Annexe A

Best Value Performance Indicators – Play Areas

Council	Playgrounds and play areas per 1000 children under 12	Local equipped play areas
Amber Valley	5.90	48%
Bolsover	0.95	55%
Chesterfield	4.47	79%
Erewash	4.50	41%
High Peak	2.17	0%
North East Derbyshire	1.33	0%
South Derbyshire	3.39	7%
Derbyshire Dales	3.30	31%
District Council Ave	2.60	34%
All England Ave	2.5	35%



Annexe B

BMX/ Rollerblading / Skateboarding Provision

Purpose of Report

To briefly outline options for the above provision in the Swadlincote urban area.

Introduction

There has been extensive lobbying, particularly at Swadlincote Area Committee, for this Council to make provision for the above in the Swadlincote area. These demands should be considered within the context of other similar demands for provision for 'motorised sports'. At different stages, Members have indicated their desire to support the demand for all of these activities.

One of the main issues to consider is location. For example a visit by Members and
officers to the BMX circuit at Derby identified that this facility occupies an area
approximately the size of a football pitch. As Members will be more than aware to
place these type of facilities on land that has existing uses is very difficult (sometimes
impossible) without the consent of residents who would be affected by the new
provision.

There has also never been any detailed feasibility to ascertain accurate levels of demand, the best location for a site and indeed how long the demand would last.

Detailed below are pros and cons of possible location options

Options

Option	Pros	Cons	Cost
Eureka Park	 Facility would be located in the area where the perceived demand is During the summer months staff would be on site to supervise use 	 Major difficulty in managing the interaction between skaters etc. and other users of the park Lack of sufficient space within the park to accommodate facility. One area suggested is close to the extremities of the park and close to houses Lack of a hard standing area to 	Cost would be higher to provide hard standing area. £30,000

- Average			
3			
in in the state of			
Part ticke			
2004 Line			
Table Control			
å transmin			
St Hyperson			
restructively.			
n kanada a			
Property			
* in the second			
u J. Billion			
notice to the second			
Table of the Control			
pp.			
\$			
Grand Control of the			
DI PARK			
training to the state of the st			
turna.			
76-001 20			
7			

\$ 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6			
0 0 0 0 0 0			
f			

		accommodate	
		specialist equipment	
Woodhouse Sports Ground Car Park	 Site has hard-standing Not overlooked by properties Less interaction with other users than a park based facility (mainly football use at weekend) 	 Accessing the site is off a busy road often used by heavy vehicles Site is currently leased as part of the agreement with the Ski Centre Closed in, out of the way location Space would still need to be left for car parking for other users and there would be some interaction between the different type of users Vision for the Urban Forest Park looks at linkages between sites and using this car park to service the increased usage from this link. Unsupervised by SDDC staff 	• £22,000 for local sized facility. • £35,000 for larger facility
Common Land- Commonside	 quiet site where there would not be a great deal of interaction with existing users Could accommodate both types of provision 	 Land is common land. Would have to obtain legal permission to use it for skating etc. Likely to meet objections from nearby houses who would be affected by new provision No hard-standing for specialist equipment Unsupervised by staff Enclosed site 	£30,000 for purpose built local facility
Maurice Lea Memorial Park	 Existing area of hard-standing created to accommodate skateboarding / rollerblading/ BMX Would meet demand for the above Would fit in with existing layout of park and development strategies 	Not in Swadlincote ward were the perceived demand is	£22,000

for the site	
Supervised during the	AND 100 TO 100 T
summer months	
Not immediately	
overlooked by properties	TO .
No preliminary work	
would be required	Line
Could separate above	
uses from other parks	
activities	
No preliminary work	
required	
Would be least risk	
option without the	
guidance of a detailed	
feasibility	