Provision for children and young people

Introduction and definition

7.1 PPG17 states that the broad objective of provision for children and young people is to ensure that they have opportunities to interact with their peers and learn social and movement skills within their home environment. At the same time, they must not create nuisance for other residents or appear threatening to passers-by.

7.2 This typology encompasses a vast range of provision, from small areas of green space with a single piece of equipment (similar to the typology of amenity greenspace) to large, multi-purpose play areas. It considers equipped provision only.

7.3 PPG17 notes that using these sub-types of provision for children and young people often ignores the needs of older children. Each site and range of equipment has a different purpose and often serves a different age group and catchment. Provision of facilities for children does not necessarily negate the need for provision for young people and vice versa.

7.4 The National Playing Fields Association (NPFA) categorises play facilities into three distinct types of facility, specifically:

- Local Areas of Play (LAPs)
- Local Equipped Areas of Play (LEAPs)
- Neighbourhood Equipped Areas of Play (NEAPs).

7.5 In light of the differences between provision for children and young people, this typology has been subdivided and provision for children and facilities for young people have been analysed separately.

7.6 Provision for children is taken to include equipped children’s play areas and adventure playgrounds that are perceived to cater for children under 12.

7.7 Facilities for young people includes the following types of provision:

- Multi Use Games Areas (MUGAs)
- skateparks
- basketball courts
- youth shelters
- informal kickabout areas
- BMX tracks.

7.8 It is anticipated that these facilities would serve young people over the age of 12.

7.9 This section of the report sets out the strategic context, key findings emerging from consultation and assessment of current provision for children and young people. Local standards have been derived from the consultation undertaken as part of this study and are therefore directly representative of local needs. The application of these standards provides the Council with a number of policy options for the delivery of facilities for young people and children.
7.10 The Building Schools for the Future (BSF) Programme looks to place schools at the heart of their community and therefore provides facilities local to each neighbourhood. The programme will ensure that a range of facilities are provided which reflect the needs of the community as well as curriculum needs. This will generate improvements to the overall quality and quantity of provision across Hull.

7.11 The majority of schools are currently inaccessible to the community outside of school hours and play areas at these sites have not been considered as part of this assessment.

**Strategic context**

7.12 The key issues for children and young people’s facilities arising from a review of strategic documents are set out in Table 7.1 overleaf.
### Table 7.1 – Strategic context – regional and local

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Reviewed</th>
<th>Summary of key strategic drivers</th>
<th>Influence on the provision of facilities for children and young people in Hull</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Children and Young People’s Plan 2006 – 2008** | The vision of the strategy is, “to make Hull the family friendly city where no child is left behind”. The aim of the plan is for every child and young person in Hull to receive the support they need to:  
• be healthy  
• stay safe  
• enjoy life  
• achieve  
• make a positive contribution  
• achieve economic well being.  
The priorities for children and young people of relevance to this study are:  
• promoting healthy lifestyles  
• to promote opportunities for all children and young people to have fun and enjoy life  
• to prevent children and young people becoming involved in or affected by, crime and anti-social behaviour. | It is essential to maximise opportunities for children and young people. This will include not only ensuring that there are appropriate facilities specifically targeting children and young people, but also ensuring that children and young people have access to open spaces, sports facilities and other activities that will help to achieve the key objectives of the plan.                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
| **ONE HULL Community Strategy 2006 – 2011**    | The strategy sets out the vision and priorities for action to transform the city and improve the quality of life for everyone that lives in, works in and visits Hull.  
The vision of the strategy is that by 2020, “Hull is a City which is living, learning, working, healthy and proud. To be one of the most important cities in Northern Europe…” | Appropriate provision and access to open spaces and sports facilities for children is central to local priorities.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Reviewed</th>
<th>Summary of key strategic drivers</th>
<th>Influence on the provision of facilities for children and young people in Hull</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Serious about play – a play policy for Hull’s children, young people and their communities** | - The key objectives of the Play Policy are to increase the quantity and enhance the quality of children’s play opportunities.  
  - The policy states that the Council will create play opportunities that will allow children and young people to explore, manipulate, experience and affect their environment within challenging but secure settings.  
  - The policy identifies that play provision will work to the ‘Seven Best Play’ objectives. These are as follows:  
    - provision that extends children’s choice and control over play  
    - provision that recognises the need for children to test their boundaries  
    - provision that balances risk and safety  
    - provision that maximises play opportunities  
    - provision that encourages independence and self esteem  
    - provision that fosters respect and offers opportunities for social interaction  
    - provision that develops a child’s well being, healthy growth and development, knowledge and understanding, creativity and capacity to learn. | This assessment supports the findings of the play policy and interprets the key issues from a planning perspective.                                                                                                                      |
Consultation – Assessing Local Needs

7.13 Consultation undertaken as part of this study highlighted the following key issues relating to provision for children and young people:

- provision for children and young people were the overriding themes of all consultations
- the lack of facilities for young people was the primary issue raised throughout consultation. Although residents stated there was a need to increase the provision of facilities for young people, they highlighted the importance of providing a range of activities to address the current anti-social behaviour associated with this age group
- a lack of opportunities for younger residents is perceived to have a knock-on impact on the poor quality of other types of open space, generating misuse and anti-social behaviour
- while there was an emphasis on increasing the quantity of provision for children also, in many instances the quality of children’s facilities was deemed to be as significant an issue, with many residents highlighting safety concerns and litter
- in addition to providing young people and children with an opportunity to play, facilities for children and young people encourage social interaction and provide educational opportunities
- young people at the workshop session reinforced the importance of ensuring that facilities were appropriate for the target audience, as well as highlighting the importance of localised provision. It was evident that proximity to the home is as important to younger residents as the type of facilities available. Perception of security and safety at sites also emerged as a key issue.

Quantity of provision

7.14 The quantity of provision for children and young people across Hull is summarised in Tables 7.2 and 7.3 respectively.

7.15 It must be noted that this assessment considers only the provision of equipped facilities and does not take into account other activities offered.
Table 7.2 – Provision for children across Hull

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Current provision</th>
<th>Number of sites</th>
<th>Smallest site (hectares)</th>
<th>Largest site (hectares)</th>
<th>Scenario a provision per 1000 population (2026)</th>
<th>Scenario b provision per 1000 population (2026)</th>
<th>Scenario c provision per 1000 population (2026)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>0.043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>0.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carr</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.046</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>0.044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>0.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td>0.041</td>
<td>0.040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>0.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyke</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>0.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>6.65</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td>0.025</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.16 The key issues emerging from Table 7.2 and consultations relating to the quantity of provision are as follows:

- there are 70 facilities for children across the city, covering a total of 6.65 hectares. This equates to 0.026 hectares per 1000 population.

- 55% of respondents to the household survey indicate that the provision of children’s play areas is insufficient, highlighting a perceived lack of provision. In contrast, 33% of residents state provision is sufficient

- facilities are fairly evenly distributed across the city with the exception of the Riverside area, where 22 play areas are located. This equates to 1.92 hectares, or 0.042 hectares per 1000 population. Unsurprisingly, the findings of the household survey demonstrate that overall satisfaction is highest in this area, with over 40% of residents indicating that the quantity of provision is adequate

- in contrast, provision in the Northern area is significantly lower than in other areas of the city, with provision equating to 0.009 hectares per 1000 population. This corresponds with the lowest level of satisfaction which is found in the Northern area, where 71% state that the level of provision is insufficient (nearly enough/ not enough) while only 16% feel that the level of provision is more than enough/about right

- 40% of respondents to the children’s IT survey state that although there are some play areas near their home, they could do with more. 37% of children identify the provision of play areas as sufficient. However, only 11% of
children identify play areas as their favourite open space. This suggests that there are variations in the opinion of children. This may arise for a number of reasons and may suggest that perceptions on quantity are blurred with quality.

