
LEAP	1	0.48
NEAP	0	0.00
Skateboard Park	0	0.00
MUGA	0	0
Total	2	0.96

HEMINGBROUGH

Population (Mid 2020): 1,974

	Hectarage	Hectarage per 1,000 population
Parks & Recreation Grounds	2.36	1.20
Allotments	0	0.00
Churchyards / Cemeteries	0.9	0.46
Informal Greenspace	0.31	0.16
Natural / Semi-Natural Greenspace	0	0.00
Formal Outdoor Sports	0.41	0.21
TOTAL	3.98	

	Number of facilities	Number of facilities per 1,000 population
LAP	0	0.00
LEAP	0	0.00
NEAP	1	0.51
Skateboard Park	0	0.00
MUGA	0	0
Total	1	0.51

RICCALL

Population (Mid 2020): 2,421

	Hectarage	Hectarage per 1,000 population
Parks & Recreation Grounds	6.61	2.73
Allotments	2.64	1.09
Churchyards / Cemeteries	0.59	0.24
Informal Greenspace	1.51	0.62
Natural / Semi-Natural Greenspace	0	0.00
Formal Outdoor Sports	5.23	2.16
TOTAL	16.58	

	Number of facilities	Number of facilities per 1,000 population
LAP	0	0.00
LEAP	0	0.00
NEAP	1	0.41
Skateboard Park	0	0.00
MUGA	0	0
Total	1	0.41

SOUTH MILFORD

Population (Mid 2020): 2,860

	Hectarage	Hectarage per 1,000 population
Parks & Recreation Grounds	1.11	0.39
Allotments	0.07	0.02
Churchyards / Cemeteries	0.62	0.22
Informal Greenspace	1.47	0.51
Natural / Semi-Natural Greenspace	0	0.00
Formal Outdoor Sports	3.68	1.29
TOTAL	6.95	

	Number of facilities	Number of facilities per 1,000 population
LAP	1	0.35
LEAP	1	0.35
NEAP	1	0.35
Skateboard Park	0	0.00
MUGA	0	0
Total	3	1.05

THORPE WILLOUGHBY

Population (Mid 2020): 3,343

	Hectarage	Hectarage per 1,000 population
Parks & Recreation Grounds	2.48	0.74
Allotments	0	0.00
Churchyards / Cemeteries	0	0.00
Informal Greenspace	0.7	0.21
Natural / Semi-Natural Greenspace	0	0.00
Formal Outdoor Sports	0	0.00
TOTAL	3.18	

	Number of facilities	Number of facilities per 1,000 population
LAP	3	0.90
LEAP	0	0.00
NEAP	1	0.30
Skateboard Park	0	0.00
MUGA	0	0
Total	4	1.20

TIER 2 VILLAGES:**APPLETON ROEBUCK**

Population (Mid 2020): 908

	Hectarage	Hectarage per 1,000 population
Parks & Recreation Grounds	0.38	0.42
Allotments	0	0.00
Churchyards / Cemeteries	0.39	0.43
Informal Greenspace	3.27	3.60
Natural / Semi-Natural Greenspace	0	0.00
Formal Outdoor Sports	0.16	0.18
TOTAL	4.2	

	Number of facilities	Number of facilities per 1,000 population
LAP	0	0.00
LEAP	0	0.00
NEAP	0	0.00
Skateboard Park	0	0.00
MUGA	0	0
Total	0	0.00

CAMBLESFORTH

Population (Mid 2020): 1,530

	Hectarage	Hectarage per 1,000 population
Parks & Recreation Grounds	0.37	0.24
Allotments	0	0.00
Churchyards / Cemeteries	0	0.00
Informal Greenspace	0.16	0.10
Natural / Semi-Natural Greenspace	0	0.00
Formal Outdoor Sports	0	0.00
TOTAL	0.53	

	Number of facilities	Number of facilities per 1,000 population
LAP	0	0.00
LEAP	0	0.00
NEAP	1	0.65
Skateboard Park	0	0.00
MUGA	0	0
Total	1	0.65