- There is a mixed response regarding the provision of children’s play areas in the city from residents at drop-in sessions. A large proportion of residents felt that provision for children, specifically for the preschool age group, is insufficient to meet current need. This is also reinforced by 54% of respondents to the community network survey, who state that the quantity of play areas is insufficient.

7.17 Table 7.3 summarises the quantity of facilities for young people across Hull.

Table 7.3 – Provision for young people across Hull

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Current provision</th>
<th>Number of sites</th>
<th>Smallest site (hectares)</th>
<th>Largest site (hectares)</th>
<th>Scenario a provision per 1000 population (2026)</th>
<th>Scenario b provision per 1000 population (2026)</th>
<th>Scenario c provision per 1000 population (2026)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>0.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carr</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>0.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>0.059</td>
<td>0.057</td>
<td>0.056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>0.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyke</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>0.018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.18 The key issues emerging from Table 7.3 above and consultations relating to the quantity of provision for young people are as follows:

- There are 34 facilities for young people across the city, equating to a total of 4.90 hectares. These facilities range in size from 0.01 to 1.14 hectares.
- Responses from the household survey indicate that the majority of residents (73%) feel the provision of facilities for young people is insufficient. The high level of dissatisfaction with provision for young people is the most conclusive of all types of open space in the city.
- The distribution of facilities across the city is fairly even. The greatest number of facilities are located in the Park area (9).
• the greatest provision per 1000 population across all three growth scenarios is located in the Park area

• 19% of young people state that there are no facilities where they live. To an extent, this supports the perception of a lack of provision for young people in Hull although it is clear that the issue is more apparent for adults than for young people themselves. This is also evident in the workshop for young people, where teenagers indicated that they like to use green space “to hang around” and do not always need dedicated facilities

• the need for the increased provision of young people’s facilities is also a key theme at drop in sessions. Although residents stated there was a need to increase the provision of facilities for young people, they highlight the importance of providing a range of activities for this age group

• general comments from respondents to the household survey further reinforce the lack of provision for young people in Hull. The need for increased provision in all areas of the city is highlighted, however young people at the workshop indicate that it is important to ensure that these facilities are appropriate for their target audience.

Setting provision standards – quantity

7.19 The recommended local quantity standards have been derived from the local needs consultation and audit of provision and are summarised overleaf. Full justification for each of the standards is provided within Appendix F.

7.20 Both standards require an increase on existing levels of provision in light of the findings of the local needs assessment, where there is an overwhelming concern that provision is insufficient. These findings are consistent with the Hull play policy.
SECTION 7 – PROVISION FOR CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE

Quantity standard – provision for children (see Appendices E and F – standards and justification, worksheet and calculator)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing level of provision</th>
<th>Recommended standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.026 hectares per 1000</td>
<td>0.030 hectares per 1000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Justification**

Local consultation identified a conclusive perception of inadequate provision of children’s play areas, with 55% of respondents to the household survey stating provision is insufficient. Findings within the individual analysis areas reinforce this perception of insufficient provision, with over 40% of residents in each area stating that provision is insufficient. Respondents to the Children’s IT Survey further identified the need for increased provision, with 40% of respondents stating there is some play areas near their home but that they would like more.

In consideration of the conclusive perception of insufficient provision of children’s play areas in the city the local quantity standard has been set above the existing level of provision. While this will require an increase in the existing quantity of facilities, it is important to ensure that this standard is balanced with the need to provide high quality facilities. Quality was perceived to be almost as important as quantity and residents were willing to travel further to higher quality facilities.

Setting the standard at above the existing level of provision will ensure that opportunities to provide new play areas are taken and will guarantee that new developments provide appropriate facilities for children where they are required. Balancing the quality and quantity of provision will be particularly important given that respondents to the children’s survey identified the need for more interesting equipment and that the existing quality of children’s play areas is rated as average by 48% of residents and poor by 28% of residents. The recommended increase in quantity is therefore proportionate to both the quantity of residents who are dissatisfied with existing provision as well as the deficiencies identified through the application of the accessibility standard.

Quantity standard – provision for young people (see Appendices E and F – standards and justification, worksheet and calculator)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing level of provision</th>
<th>Recommended standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.019 hectares per 1000</td>
<td>0.023 hectares per 1000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Justification**

The significant majority of respondents to the household survey (73%) regard the provision of this type of open space to be insufficient and findings within the individual analysis areas further reinforce this perception. Throughout consultation a lack of provision for young people was recognised and the insufficient provision of this type of open space was the most conclusive perception of all typologies in Hull.

The local quantity standard has therefore been set above the existing level of provision to reflect the overwhelming need, identified throughout local consultation, for increased provision for young people. Setting the standard at this level will highlight the need for increased provision and combined with the application of the accessibility standard, identify locational deficiencies in Hull.

The quality of existing facilities is regarded to be poor by 59% of respondents to the household survey. Therefore, although the local quantity standard will prioritise new provision, the need to enhance the quality of facilities is also evident and should be taken into consideration by the Council. It will be essential that any new facilities that are provided are of appropriate quality and meet the needs of their target audience.
Current provision – quality

7.21 The quality of provision for children and young people was assessed through site visits. It is important to note that site assessments are conducted as a snapshot in time and are therefore reflective of the quality of the site on one specific day.

7.22 The quality scores are weighted according to the findings of the local consultation. Those elements that were highlighted through consultation as being a particularly important determinant of the quality have been weighted higher to ensure that they have a greater influence on the overall quality score that each site achieves. The full rationale behind this approach is set out in appendix G.

7.23 The quality of provision for children is summarised in Table 7.4 overleaf. Issues arising from the assessment of facilities for young people are set out in Table 7.5.
Table 7.4 – Quality of provision for children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Range of quality scores (%)</th>
<th>Average quality scores (%)</th>
<th>Lowest quality sites</th>
<th>Highest quality sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>24–96</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>Barra Close Play Area</td>
<td>Dorchester Road Play Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern</td>
<td>42–94</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>Quilcort Play Area</td>
<td>Oak Road Play Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carr</td>
<td>53–94</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>Noddle Hill Play Area</td>
<td>Lambwath Park Play Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park</td>
<td>53–98</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>Cullen Close Play Area</td>
<td>Cambridge Grove Play Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>34–96</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>Bean Street Play Area</td>
<td>Peel Street Play Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>44–100</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>Ascott Close Play Area</td>
<td>Pickering Park Play Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyke</td>
<td>47–100</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>Alexandra Road Play Area</td>
<td>Pearson Park Play Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>24–100</td>
<td>73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.24 The key issues emerging from Table 7.4 and the consultation relating to the quality of facilities for children are as follows:

- the majority of respondents to the household survey regard the quality of children’s play areas as average (49%). 28% of residents state that the quality of play areas is poor and 22% good. This highlights a mixed perception regarding the quality of children’s play areas in Hull. For many residents, improving the quality of facilities was considered to be as important as increasing the quantity.