CAWOOD

Population (Mid 2020): 1,687

	Hectarage	Hectarage per 1,000 population
Parks & Recreation Grounds	2.68	1.59
Allotments	0.83	0.49
Churchyards / Cemeteries	0.77	0.46
Informal Greenspace	6.43	3.81
Natural / Semi-Natural Greenspace	0	0.00
Formal Outdoor Sports	2.68	1.59
TOTAL	13.39	

	Number of facilities	Number of facilities per 1,000 population
LAP	1	0.59
LEAP	0	0.00
NEAP	1	0.59
Skateboard Park	0	0.00
MUGA	0	0
Total	2	1.19

CHURCH FENTON

Population (Mid 2020): 1,502

	Hectarage	Hectarage per 1,000 population
Parks & Recreation Grounds	1.28	0.85
Allotments	0.83	0.55
Churchyards / Cemeteries	0.68	0.45
Informal Greenspace	0.29	0.19
Natural / Semi-Natural Greenspace	0	0.00
Formal Outdoor Sports	3.97	2.64
TOTAL	7.05	

	Number of facilities	Number of facilities per 1,000 population
LAP	1	0.67
LEAP	0	0.00
NEAP	1	0.67
Skateboard Park	0	0.00
MUGA	0	0
Total	2	1.33

CLIFFE

Population (Mid 2020): 1,439

	Hectarage	Hectarage per 1,000 population
Parks & Recreation Grounds	2.07	1.44
Allotments	0	0.00
Churchyards / Cemeteries	0	0.00
Informal Greenspace	0.42	0.29
Natural / Semi-Natural Greenspace	0	0.00
Formal Outdoor Sports	0	0.00
TOTAL	2.49	

	Number of facilities	Number of facilities per 1,000 population
LAP	0	0.00
LEAP	0	0.00
NEAP	1	0.69
Skateboard Park	0	0.00
MUGA	0	0
Total	1	0.69

ESCRICK

Population (Mid 2020): 1,138

	Hectarage	Hectarage per 1,000 population
Parks & Recreation Grounds	1.43	1.26
Allotments	0.12	0.11
Churchyards / Cemeteries	0.71	0.62
Informal Greenspace	1.85	1.63
Natural / Semi-Natural Greenspace	5.89	5.18
Formal Outdoor Sports	0.1	0.09
TOTAL	10.1	

	Number of facilities	Number of facilities per 1,000 population
LAP	0	0.00
LEAP	0	0.00
NEAP	1	0.88
Skateboard Park	0	0.00
MUGA	0	0
Total	1	0.88

FAIRBURN

Population (Mid 2020): 859

	Hectarage	Hectarage per 1,000 population
Parks & Recreation Grounds	1.77	2.06
Allotments	0	0.00
Churchyards / Cemeteries	0.42	0.49
Informal Greenspace	0	0.00
Natural / Semi-Natural Greenspace	173.94	202.49
Formal Outdoor Sports	0	0.00
TOTAL	176.13	

	Number of facilities	Number of facilities per 1,000 population
LAP	0	0.00
LEAP	0	0.00
NEAP	1	1.16
Skateboard Park	1	1.16
MUGA	0	0
Total	2	2.33

HENSALL

Population (Mid 2022): 821

	Hectarage	Hectarage per 1,000 population
Parks & Recreation Grounds	0.57	0.69
Allotments	0	0.00
Churchyards / Cemeteries	0.53	0.65
Informal Greenspace	0	0.00
Natural / Semi-Natural Greenspace	0	0.00
Formal Outdoor Sports	2.48	3.02
TOTAL	3.58	

	Number of facilities	Number of facilities per 1,000 population
LAP	0	0.00
LEAP	1	1.22
NEAP	1	1.22
Skateboard Park	0	0.00
MUGA	0	0
Total	2	2.44

KELLINGTON

Population (Mid 2020): 894

	Hectarage	Hectarage per 1,000 population
Parks & Recreation Grounds	0.23	0.26
Allotments	0	0.00
Churchyards / Cemeteries	0	0.00
Informal Greenspace	0.1	0.11
Natural / Semi-Natural Greenspace	0	0.00
Formal Outdoor Sports	0	0.00
TOTAL	0.33	