- these views are supported by the findings of the site assessments, which reveal that the average score for a play area is 73%. This suggests that provision is average to good. This however disguises the significant variation in the quality of facilities across the city. Site scores ranged from 24% to 100%, meaning that while there are some very high quality sites, there are also many poor facilities.
based on findings from the household survey, views on the quality of facilities for children were similar across all areas, with ‘poor’ being the modal response. Residents in the Northern area expressed the lowest satisfaction of all areas with 35% of respondents rating the quality of play areas as poor.

findings from the site assessments demonstrate that the overall quality of facilities is relatively consistent across the city, with the average quality score ranging from 68% in the East area to 81% in the Wyke area.

general comments within the household survey produced recurring themes in terms of safety concerns and problems with facilities, further cementing issues surrounding these sites.

residents at drop-in sessions identify the quality of children’s play areas as being poor. Specifically, a number of residents raise safety concerns when using children’s play areas, with broken glass and needles found at some sites. Site assessments support these issues, with many of the sites scoring poorly suffering from litter and broken glass. Other issues identified during site visits included vandalism and graffiti and broken equipment. On the whole, newer facilities were perceived to be of significantly higher quality.

while 26% of respondents to the children’s IT survey state that play areas are clean, safe and nice to use, 36% feel that sites often unclean and facilities need improving. There is also a significant amount of children (23%) who feel that sites regularly suffer from litter problems. When asked what improvement they would make to existing facilities, cleaner facilities (19%) and closer to home (19%) are the most common responses.

attendees at the workshop for children reinforce the issues raised above and also raise safety concerns.
SECTION 7 – PROVISION FOR CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE

Table 7.5 – Quality of provision for young people

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee area</th>
<th>Range of quality scores (%)</th>
<th>Average quality scores (%)</th>
<th>Lowest quality sites</th>
<th>Highest quality sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>20–86</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Alderman Kneeshaw Basketball</td>
<td>Dorchester Road MUGA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern</td>
<td>44–80</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>Dane Park MUGA</td>
<td>Oak Road Skate Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carr</td>
<td>66–87</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>North Carr Five a Side</td>
<td>Hamilton Playing Fields Basketball</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park</td>
<td>66–84</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Falkland Road Five a side</td>
<td>Stonebridge Park MUGA / Peppleton Close</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>20–100</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>Abbey Street MUGA</td>
<td>Dansom Lane MUGA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>60–82</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>Wymersley Park MUGA</td>
<td>Pickering Park MUGA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyke</td>
<td>69–80</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>Fenchurch Street MUGA</td>
<td>Thoresby MUGA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>20–100</td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.25 The key issues emerging from Table 7.5 and the consultation relating to the quality of facilities for young people are:

- respondents to the household survey regard the quality of young people’s provision to be poor (59%). This is significantly higher than for any of the other typologies. This high level of dissatisfaction is consistent across all of the areas. These issues surrounding the quality of existing provision are compounded by the dissatisfaction with the quantity of provision – with 73% of respondents stating that there is a lack of facilities

- despite the general comments made, site assessments indicate that the general quality of those facilities available is reasonable, with an average score of 71%. This however disguises the variation in the quality of facilities, with scores ranging from 20% to 100%

- it is clear from the site assessments that there are significant ranges in the quality of provision in all areas of the city. The greatest range is apparent in the Riverside area, where the overall quality of facilities varies from 20–100%. The lowest average score is found in the East area (60%). The Park and
West areas of the city contain the highest quality facilities for young people. To some extent, the quality is dictated by the type of facility provided.

- from the general comments given, parents seem to suggest that there is a distinct lack of facilities for their children; furthermore, safety concerns at existing sites are seen as an issue that prevents them from being used. The key issues identified during site assessments related to vandalism, litter and the presence of broken bottles.

- young people at the workshop session reinforce the safety concerns emphasised by parents. Conversations also suggest that it is important to ensure that the facilities meet the needs of the target users and the local young people.

- respondents to the young people’s IT survey suggest that the current provision is average and in need of improvements (48%). Furthermore, 24% of respondents feel that the current provision is poor and in need of extensive improvement.

- those young people that identified young people’s facilities as their favourite open space suggest distance from home, boring facilities and old equipment are the main things they don’t like about young people’s facilities.

**Setting provision standards – quality**

7.26 The recommended local quality standards for provision for children and young people are summarised below and overleaf. Full justifications and consultation relating to the quality of provision for the local standard is provided within Appendix G.

7.27 The standards summarise the key aspirations of residents of Hull with regards provision for children and young people. The quality standard for a children’s play area is set at 86%, the minimum score required to fall within the top quartile. For young people, the quality standard is set at 80%. The importance of tailoring the facility to the needs and aspiration of the children within the catchment area cannot be underestimated.
Quality Standard (see Appendix G)

**Recommended standard – provision for children**

Local consultation, national guidance and best practice suggest that the following features are essential and desirable to local residents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Essential</th>
<th>Desirable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clean/litter free</td>
<td>Toilets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenging equipment for older children</td>
<td>Dog free area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Litter bins</td>
<td>Seating</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Detailed analysis of the local consultation suggests that with regards to play areas for children, the relative importance of the key components is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component of quality</th>
<th>Proportion of possible total responses received</th>
<th>Weighting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Security and Safety</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleanliness and maintenance</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegetation</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ancillary accommodation</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis highlights the need for innovative and imaginative provision of facilities for children as well as improvements to the quantity of facilities.

**Recommended standard – provision for young people**

Local consultation, national guidance and best practice suggest that the following features are essential and desirable to local residents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Essential</th>
<th>Desirable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>Equipment maintenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good access</td>
<td>Clean/Litter Free</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range of facilities</td>
<td>Litter bins</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Detailed analysis of the local consultation suggests that with regards to facilities for young people, the relative importance of the key components is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component of quality</th>
<th>Weighting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Security and Safety</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleanliness and maintenance</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegetation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ancillary accommodation</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis highlights the need for more innovative and imaginative provision for teenagers. The quantity of provision and location of facilities were perceived to be particularly important.
7.28 The accessibility of sites is paramount in maximising usage as well as providing opportunities for people to use the site. The recommended local standard is set in the form of a distance threshold and is derived directly from the findings of the local consultations.

7.29 Local access to provision for children and young people is particularly important in order to promote use of the site. In some instances, territorial issues prevent young people from using facilities that would appear to be in close proximity to their home.

7.30 Site specific accessibility issues were also analysed as part of the programme of site visits where information and signage, transport and general issues were assessed.

7.31 Consultation and analysis highlights that the key issues with regards accessibility of provision for children and young people include:

- unsurprisingly, current and expected travel methods highlight a clear preference for walking to children's play areas, reinforcing the expectation that facilities are provided locally
- the majority of respondents to the household survey indicate that they prefer to walk to a children's play area (76%) and a young people's facility (54%)
- the IT children and young people survey highlighted the importance of providing local facilities, with children indicating that the key determinant of which facilities they used was the location. Distance from home was perceived to be a far greater barrier to usage than cost or poor quality facility provision
- site assessments reveal that on the whole, facilities for children and young people are relatively accessible. All sites for young people achieved a score of 60% or more. In contrast, some facilities for children were perceived to have more limited accessibility and several sites scored below 50%. The key issues identified with regards access to facilities for children and young people included a lack of signage and gates that were perceived to restrict access for disabled residents and / or pushchairs.

7.32 The recommended local accessibility standards for children and young people are summarised below. It can be seen that residents expect to travel further to reach facilities for young people than they do for children. Provision of both types of facility is expected to be in close proximity to the home. Full justification for the local standard is provided within Appendix H.

7.33 It is recognised that some facilities may attract users from a wider catchment and this will be discussed in the analysis that follows. While these facilities do not negate the need for local provision, they provide an additional and frequently used citywide resource.
SECTION 7 – PROVISION FOR CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE

Accessibility Standard (see Appendix H)

### Recommended standard – Play areas for Children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10 MINUTE WALK TIME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Justification</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The majority of respondents to the household survey indicate that they would expect to walk to a children’s play facility. Furthermore, the distances that parents are willing to let their children travel unaccompanied from their homes to play facilities has reduced as concerns over safety have grown. Analyses of current travel patterns, alongside expectations, demonstrate conclusively that a standard based on a walk time should be set.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

60% of current users and 76% of respondents to the household survey expect to walk to a children’s play area. In light of this it is recommended a walk time be set to meet the expectations of current and prospective users. Of those respondents who prefer to access a play area on foot, a journey time of 5–10 minutes is expected (61%). Findings across the individual analysis areas support this response. Citywide results reveal that the modal response is 10 minutes and this is reflected across all individual analysis areas.