	Number of facilities	Number of facilities per 1,000 population
LAP	0	0.00
LEAP	1	1.12
NEAP	0	0.00
Skateboard Park	0	0.00
MUGA	0	0
Total	1	1.12

MONK FRYSTON / HILLAM

Population (Mid 2020): 1,762

	Hectarage	Hectarage per 1,000 population
Parks & Recreation Grounds	0.37	0.21
Allotments	0	0.00
Churchyards / Cemeteries	0.16	0.09
Informal Greenspace	0.24	0.14
Natural / Semi-Natural Greenspace	1.39	0.79
Formal Outdoor Sports	4.08	2.32
TOTAL	6.24	

	Number of facilities	Number of facilities per 1,000 population
LAP	1	0.57
LEAP	1	0.57
NEAP	0	0.00
Skateboard Park	0	0.00
MUGA	0	0
Total	2	1.14

NORTH DUFFIELD

Population (Mid 2020): 1,357

	Hectarage	Hectarage per 1,000 population
Parks & Recreation Grounds	2.85	2.10
Allotments	0.29	0.21
Churchyards / Cemeteries	0	0.00
Informal Greenspace	0.57	0.42
Natural / Semi-Natural Greenspace	0	0.00
Formal Outdoor Sports	0	0.00
TOTAL	3.71	

	Number of facilities	Number of facilities per 1,000 population
LAP	0	0.00
LEAP	0	0.00
NEAP	1	0.74
Skateboard Park	0	0.00
MUGA	0	0
Total	1	0.74

ULLESKELF

Population (Mid 2020): 1,232

	Hectarage	Hectarage per 1,000 population
Parks & Recreation Grounds	0.41	0.33
Allotments	0	0.00
Churchyards / Cemeteries	0	0.00
Informal Greenspace	0.96	0.78
Natural / Semi-Natural Greenspace	0	0.00
Formal Outdoor Sports	3.9	3.17
TOTAL	12.67	

	Number of facilities	Number of facilities per 1,000 population
LAP	1	0.81
LEAP	0	0.00
NEAP	0	0.00
Skateboard Park	0	0.00
MUGA	0	0
Total	1	0.81

WISTOW

Population (Mid 2020): 1,304

	Hectarage	Hectarage per 1,000 population
Parks & Recreation Grounds	0	0.00
Allotments	0	0.00
Churchyards / Cemeteries	0.31	0.24
Informal Greenspace	0.41	0.31
Natural / Semi-Natural Greenspace	325.13	249.33
Formal Outdoor Sports	2.08	1.60
TOTAL	327.93	

	Number of facilities	Number of facilities per 1,000 population
LAP	0	0.00
LEAP	0	0.00
NEAP	1	0.77
Skateboard Park	0	0.00
MUGA	0	0
Total	1	0.77

SMALLER VILLAGES:**BARKSTON ASH**

Population (Mid 2020): 363

	Hectarage	Hectarage per 1,000 population
Parks & Recreation Grounds	0	0.00
Allotments	0	0.00
Churchyards / Cemeteries	0	0.00
Informal Greenspace	0	0.00
Natural / Semi-Natural Greenspace	0	0.00
Formal Outdoor Sports	0	0.00
TOTAL	0	

	Number of facilities	Number of facilities per 1,000 population
LAP	0	0.00
LEAP	0	0.00
NEAP	0	0.00
Skateboard Park	0	0.00
MUGA	0	0
Total	0	0.00

BARLOW

Population (Mid 2020): 808

	Hectarage	Hectarage per 1,000 population
Parks & Recreation Grounds	3.11	3.85
Allotments	0	0.00
Churchyards / Cemeteries	0	0.00
Informal Greenspace	0.06	0.07
Natural / Semi-Natural Greenspace	32.95	40.78
Formal Outdoor Sports	0	0.00
TOTAL	36.12	

	Number of facilities	Number of facilities per 1,000 population
LAP	0	0.00
LEAP	0	0.00
NEAP	2	2.48
Skateboard Park	0	0.00
MUGA	0	0
Total	2	2.48

BEAL

Population (Mid 2020): 769

	Hectarage	Hectarage per 1,000 population
Parks & Recreation Grounds	1.43	1.86
Allotments	0.26	0.34
Churchyards / Cemeteries	0	0.00
Informal Greenspace	0.35	0.46
Natural / Semi-Natural Greenspace	0	0.00
Formal Outdoor Sports	0	0.00
TOTAL	2.04	

	Number of facilities	Number of facilities per 1,000 population
LAP	0	0.00
LEAP	1	1.30
NEAP	1	1.30
Skateboard Park	0	0.00
MUGA	0	0
Total	2	2.60

BIGGIN

Population (Mid 2020): 150

	Hectarage	Hectarage per 1,000 population
Parks & Recreation Grounds	0	0.00
Allotments	0	0.00
Churchyards / Cemeteries	0	0.00
Informal Greenspace	0	0.00
Natural / Semi-Natural Greenspace	0	0.00
Formal Outdoor Sports	0	0.00
TOTAL	0	

	Number of facilities	Number of facilities per 1,000 population
LAP	0	0.00
LEAP	0	0.00
NEAP	0	0.00
Skateboard Park	0	0.00
MUGA	0	0
Total	0	0.00

BILBROUGH

Population (Mid 2020): 399

	Hectarage	Hectarage per 1,000 population
Parks & Recreation Grounds	0.2	0.50
Allotments	0	0.00
Churchyards / Cemeteries	0.37	0.93
Informal Greenspace	0.01	0.03
Natural / Semi-Natural Greenspace	0	0.01
Formal Outdoor Sports	0	0.00
TOTAL	0.58	

	Number of facilities	Number of facilities per 1,000 population
LAP	0	0.00
LEAP	1	2.51
NEAP	0	0.00
Skateboard Park	0	0.00
MUGA	0	0
Total	1	2.51

BIRKIN

Population (Mid 2020): 129

	Hectarage	Hectarage per 1,000 population
Parks & Recreation Grounds	0.09	0.70
Allotments	0	0.00
Churchyards / Cemeteries	0.3	2.33
Informal Greenspace	0.03	0.23
Natural / Semi-Natural Greenspace	0	0.00
Formal Outdoor Sports	0	0.00
TOTAL	0.42	

	Number of facilities	Number of facilities per 1,000 population
LAP	0	0.00
LEAP	0	0.00
NEAP	1	7.75
Skateboard Park	0	0.00
MUGA	0	0
Total	1	7.75

BOLTON PERCY

Population (Mid 2020): 350

	Hectarage	Hectarage per 1,000 population
Parks & Recreation Grounds	0	0.00
Allotments	0.1	0.29
Churchyards / Cemeteries	0.57	1.63
Informal Greenspace	0.2	0.57
Natural / Semi-Natural Greenspace	0	0.00
Formal Outdoor Sports	2.02	5.77
TOTAL	2.89	

	Number of facilities	Number of facilities per 1,000 population
LAP	0	0.00
LEAP	0	0.00
NEAP	0	0.00
Skateboard Park	0	0.00
MUGA	0	0
Total	0	0.00

BURN

Population (Mid 2020): 462

	Hectarage	Hectarage per 1,000 population
Parks & Recreation Grounds	0	0.00
Allotments	0	0.00
Churchyards / Cemeteries	0	0.00
Informal Greenspace	0.02	0.04
Natural / Semi-Natural Greenspace	0	0.00
Formal Outdoor Sports	0.77	1.67
TOTAL	0.79	

	Number of facilities	Number of facilities per 1,000 population
LAP	0	0.00
LEAP	0	0.00
NEAP	0	0.00
Skateboard Park	0	0.00
MUGA	0	0
Total	0	0.00

BURTON SALMON

Population (Mid 2020): 401

	Hectarage	Hectarage per 1,000 population
Parks & Recreation Grounds	0	0.00
Allotments	0	0.00
Churchyards / Cemeteries	0	0.00
Informal Greenspace	0	0.00
Natural / Semi-Natural Greenspace	0	0.00
Formal Outdoor Sports	1.65	4.11
TOTAL	1.65	