In consideration of the expectation of residents to travel between 5 and 10 minutes (61%) to access a children’s play area and the emphasis on the provision of locally accessible facilities a 10 minute walk time has been set. This standard is derived directly from local consultation and is based upon the citywide modal response of a 10 minute walk time. Setting a standard at this level will ensure the provision of locally accessible children’s play areas and allow for a balance between quantity and quality.

### Recommended standard – Provision for Young People

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>15 MINUTE WALK TIME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Justification</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A large proportion of respondents to the household survey expect to walk to young people’s facilities (54%).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A 15 minute walk time has been set based upon the third quartile figure, as well as the average response across the city. Setting a local standard at this level will highlight deficiencies and allow for facilities to be provided in larger more strategic sites, such as parks. The local standard is broadly representative of the opinions of all residents in all areas and will enable a focus on quality facilities and ensure that saturation does not occur.

It will be important that the type of facilities required is considered as well as the location in order to ensure that facilities meet the needs of the local population. It is clear from the IT young people survey as well as the workshop for children and young people that a uniform facility provided at locations across the city will not meet local need. The strategy for sport and active recreation in Hull reinforces this.

### Applying provision standards

7.34 The application of the recommended quality, quantity and accessibility standards is essential in understanding the existing distribution of open space, sport and recreation facilities and identifying areas where provision is insufficient to meet local need.
7.35 The quantity standards enable the identification of areas that do not meet the minimum provision standards, while the accessibility standards will help determine where those deficiencies are of high importance. Applying the standards together is a much more meaningful method of analysis than applying the standards separately. The application of these standards is set out below in Table 7.6. In light of the importance of the proximity of facilities to the home, the application of accessibility standards is particularly important.

7.36 The findings of the application of these standards should complement the principles set out in the play policy and inform future decision making.

Table 7.6 – Application of quantity standard - children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Current balanced against local standard - (0.030 res per 1000 population)</th>
<th>Future balanced against local standard – Scenario a (0.030 res per 1000 population)</th>
<th>Future balanced against local standard – Scenario b (0.030 res per 1000 population)</th>
<th>Future balanced against local standard – Scenario c (0.030 res per 1000 population)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern</td>
<td>-0.68</td>
<td>-0.67</td>
<td>-0.70</td>
<td>-0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carr</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park</td>
<td>-0.67</td>
<td>-0.66</td>
<td>-0.70</td>
<td>-0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>-0.64</td>
<td>-0.63</td>
<td>-0.66</td>
<td>-0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyke</td>
<td>-0.58</td>
<td>-0.57</td>
<td>-0.59</td>
<td>-0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>-1.04</td>
<td>-0.95</td>
<td>-1.17</td>
<td>-1.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.37 The application of the local standard for quantity results in the following issues:

- within the city there is a shortfall of children’s play areas (1.04 hectares). Based on future population projections, these shortfalls are expected to increase by 2026 with shortfalls in growth scenario c equating to 1.38 hectare of provision.
- the provision children’s play areas in four of the seven areas is insufficient in quantitative terms to meet current and future demand.
- the largest current and future deficiencies of children’s play areas across the city can be found in the Park area, where there is a projected shortfall of 0.70 hectares by 2026 (Scenario b).
### Table 7.7 – Application of quantity standard – young people

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Current balanced against local standard - (0.023 res per 1000 population)</th>
<th>Future balanced against local standard - Scenario a (0.023 res per 1000 population)</th>
<th>Future balanced against local standard - Scenario b (0.023 res per 1000 population)</th>
<th>Future balanced against local standard - Scenario c (0.023 res per 1000 population)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern</td>
<td>-0.60</td>
<td>-0.59</td>
<td>-0.61</td>
<td>-0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carr</td>
<td>-0.23</td>
<td>-0.23</td>
<td>-0.24</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>-0.65</td>
<td>-0.63</td>
<td>-0.67</td>
<td>-0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>-0.57</td>
<td>-0.56</td>
<td>-0.59</td>
<td>-0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyke</td>
<td>-0.47</td>
<td>-0.46</td>
<td>-0.48</td>
<td>-0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>-0.99</td>
<td>-0.92</td>
<td>-1.10</td>
<td>-1.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 7.38 The application of the local quantity standard for young people results in similar issues to those highlighted for children:

- there is a current deficiency of facilities for young people in the city (0.99 hectares). Future population projections show this shortfall is expected to increase to 1.25 hectares by 2026 (Scenario c)
- across the areas there are current and expected shortfalls in six of the seven analysis areas
- however, the quantity of facilities for young people is adequate to meet current and future demand in the Park area. It is within this area of the city where the highest provision for young people is found.

#### 7.39 In light of the local nature of both facilities for children and facilities for young people, consideration has been given to the application of the quantity standard at a ward level. This further highlights shortfalls and surpluses and is set out in Table 7.8 (children) and Table 7.9 (young people) overleaf.
### Table 7.8 – Provision of facilities for children by ward

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Provision for children (hectares)</th>
<th>Local Standard (hectares per 1000)</th>
<th>Per 1000 population current</th>
<th>TOTAL Requirement</th>
<th>Surplus / Deficiency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Avenue</td>
<td>12336</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>-0.100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beverley</td>
<td>8431</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>-0.183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boothferry</td>
<td>12905</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>-0.317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bransholme East</td>
<td>10645</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bransholme West</td>
<td>8740</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>-0.182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bricknell</td>
<td>8388</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>-0.192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derringham</td>
<td>11811</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>-0.244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drypool</td>
<td>12888</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holderness</td>
<td>13779</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>-0.103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ings</td>
<td>12715</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kings Park</td>
<td>8528</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longhill</td>
<td>11726</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marfleet</td>
<td>13786</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>-0.324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myton</td>
<td>13403</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newington</td>
<td>12362</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newland</td>
<td>10203</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>-0.286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orchard Park and Greenwood</td>
<td>14306</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>-0.189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pickering</td>
<td>11889</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>-0.077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southcoates East</td>
<td>8783</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>-0.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southcoates West</td>
<td>8416</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>-0.212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Andrews</td>
<td>6872</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutton</td>
<td>13029</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>-0.191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>10274</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>-0.308</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.40 It can be seen that there are seven wards where the level of provision for children is sufficient to meet the needs of the local population. The greatest shortfalls exist in:

- Marfleet – 0.32 hectares
- Boothferry – 0.32 hectares
- University – 0.31 hectares
- Newland – 0.29 hectares
- Derringham – 0.24 hectares.
Table 7.9 – Provision for young people by ward

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Provision for young people (hectares)</th>
<th>Local Standard (hectares per 1000)</th>
<th>Per 1000 population current</th>
<th>TOTAL Requirement</th>
<th>Surplus / Deficiency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Avenue</td>
<td>12336</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>-0.184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beverley</td>
<td>8431</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>-0.144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boothferry</td>
<td>12905</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>-0.297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bransholme East</td>
<td>10645</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bransholme West</td>
<td>8740</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>-0.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bricknell</td>
<td>8388</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>-0.163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derringham</td>
<td>11811</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>-0.142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drypool</td>
<td>12888</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>-0.186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holderness</td>
<td>13779</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ings</td>
<td>12715</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kings Park</td>
<td>8528</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>-0.196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longhill</td>
<td>11726</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>-0.140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marfleet</td>
<td>13786</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>-0.137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myton</td>
<td>13403</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>-0.178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newington</td>
<td>12362</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>-0.274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newland</td>
<td>10203</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>-0.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orchard Park and Greenwood</td>
<td>14306</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>-0.219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pickering</td>
<td>11889</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>-0.133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southcoates East</td>
<td>8783</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>1.078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southcoates West</td>
<td>8416</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>-0.194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Andrews</td>
<td>6872</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>-0.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutton</td>
<td>13029</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>-0.130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>10274</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>-0.236</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.41 It can be seen that there are only four wards where the level of provision for young people is sufficient to meet local needs. The wards that contain the largest deficiencies per 1000 population are:

- Boothferry – 0.30 hectares
- Newington – 0.28 hectares
- University – 0.24 hectares
- Orchard Park and Greenwood – 0.22 hectares.

7.42 The application of the local accessibility standards in relation to provision for children and young people is set out in Map 7.1 and 7.2 overleaf.
Map 7.1 – Provision for children in Hull

Children's play areas

Based upon the Ordnance Survey with the permission of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationary Office. Crown Copyright: Hull City Council Licence No. 10023372.
Facilities for young people in Hull

Map 7.2 – Provision for young people in Hull

- Facilities for young people
- 15 minute walk catchment
- Analysis areas

Based upon the Ordnance Survey with the permission of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationary Office. Crown Copyright. Hull City Council Licence No. 100023572.
7.43 Map 7.1 highlights that facilities for children are relatively evenly distributed across Hull. However, despite this, it can be seen that there are a number of areas where residents are outside of the appropriate catchment for a facility, particularly in the Northern area, centre of the Wyke area and in the north of the Park and Longhill area of the East area.

7.44 Additionally, there are a significant amount of children’s play areas that have overlapping catchments. This is caused by a large proportion of children’s play areas that are located in close proximity to one another and indicates that the relocation of some sites may ensure that sites better meet the needs of local residents.

7.45 Map 7.2 illustrates that there are also a large number of residents outside the catchment of a facility for young people. Areas of deficiency are evident across the city, however the areas which appear to be most lacking in provision are the Northern and West areas.

7.46 While this section focuses primarily on equipped areas for children and young people, it is also essential to consider the role that amenity green spaces play in providing informal play opportunities. Areas deficient in both amenity space and formal facilities should be a particular priority for new provision, as this indicates that there is a distinct lack of opportunities. The provision of amenity green space in relation to facilities for children and young people is set out overleaf in Maps 7.3 - 7.4.
Map 7.3 – Provision for children and amenity green space in Hull

Children's play areas with amenity greenspace
Map 7.4 – Provision for young people and amenity green space in Hull

Facilities for young people with amenity greenspace
SECTION 7 – PROVISION FOR CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE

7.47 Map 7.3 illustrates that when amalgamating the provision of amenity green space and children’s play areas, the majority of residents in Hull have access to at least one of these types of open space.

7.48 Map 7.4 indicates that the majority of residents in Hull have access to either an amenity green space or young people’s facility. Despite this, there are some areas of the Wyke area where residents do not have access to amenity space or facilities for young people.

Quality of provision

7.49 While the quantity of provision was the overriding theme of consultations, the quality of provision was also considered to be important, and many existing facilities were criticised for the lack of innovative, challenging and exciting play equipment.

7.50 Hull’s Children and Young People’s Plan aims to provide opportunities for all children and young people in the city.

7.51 The key objectives of the Play Policy are to increase the quantity and enhance the quality of children’s play opportunities. The policy states that the Council will create play opportunities that will allow children and young people to explore, manipulate experience and affect their environment within challenging but secure settings. This recognises and reinforces the key issue raised through consultation.

C1 Seek to replace traditional facilities with challenging and exciting play facilities for children and young people that encourage children to test their boundaries and balance risk and safety.

7.52 The site assessments provide an indication of the quality of existing facilities and it is clear that there is significant variation across the city. The quality standard and related site assessments should inform a programme of improvements, highlighting sites in need of upgrading. Sites serving unique catchments that are considered to be of poor quality should be given particular priority. Play facilities should be designed giving consideration to the Play England guide for creating successful play spaces and the Performance Indicators also created by Play England.

C2 Use the findings of the quality assessment to inform a programme of improvements across facilities for children and young people. Where the opportunity arises, priority should be given to poor quality play areas serving unique catchments. Consideration should be given to the provision of an appropriate variety of facilities.

7.53 In line with current Council policy, in order to ensure that facilities are appropriate for their target audience, decisions should be made in consultation with the local residents. The importance of this was emphasised during the workshop for young people, where it was apparent that not only did young people have different hobbies and aspirations, but also that expensive and complex facilities were not always required.

C3 Policy should promote the involvement of young people and children in the design of facilities intended for their local area.

7.54 The distribution of the quality of children’s play areas and facilities for young people can be seen on Maps 7.5 and 7.6 overleaf. This highlights that there are clusters of
high quality and poorer quality facilities based on the site assessments undertaken as part of this assessment.

7.55 In particular, Map 7.5 shows two clusters of lower quality facilities, focusing around the East and West areas. Map 7.6 demonstrates that the lower quality facilities are distributed across the city. In both maps, it is clear that there is a particular concentration of higher quality facilities in the North Carr area of the city. Many of the lower quality facilities contain very few pieces of equipment.

Map 7.5 – Quality of children’s play areas in Hull
Map 7.6 – Quality of young people's facilities in Hull
7.56 As well as guiding the enhancement of existing sites, the quality standard should also drive new provision and all new sites should be developed taking into account the identified aspirations of the local residents.

**C4**

Planning policies relating to the provision of new facilities for children and young people should include comprehensive guidelines intended to encourage the provision of a wide variety of new facilities and to move away from traditional facilities. They should also reflect the importance of appropriate location of facilities.

7.57 In light of the localised nature of play provision, consideration has been given to priorities within each analysis area through the interpretation of the quantity, quality and accessibility assessments.

7.58 In terms of locating priority areas for new facilities, new provision should be targeted at those areas outside the distance threshold where there are sufficient people to justify new provision. This emphasises the importance of access in determining the need for new provision for children.

7.59 In order to effectively meet the needs of residents it is essential to ensure that residents have access to facilities of the appropriate quality within the required distance threshold. The accessibility standards therefore indicate that more facilities will be required for children than young people, as young people can be expected to travel further to reach a facility.

7.60 Key areas of deficiency are highlighted in the area specific sections that follow. In light of the numerous deficiencies and the number of residents currently outside of the appropriate catchment for a facility, it will be essential to maximise public transport links and where possible, to locate sites, particularly those for young people, on routes which are easily accessible by public transport.

7.61 In addition, in order to promote sustainable transport, green linkages and cycle routes between large residential neighbourhoods, play facilities and other green spaces should be developed.

**C5**

Facilitate the development of green linkages and cycle routes between large residential neighbourhoods, play facilities and other green spaces.

Encourage the development of facilities on sites which are easily accessible by public transport.

7.62 As illustrated in the paragraphs that follow, there are a significant number of deficiencies in facilities for children and young people. The Building Schools for the Future programme looks to place schools at the heart of their community and therefore provides facilities local to each neighbourhood. The programme will ensure that a range of facilities are provided which reflect the needs of the community as well as curriculum needs. This will generate improvements to the overall quality and quantity of provision across Hull. The capital improvement programme will also see the enhancement of facilities at primary schools.
SECTION 7 – PROVISION FOR CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE

7.63 In light of the high levels of deficiency, and the location of schools, consideration should be given to the provision of equipped facilities for children and young people at these sites. Full access for the community outside of school hours should be negotiated.

| C5 | Consider the location of facilities for children and young people at school sites. Ensure full access to these sites for the local community |

East area

7.64 Application of the quantity standard indicates that the provision of children’s play areas is sufficient to meet current and future demand. Despite there being sufficient provision, accessibility mapping illustrates a shortfall with the majority of residents in the Longhill ward unable to access a children’s play area within the recommended 10 minute walk time (Figure 7.1).