	Number of facilities	Number of facilities per 1,000 population
LAP	0	0.00
LEAP	0	0.00
NEAP	0	0.00
Skateboard Park	0	0.00
MUGA	0	0
Total	0	0.00

CHAPEL HADDLESEY

Population (Mid 2020): 218

	Hectarage	Hectarage per 1,000 population
Parks & Recreation Grounds	0.98	4.50
Allotments	0	0.00
Churchyards / Cemeteries	0.32	1.47
Informal Greenspace	0	0.00
Natural / Semi-Natural Greenspace	0	0.00
Formal Outdoor Sports	0	0.00
TOTAL	1.3	

	Number of facilities	Number of facilities per 1,000 population
LAP	0	0.00
LEAP	1	4.59
NEAP	0	0.00
Skateboard Park	0	0.00
MUGA	0	0
Total	1	4.59

COLTON

Population (Mid 2020): 197

	Hectarage	Hectarage per 1,000 population
Parks & Recreation Grounds	0	0.00
Allotments	0	0.00
Churchyards / Cemeteries	0.06	0.30
Informal Greenspace	0.26	1.32
Natural / Semi-Natural Greenspace	0	0.00
Formal Outdoor Sports	0	0.00
TOTAL	0.32	

	Number of facilities	Number of facilities per 1,000 population
LAP	0	0.00
LEAP	0	0.00
NEAP	0	0.00
Skateboard Park	0	0.00
MUGA	0	0
Total	0	0.00

CRIDLING STUBBS

Population (Mid 2020): 164

	Hectarage	Hectarage per 1,000 population
Parks & Recreation Grounds	0	0.00
Allotments	0	0.00
Churchyards / Cemeteries	0	0.00
Informal Greenspace	0	0.00
Natural / Semi-Natural Greenspace	0	0.00
Formal Outdoor Sports	0	0.00
TOTAL	0	

	Number of facilities	Number of facilities per 1,000 population
LAP	0	0.00
LEAP	0	0.00
NEAP	0	0.00
Skateboard Park	0	0.00
MUGA	0	0
Total	0	0.00

DRAX

Population (Mid 2020): 460

	Hectarage	Hectarage per 1,000 population
Parks & Recreation Grounds	0.82	1.78
Allotments	0	0.00
Churchyards / Cemeteries	1.08	2.35
Informal Greenspace	0	0.00
Natural / Semi-Natural Greenspace	0	0.00
Formal Outdoor Sports	1.63	3.54
TOTAL	3.53	

	Number of facilities	Number of facilities per 1,000 population
LAP	0	0.00
LEAP	0	0.00
NEAP	1	2.17
Skateboard Park	0	0.00
MUGA	0	0
Total	1	2.17

GATEFORTH

Population (Mid 2020): 243

	Hectarage	Hectarage per 1,000 population
Parks & Recreation Grounds	0	0.00
Allotments	0	0.00
Churchyards / Cemeteries	0	0.00
Informal Greenspace	1.34	5.51
Natural / Semi-Natural Greenspace	0	0.00
Formal Outdoor Sports	0	0.00
TOTAL	1.34	

	Number of facilities	Number of facilities per 1,000 population
LAP	0	0.00
LEAP	0	0.00
NEAP	0	0.00
Skateboard Park	0	0.00
MUGA	0	0
Total	0	0.00

GREAT HECK

Population (Mid 2020): 219

	Hectarage	Hectarage per 1,000 population
Parks & Recreation Grounds	0.45	2.05
Allotments	0	0.00
Churchyards / Cemeteries	0	0.00
Informal Greenspace	0.04	0.18
Natural / Semi-Natural Greenspace	0	0.00
Formal Outdoor Sports	0	0.00
TOTAL	0.49	

	Number of facilities	Number of facilities per 1,000 population
LAP	0	0.00
LEAP	0	0.00
NEAP	1	4.57
Skateboard Park	0	0.00
MUGA	0	0
Total	1	4.57