Figure 7.1 – Deficiencies of children’s play areas in the Longhill ward

7.65 Although there is sufficient provision of children’s play areas in the East area, when analysing the quantity of provision on a ward by ward basis, there is a quantitative shortfall of 0.19 hectares in Sutton, equating to two facilities (based on the average size of a play area in Hull).

7.66 The highest quantity of amenity green space is located in the East area and when amalgamating the provision of amenity green space and children’s play areas, all residents have access to at least one of these types of open space within the recommended accessibility standards. Furthermore, there are some play areas with overlapping catchment areas. The accessibility deficiencies however highlight the need for additional provision both in the short term and to meet longer term population growth. As a minimum an additional facility should be provided at a site within the Longhill ward. An additional facility within the Sutton area of the city should also be considered.
SECTION 7 – PROVISION FOR CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE

7.67 The quality of facilities for children in the East area is poorer than in any other across the city with an average score of 68%. The quality of sites ranges significantly, with scores varying between 24% and 96%.

7.68 The provision of an additional facility should therefore be balanced with a programme of qualitative improvements, targeting those sites which achieved low quality scores.

C6
Consider the provision of a new children’s play area to the east of the Longhill ward.
Balance the provision of a new site with a programme of qualitative improvements at existing sites.

7.69 In contrast with the findings for children’s play areas, the quantity of facilities for young people is insufficient to meet the minimum quantity standard both in the short term and looking forward to the future.

7.70 Accessibility mapping supports this shortfall, indicating that there are some residents that cannot access a facility. A number of residents in the Longhill ward, Sutton ward and south of the Ings ward are outside the accessibility threshold of a young people’s facility (Figures 7.2–7.4). Access to facilities is particularly important and takes greater priority than the quantity standard.

Figure 7.2 – Deficiencies of young people’s facilities in the Longhill ward

Based upon Ordnance Survey mapping with permission of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office (C) Crown Copyright. Kingston Upon Hull City Council 100023372 (2008)
7.71 The quality of existing facilities is lower in the East than in other areas of the city. It can be seen on Map 7.6 that all facilities to the east of the area are of poor quality. In light of the sufficient quantity of facilities in this area, improvements to the quality should be prioritised.

7.72 While shortfalls in provision in the East area are less apparent than in other areas and quality issues are of greater concern, new provision in areas where residents are outside of the appropriate catchment of a facility should be considered. Analysis of the quantity of provision on a ward by ward basis indicates that there are shortfalls of provision in both the Ings and Longhill wards, although neither exceeds the size of a facility, indicating that addressing these issues should not be a priority.
7.73 When combining the provision of amenity green space and young people’s facilities, nearly all residents have access to an amenity green space or young people’s facility within the recommended distance thresholds. While in some instances amenity space may satisfy the requirements of local young people, the presence of amenity space does not negate the need for appropriate equipped provision.

7.74 In order to address the key areas of deficiency, provision of an additional two facilities should be considered. Provision of a facility on Barham Road Recreation Ground would address shortfalls in Longhill ward and ensure that almost all residents have access to a minimum of one facility. The location of a facility for young people in the area of deficiency to the south of the Ings ward would also meet deficiencies in Marfleet ward and consideration should be given to the provision of a facility at a school site.

C7
Prioritise improvements to the quality of facilities for young people within the East area.
Longer term, identify opportunities to provide an additional two facilities for young people within the Longhill ward and the Ings ward.

Northern area

7.75 The largest quantitative shortfall of children’s play areas is found in the Northern area and application of the quantity standard reveals there is insufficient provision to meet current and future demand.

7.76 Accessibility mapping illustrates this shortfall, with the majority of residents in the area unable to access a children’s play area within the recommended 10 minute walk time (Figure 7.5). The provision of new play areas is therefore a priority within this sector of the city.

Figure 7.5 – Deficiencies of children’s play areas in the Northern area

Based upon Ordnance Survey mapping with permission of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office (C) Crown Copyright, Kingston Upon Hull City Council 100023372 (2008)
7.77 Future population projections indicate that there will be an expected shortfall of between 0.70 (Scenario b) and 0.72 hectares (Scenario c) by 2026. Both population growth scenarios therefore require the creation of several additional facilities.

7.78 Analysis of the provision of children's play areas by ward indicates that shortfalls exist in the University (0.31 hectares), Orchard Park and Greenwood (0.19 hectares) and Beverley wards (0.18 hectares). The deficiency of children's play areas in the Orchard Park and Greenwood ward is particularly important considering that this ward is the third most deprived in Hull and 80th most deprived nationally. The profile of the population of University ward means that the deficiency in this area is of lower significance.

7.79 Although there are also large quantitative shortfalls of amenity green space in the Northern area, accessibility mapping indicates that all residents have access to this type of open space. Therefore, when amalgamating the provision of children's play areas and amenity green space, all residents have access to at least one of these types of open space within the recommended accessibility standards. The presence of amenity space ensures that there are informal opportunities for play, but does not negate the need for equipped play facilities.

7.80 The quality of facilities for children in the Northern area is average, with the mean site assessment score being 65%. The quality of provision in this area varies significantly, with scores ranging from 42–94%. This suggests that while addressing shortfalls in provision is of greater importance, qualitative improvements may also be required.

7.81 In light of the large quantitative shortfalls of children's play areas and the lack of other types of open space in the area, the Council should prioritise increasing the provision of children’s play areas in the Northern area. There is a particular need for new provision in the Orchard Park and Greenwood ward.

7.82 Similar to the findings for children's play areas, accessibility mapping reveals that the majority of residents in the Northern area do not have access to a facility for young people (Figure 7.6). Furthermore, quantitative analysis indicates that there is insufficient provision to meet current and future demand.
7.83 Analysis of the quantity of provision by ward reveals that the University (0.24 hectares) and Orchard Park and Greenwood (0.22 hectares) wards have the third and fourth largest deficiency of all wards in the city and as previously mentioned the Orchard Park and Greenwood ward is the third most deprived in Hull. The current facility at Dane Park serves only those residents in the most northern part of Orchard Park and Greenwood ward. There is also a shortfall of several facilities in the Beverley ward.

7.84 Deficiencies in access to facilities in the Northern area are exacerbated by the poorer quality provision, with the facility at Dane Park being one of the lowest scoring sites in the city.

7.85 In consideration of the quantitative shortfalls and large accessibility deficiencies, increases to the provision of facilities for young people should be prioritised. Any new provision should be located in the south of Orchard Park and Greenwood ward and in Beverley ward.

**C9**

Seek to increase the provision of young people’s facilities in the Northern area by providing a facility in the south of Orchard Park and Greenwood ward and in Beverley ward.

Improve the quality of existing sites in the area.

**North Carr area**

7.86 Application of the quantity standard reveals that there is sufficient provision of children’s play areas to meet current and future demand. Accessibility mapping supports this sufficient provision, indicating that the majority of residents have access to a children’s play area within the recommended accessibility threshold. Furthermore, there are several facilities with overlapping catchments.
7.87 Only a few residents in the south of the Kings Park ward and east of the Bransholme East ward cannot access a children's play area (Figures 7.7–7.9). There are also deficiencies in the Bransholme West ward.