HEALAUGH

Population (Mid 2020): 240

	Hectarage	Hectarage per 1,000 population
Parks & Recreation Grounds	0	0.00
Allotments	0	0.00
Churchyards / Cemeteries	0.71	2.96
Informal Greenspace	0.01	0.04
Natural / Semi-Natural Greenspace	0	0.00
Formal Outdoor Sports	0	0.00
TOTAL	0.72	

	Number of facilities	Number of facilities per 1,000 population
LAP	0	0.00
LEAP	0	0.00
NEAP	0	0.00
Skateboard Park	0	0.00
MUGA	0	0
Total	0	0.00

HIRST COURTNEY

Population (Mid 2020): 342

	Hectarage	Hectarage per 1,000 population
Parks & Recreation Grounds	0	0.00
Allotments	0	0.00
Churchyards / Cemeteries	0	0.00
Informal Greenspace	0	0.00
Natural / Semi-Natural Greenspace	0	0.00
Formal Outdoor Sports	1.03	3.01
TOTAL	1.03	

	Number of facilities	Number of facilities per 1,000 population
LAP	0	0.00
LEAP	0	0.00
NEAP	0	0.00
Skateboard Park	0	0.00
MUGA	0	0
Total	0	0.00

KELFIELD

Population (Mid 2020): 438

	Hectarage	Hectarage per 1,000 population
Parks & Recreation Grounds	0	0.00
Allotments	0.14	0.32
Churchyards / Cemeteries	0	0.00
Informal Greenspace	0.15	0.34
Natural / Semi-Natural Greenspace	0	0.00
Formal Outdoor Sports	0.87	1.99
TOTAL	1.16	

	Number of facilities	Number of facilities per 1,000 population
LAP	0	0.00
LEAP	0	0.00
NEAP	0	0.00
Skateboard Park	0	0.00
MUGA	0	0
Total	0	0.00

KIRK SMEATON

Population (Mid 2020): 404

	Hectarage	Hectarage per 1,000 population
Parks & Recreation Grounds	0	0.00
Allotments	0.12	0.30
Churchyards / Cemeteries	0.27	0.67
Informal Greenspace	0.09	0.22
Natural / Semi-Natural Greenspace	0	0.00
Formal Outdoor Sports	0	0.00
TOTAL	0.48	

	Number of facilities	Number of facilities per 1,000 population
LAP	0	0.00
LEAP	0	0.00
NEAP	0	0.00
Skateboard Park	0	0.00
MUGA	0	0
Total	0	0.00

LITTLE FENTON

Population (Mid 2020): 373

	Hectarage	Hectarage per 1,000 population
Parks & Recreation Grounds	0	0.00
Allotments	0	0.00
Churchyards / Cemeteries	0	0.00
Informal Greenspace	0	0.00
Natural / Semi-Natural Greenspace	0	0.00
Formal Outdoor Sports	0	0.00
TOTAL	0	

	Number of facilities	Number of facilities per 1,000 population
LAP	0	0.00
LEAP	0	0.00
NEAP	0	0.00
Skateboard Park	0	0.00
MUGA	0	0
Total	0	0.00

LITTLE SMEATON

Population (Mid 2020): 288

	Hectarage	Hectarage per 1,000 population
Parks & Recreation Grounds	0.79	2.74
Allotments	0	0.00
Churchyards / Cemeteries	0	0.00
Informal Greenspace	0	0.00
Natural / Semi-Natural Greenspace	0	0.00
Formal Outdoor Sports	0	0.00
TOTAL	0.79	

	Number of facilities	Number of facilities per 1,000 population
LAP	0	0.00
LEAP	1	3.47
NEAP	0	0.00
Skateboard Park	0	0.00
MUGA	0	0
Total	1	3.47

NEWLAND

Population (Mid 2020): 227

	Hectarage	Hectarage per 1,000 population
Parks & Recreation Grounds	0	0.00
Allotments	0	0.00
Churchyards / Cemeteries	0	0.00
Informal Greenspace	0	0.00
Natural / Semi-Natural Greenspace	0	0.00
Formal Outdoor Sports	0	0.00
TOTAL	0	