Figure 7.7 – Deficiencies of children's play areas in the Bransholme West ward

Figure 7.8 – Deficiencies of children's play areas in the Kings Park ward
7.88 The provision of amenity green space in the area is sufficient to meet demand and accessibility mapping indicates that all residents have access to an amenity green space. Therefore all residents in the North Carr area have access to either an amenity green space or children’s play area within the recommended accessibility standards.

7.89 The quality of facilities for children in North Carr is average, with site scores ranging from 53–94%. This indicates that while there are some higher quality facilities, there are some opportunities to provide higher quality sites.

7.90 In light of issues of deprivation within Bransholme East and West, consideration should be given to the provision of an additional facility within these areas. In particular, ward by ward analysis highlights deficiencies in Bransholme West (0.18 hectares).

7.91 Outside of these areas, accessibility shortfalls are limited and the number of residents outside of the catchment area would be insufficient to warrant an additional facility. Further improvements should therefore focus on enhancing the quality and increasing access to existing play areas in the North Carr area.

C10 Seek to enhance the quality and increase access to children’s play areas in the North Carr area. Provide new play areas to serve residents in Bransholme East and Bransholme West who are currently outside of the appropriate catchment for a new facility.
Quantitative analysis indicates that there is insufficient provision of facilities for young people to meet existing demand. Based on growth scenarios b and c this shortfall is expected to increase.

Accessibility mapping supports this shortfall, with nearly all residents in the Kings Park ward and residents in the north of the Bransholme East ward outside the recommended catchment of a young people's facility (Figures 7.10 and 7.11) although all have access to at least one amenity space. Analysis of the distribution of sites in this area of the city highlights that all four sites are located in close proximity to each other.

Figure 7.10 – Deficiencies of young people's facilities in the Kings Park ward

Figure 7.11 – Deficiencies of young people's facilities in the Bransholme East ward
The average quality score of facilities for young people in North Carr is 77%, indicating the overall quality is good. Scores ranged from 66–87%, indicating that there are no sites of poor quality.

In light of the quality of sites, priority should focus on alleviating deficiencies. Consideration should be given to the provision of two new facilities for young people, potentially located on existing amenity spaces or within school sites in Kings Park and Bransholme East wards.

Consider the provision of a new young people’s facility within an existing amenity green space site in the Kings Park and Bransholme East wards.

Application of the quantity standard indicates that there are insufficient children’s play areas to meet current and future demand. Accessibility mapping reinforces this shortfall with areas of deficiency located in the Southcoates East and Southcoates West wards and north of the Marfleet ward (Figures 7.12 and 7.13).

Figure 7.12 – Deficiencies of children’s play areas in the Southcoates East and Southcoates West wards
7.97 Based on growth Scenario b there will be a shortfall of 0.70 hectares by 2026. Furthermore, ward analysis reveals that the Marfleet ward has the fourth largest shortfall of children’s play areas of all wards in the city (0.32 hectares). Within the Park area there is also a shortfall of amenity green space and when amalgamating the provision of amenity green space and children’s play areas it can be seen that residents in the Southcoates West ward (Figure 7.14) are outside of the appropriate catchment for both amenity space and facilities for children.

Figure 7.14 – Deficiencies of amenity green space and children’s play areas in the Southcoates West ward
SECTION 7 – PROVISION FOR CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE

7.98 The quality of provision for children in the Park area is good, with an average score of 78%. The quality of scores varies from 53% to 98% indicating that while there are some higher quality facilities, there are also some opportunities for improvement. Two of the poorest facilities are located in close proximity to each other in the Holderness ward.

7.99 In light of the above, the Council should prioritise the provision of a new play area within the Southcoates West ward. Opportunities to increase provision in Marfleet should also be seized. If a facility was to be located to the South of the Ings ward (East area) it is likely that this would serve residents in Marfleet and negate the need for additional provision.

C12

Consider the provision of a new children’s play area within the Southcoates West ward. Seize opportunities to increase the provision of play areas in other areas of deficiency, particularly in Marfleet. In areas where play provision is sufficient, the Council should focus on improvements to existing play provision.

7.100 The Park area contains the highest amount of provision for young people of all areas. Quantitative analysis indicates that there is sufficient provision to meet current and future demand. Although there is sufficient provision in the area, application of the accessibility standards illustrates that residents situated in the north of the Marfleet and Southcoates West wards are outside the recommended catchment of a young people’s facility (Figures 7.15–7.16).

Figure 7.15 – Deficiencies of young people’s facilities in the Marfleet ward

Based upon Ordnance Survey mapping with permission of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office (C) Crown Copyright. Kingston Upon Hull City Council 100023372 (2008)
Figure 7.16 – Deficiencies of young people’s facilities in the Southcoates West ward

In light of the reasonable quality of facilities, future priority should be given to the provision of additional facilities in areas devoid of provision should the opportunities arise. The provision of a facility in the south of the Ings ward (as recommended in the East area analysis) would also offset some of the deficiencies. In light of the application of the quantity standards, which demonstrates that the quantity of provision is currently sufficient, addressing these deficiencies should be considered as a longer term priority.

C13

Seize opportunities to provide additional facilities for young people within the Park area. These should focus on the areas currently devoid of provision.

Riverside area

7.102 The highest quantity of children’s play areas is located in the Riverside area (1.92 hectares) and as a consequence application of the quantity standards indicates that there is sufficient provision to meet current and future demand.

7.103 In reflection of the high quantity of provision in this area, there are few accessibility deficiencies. Only areas of the Newington, Myton (predominantly the central area) and Drypool wards are devoid of provision (Figures 7.17–7.19).
SECTION 7 – PROVISION FOR CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE

Figure 7.17 – Deficiencies of children’s play areas in the Newington ward

Figure 7.18 – Deficiencies of children's play areas in the Drypool ward
When amalgamating the provision of play areas and amenity green space, the majority of residents have access to at least one of these typologies within the recommended accessibility standards.

The quality of facilities for children in the Riverside area is the second lowest of all areas with an average score of 69%. Furthermore, the scores achieved varied from 34–96% suggesting that there are some play areas in particular need of improvement. In light of the high number of facilities and good access in this area, focus should be placed on improving the overall quality. Furthermore, it can be seen that there are several facilities located in very close proximity to each other. Rationalisation of some of these facilities may provide an opportunity to improve the quality. Quality improvements should be targeted at those sites considered poor during site assessments.

In light of the even distribution of facilities and high quantity of provision in the Riverside area, focus on improving the quality of existing facilities.

The quantity of provision for young people in the Riverside area is below the recommended minimum standard. Current shortfalls equate to 0.65 hectares (approximately five facilities) and this will increase in the event of population growth. Ward-by-ward analysis indicates that shortfalls in Newington are the second highest in the city (0.27 hectares, equating to two facilities), and provision within Drypool (0.19 hectares) is also insufficient.

Surprisingly, accessibility mapping illustrates that overall, the distribution of facilities for young people is even and the majority of residents have access to a facility.