	Number of facilities	Number of facilities per 1,000 population
LAP	0	0.00
LEAP	0	0.00
NEAP	0	0.00
Skateboard Park	0	0.00
MUGA	0	0
Total	0	0.00

NEWTON KYME

Population (Mid 2020): 631

	Hectarage	Hectarage per 1,000 population
Parks & Recreation Grounds	6.06	9.60
Allotments	0	0.00
Churchyards / Cemeteries	0.23	0.36
Informal Greenspace	0.3	0.48
Natural / Semi-Natural Greenspace	0	0.00
Formal Outdoor Sports	0	0.00
TOTAL	6.59	

	Number of facilities	Number of facilities per 1,000 population
LAP	0	0.00
LEAP	1	1.58
NEAP	0	0.00
Skateboard Park	0	0.00
MUGA	0	0
Total	1	1.58

RYTHER

Population (Mid 2020): 261

	Hectarage	Hectarage per 1,000 population
Parks & Recreation Grounds	0	0.00
Allotments	0	0.00
Churchyards / Cemeteries	0.5	1.92
Informal Greenspace	1.85	7.09
Natural / Semi-Natural Greenspace	0	0.00
Formal Outdoor Sports	0	0.00
TOTAL	2.35	

	Number of facilities	Number of facilities per 1,000 population
LAP	0	0.00
LEAP	1	3.83
NEAP	0	0.00
Skateboard Park	0	0.00
MUGA	0	0
Total	1	3.83

SAXTON

Population (Mid 2020): 582

	Hectarage	Hectarage per 1,000 population
Parks & Recreation Grounds	0.41	0.70
Allotments	0	0.00
Churchyards / Cemeteries	0.41	0.70
Informal Greenspace	0	0.00
Natural / Semi-Natural Greenspace	0	0.00
Formal Outdoor Sports	1.25	2.15
TOTAL	2.07	

	Number of facilities	Number of facilities per 1,000 population
LAP	0	0.00
LEAP	1	1.72
NEAP	0	0.00
Skateboard Park	0	0.00
MUGA	0	0
Total	1	1.72

SKIPWITH

Population (Mid 2020): 274

	Hectarage	Hectarage per 1,000 population
Parks & Recreation Grounds	0	0.00
Allotments	0.48	1.75
Churchyards / Cemeteries	0.44	1.61
Informal Greenspace	1.03	3.76
Natural / Semi-Natural Greenspace	295.33	1077.85
Formal Outdoor Sports	0	0.00
TOTAL	297.28	

	Number of facilities	Number of facilities per 1,000 population
LAP	0	0.00
LEAP	0	0.00
NEAP	0	0.00
Skateboard Park	0	0.00
MUGA	0	0
Total	0	0.00

STILLINGFLEET

Population (Mid 2020): 402

	Hectarage	Hectarage per 1,000 population
Parks & Recreation Grounds	0	0.00
Allotments	0	0.00
Churchyards / Cemeteries	0.56	1.39
Informal Greenspace	7.33	18.23
Natural / Semi-Natural Greenspace	0	0.00
Formal Outdoor Sports	1.2	2.99
TOTAL	9.09	

	Number of facilities	Number of facilities per 1,000 population
LAP	0	0.00
LEAP	0	0.00
NEAP	0	0.00
Skateboard Park	0	0.00
MUGA	0	0
Total	0	0.00

STUTTON

Population (Mid 2020): 969

	Hectarage	Hectarage per 1,000 population
Parks & Recreation Grounds	0	0.00
Allotments	0	0.00
Churchyards / Cemeteries	0	0.00
Informal Greenspace	0.54	0.56
Natural / Semi-Natural Greenspace	0	0.00
Formal Outdoor Sports	0	0.00
TOTAL	0.54	

	Number of facilities	Number of facilities per 1,000 population
LAP	0	0.00
LEAP	0	0.00
NEAP	0	0.00
Skateboard Park	0	0.00
MUGA	0	0
Total	0	0.00