Although accessibility mapping highlights an area of deficiency in the south of the St Andrews ward the majority of this land is industrial and therefore the provision of a young people’s facility would be of limited value. The only other area where residents have insufficient provision is the north of the Drypool ward (Figure 7.20).
7.109 In light of quantitative deficiencies in provision, opportunities for new provision should be seized, particularly in the Drypool ward. Furthermore, consideration should be given to the provision of an additional facility within the Newington ward, which contains the fourth largest quantitative deficiency in the city. Provision in this ward would also benefit the residents in Boothferry ward where there also deficiencies.

| C15  | Improve the quality of existing facilities in the Riverside area. Seek opportunities to provide new facilities in the Newington and Drypool wards. |

**West area**

7.110 Application of the quantity standard indicates that there are insufficient children’s play areas to meet current and future demand. Accessibility mapping reinforces this shortfall with residents in the Boothferry and Derringham wards and in the south of the Pickering ward unable to access a children’s play area within the recommended 10 minute walk time (Figures 7.21–7.23).
Figure 7.21 – Deficiencies of children’s play areas in the Boothferry ward

Based upon Ordnance Survey mapping with permission of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office (C) Crown Copyright. Kingston Upon Hull City Council 100023372 (2008)

Figure 7.22 – Deficiencies of children’s play areas in the Derringham ward

Based upon Ordnance Survey mapping with permission of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office (C) Crown Copyright. Kingston Upon Hull City Council 100023372 (2008)
7.111 When considering provision for children in the context of amenity green space, almost all residents have access to at least one of these typologies. The majority of residents in this area of Hull also have access to a park or garden. While this does not negate the need for play provision, it does mean that residents do at least have access to some informal open space.

7.112 In addition to current shortfalls, based on growth Scenario b there will be a shortfall of 0.66 hectares by 2026. Furthermore, ward analysis reveals that there is insufficient provision to meet demand in the Boothferry and Derringham wards. Demand is particularly high in Boothferry (0.32 hectares).

7.113 In light of this shortfall, the Council should consider increasing the provision of children's play areas in the Boothferry ward.

7.114 There are a number of large amenity green space sites located in the areas of existing deficiency (Figure 7.24). To help alleviate these deficiencies, the Council should consider the provision of a new children’s play area within one of these existing sites.
7.115 In addition to quantitative and access deficiencies in provision, the quality of facilities for children in West area is varied, with scores ranging from 44–100%. The average quality score was 74%. The poorest quality site (Ascott Close Play Area) is located in close proximity to other sites. Given the low number of facilities, the quality of existing sites is particularly important. A combination of new provision and qualitative improvements will therefore be required.

C17 Consider the provision of at least one new children’s play area within Boothferry and Derringham wards. Undertake a programme of improvement on sites where quality is currently considered to be poor.

7.116 Consistent with the findings for children’s play areas, the provision of young people’s facilities in the West area is insufficient to meet current and future demand, although the quality of sites is good.

7.117 Accessibility mapping illustrates that there are only three facilities for young people located in the West area, and two of these sites are located in the south of the area in the Pickering ward. Due to the distribution of facilities, no residents in the Boothferry ward and a large number of residents in the Derringham ward are able to access a facility for young people.

7.118 Analysis of provision for young people on a ward by ward basis reinforces these issues, with shortfalls in Boothferry (0.30 hectares) and Derringham (0.14 hectares). The shortfall in Boothferry is the greatest in the city.

7.119 Based on growth scenario c there will be a shortfall of 0.61 hectares (four facilities for young people) by 2026. This reinforces the need to provide additional facilities for young people in this area of the city. In order to meet existing demand, a minimum of
one site should be located in each of Boothferry and Derringham wards. To achieve this, new sites could be located within existing open spaces, such as amenity green space.

### Wyke area

7.120 Accessibility mapping highlights a number of areas of deficiency in the Wyke area, with residents in the Bricknell, Avenue and Newland wards unable to access a children’s play area within the recommended 10 minute walk time (Figure 7.25).

7.121 Application of the quantity standard also indicates that there is insufficient provision to meet current and future demand.

#### Figure 7.25 – Deficiencies of children’s play areas in the Wyke area

![Figure 7.25 – Deficiencies of children’s play areas in the Wyke area](image)

7.122 Ward analysis indicates that the provision of children’s play areas in all three wards in the Wyke area is insufficient to meet demand. The deficiency within the Newland ward is particularly considerable (0.29 hectares).

7.123 The provision of amenity green space is insufficient to meet demand. However, when amalgamating the provision of amenity green space and children’s play areas, the majority of residents have access to at least one of these types of open space. Residents in the central area of the Bricknell ward (Figure 7.26) are, however, unable to access either amenity green space or facilities for children. This reinforces the importance of rectifying the shortfall of provision in this area of the city.
Given the shortfalls in both quantity and access in the Avenue and Newland wards, at least one additional site in each area is required. Furthermore, new provision should also be considered in the central area of Bricknell. This may be delivered through the relocation of one or more of the existing play areas.

The quality of existing facilities is the highest in the city and the average score is 81%. This reinforces that new provision should be prioritised over qualitative improvements.

Quantitative analysis reveals that the provision of young people’s facilities in the Wyke area is insufficient to meet demand.

Accessibility mapping indicates that there are only three sites located in Wyke and these are predominantly situated in the south, creating deficiencies in the east of the Bricknell ward, north of the Avenue ward and west of the Newland ward (Figures 7.27 and 7.28).
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Figure 7.27 – Deficiencies of young people’s facilities in the Bricknell ward

Figure 7.28 – Deficiencies of young people’s facilities in the Avenue and Newland wards
7.128 In addition to current deficiencies, based on growth Scenario b there will be a shortfall of 0.59 hectares by 2026, which is equivalent to four facilities. Analysis of the quantitative supply on a ward-by-ward basis further reveals that the provision of facilities for young people in each of the three wards is insufficient to meet demand.

7.129 The existing facilities in Wyke are of reasonable quality and new provision should therefore be prioritised.

C21 Provide at least one facility for young people in Bricknell ward and a minimum of one site to meet the needs of residents living in the west of Avenue and Newland wards.

Summary and recommendations

7.130 Equipped provision for children and young people was the overriding theme of consultations throughout the study. Residents expressed concerns over the quantity of provision, as well as highlighting that the quality of many facilities is insufficient and that facilities are perceived to be boring and not challenging.

7.131 The Hull Play Policy recognises many of these issues and also highlights the need to increase the quantity of provision for both children and young people. There has been significant effort to ensure that recently developed facilities for children and young people are exciting, challenging and appropriate to the target audience.

7.132 Analysis of existing facilities highlights that there is significant variation in the quality of sites although sites are distributed relatively evenly across the city. While there are some new and different facilities there are also many sites which are old and offer little in terms of play value.

7.133 There are particular issues with the quantity and distribution of facilities for both children and young people across Hull. In order to ensure that all residents are within the appropriate distance threshold of a facility, significant extra provision is required in all areas across the city. There are particular priorities for new provision in the West, Wyke and Northern areas. The provision of appropriate facilities on school sites may be instrumental in the delivery of facilities to meet local need.

7.134 Any new facilities developed should meet the suggested quality criteria and should provide exciting play opportunities for children and young people. Site assessments carried out at existing facilities should also be used to inform decisions on those facilities in need of enhancement.

7.135 The key priorities for improving the provision of children’s play areas and young people’s facilities over the Hull Development Framework period therefore are:

- identify a programme of improvements across facilities for children and young people. Consideration should be given to the provision of an appropriate variety of facilities

- seek to provide challenging and exciting play facilities for children that encourage children to test their boundaries and balance risk and safety. Play facilities should be designed giving consideration to the Play England guide for creating successful play spaces and the Performance Indicators also created by Play England.
• encourage and promote the involvement of children and young people in the development of new facilities

• target improvements to the existing provision for children and young people using the quality standards and site assessments undertaken as part of this assessment to guide improvements. Ensure that new provision also meets recommended standards

• evaluate the potential of locating facilities for children and young people at school sites

• consider the provision of new facilities for children in areas currently devoid of provision

• identify new opportunities for young people in Wyke, West and Northern areas of the city

• in light of shortfalls in provision, public transport links should be maximized and particularly for young people, sites should be located in areas with good public transport links

• green linkages and cycle routes should be maximized in order to encourage the use of sustainable means of transport.