THORGANBY

Population (Mid 2020): 390

	Hectarage	Hectarage per 1,000 population
Parks & Recreation Grounds	2.46	6.31
Allotments	0	0.00
Churchyards / Cemeteries	0.41	1.05
Informal Greenspace	0	0.00
Natural / Semi-Natural Greenspace	0	0.00
Formal Outdoor Sports	0	0.00
TOTAL	2.87	

	Number of facilities	Number of facilities per 1,000 population
LAP	0	0.00
LEAP	0	0.00
NEAP	1	2.56
Skateboard Park	0	0.00
MUGA	0	0
Total	1	2.56

TOWTON

Population (Mid 2020): 229

	Hectarage	Hectarage per 1,000 population
Parks & Recreation Grounds	1.34	5.85
Allotments	0.3	1.31
Churchyards / Cemeteries	0	0.00
Informal Greenspace	0	0.00
Natural / Semi-Natural Greenspace	0	0.00
Formal Outdoor Sports	0	0.00
TOTAL	1.64	

	Number of facilities	Number of facilities per 1,000 population
LAP	0	0.00
LEAP	0	0.00
NEAP	0	0.00
Skateboard Park	0	0.00
MUGA	0	0
Total	0	0.00

WEST HADDLESEY

Population (Mid 2020): 248

	Hectarage	Hectarage per 1,000 population
Parks & Recreation Grounds	0.23	0.93
Allotments	0	0.00
Churchyards / Cemeteries	0	0.00
Informal Greenspace	0	0.00
Natural / Semi-Natural Greenspace	0	0.00
Formal Outdoor Sports	0	0.00
TOTAL	0.23	

	Number of facilities	Number of facilities per 1,000 population
LAP	0	0.00
LEAP	1	4.03
NEAP	0	0.00
Skateboard Park	0	0.00
MUGA	0	0
Total	1	4.03

WOMERSLEY

Population (Mid 2020): 503

	Hectarage	Hectarage per 1,000 population
Parks & Recreation Grounds	1.42	2.82
Allotments	0.07	0.14
Churchyards / Cemeteries	0.64	1.27
Informal Greenspace	0	0.00
Natural / Semi-Natural Greenspace	0	0.00
Formal Outdoor Sports	0	0.00
TOTAL	2.13	

	Number of facilities	Number of facilities per 1,000 population
LAP	0	0.00
LEAP	1	1.99
NEAP	0	0.00
Skateboard Park	0	0.00
MUGA	0	0
Total	1	1.99

Appendix C: Committed Greenspace

Settlement	Source	Typology	Amount (ha)
Carlton (tier 1)	Application ref. 2018/0870/REMM & 2018/0871/REMM	Informal green space	1.08
	Application ref. 2018/0870/REMM & 2018/0871/REMM	Parks & recreation ground (with equipped play)	0.04
Eggborough / Whitley (tier 1)	Application ref. 2019/1328/REMM	Parks & recreation ground	0.19
Hambleton (tier 1)	Application ref. 2018/1243/OUTM	Parks & recreation ground (with equipped play)	0.12
Selby	Application ref. 2009/0805/REM	Parks & recreation ground (with equipped play)	0.41
	Application ref. 2020/0776/FULM	Informal green space	0.28
Sherburn in Elmet	Application ref. 2012/0400/EIA	Informal green space	8.88
	Application ref. 2012/0399/EIA	Parks & recreation ground (with equipped play)	0.91
	Application ref. 2010/0148/FUL	Parks & recreation ground (with equipped play)	0.15
	Application ref. 2012/0468/EIA	Parks & recreation ground (with equipped play)	0.2
Thorpe Willoughby (Tier 1)	Application ref. 2016/0197/REM	Parks & recreation ground (with equipped play)	0.38
	Application ref. 2018/0432/FULM	Parks & recreation ground	0.01
	Application ref. 2018/0134/REMM	Parks & recreation ground (with equipped play)	0.32

Ulleskelf (tier 2)	Application ref. 2016/0892/FUL	Informal green space	0.04
	Application ref. 2019/0325/FULM	Informal green space	0.37
	Application ref. 2019/0325/FULM	Parks & recreation ground (with equipped play)	0.57