

APPENDIX: 13

NOTE OF MEETING WITH SPORT ENGLAND

30.11.16

Present:

Roy Warren, Sport England
Ruth Gray, Vincent +Gorbing

INTRODUCTION

RG gave an overview of the Schools vision to deliver a wider sports curriculum that provided for their own needs as well as those of the local community, setting out the deficiencies of the existing Beldams Lane facilities (summer use only) and the need to expand to 6FE with a view to 8FE in the future but not part of this planning application. RG explained technical work was underway and this would inform the site plans.

BELDAMS LANE SITE (MASTERPLAN REV D OPTION 1)

Overall the package provided on Beldams Lane would be supported by Sport England. It would be an improvement on the existing facilities. It would need to be supported by a reasoned argument that PE curriculum can be effectively delivered with the walking distance between the two sites. RG explained this has been addressed and will be covered in the application.

All Weather 2G hockey pitch

- SE would support this provision which makes sense in the context of the schools needs and would meet exception policy E5
- Look at potential realignment of pitch to make more use of the residual western area which could then be marked out for informal training in its current condition
- Potentially re-align footpath to run directly north/south
- Lux levels on a hockey pitch need to be higher but low spillage technology can assist with this – lighting assessment submitted with the application may assist
- Noise levels on a hockey pitch tend to be higher because of ball rebound – noise consultant needs to look at SE guidance on mitigation (diagrams on mitigation)
- Noise assessment + mitigation may determine levels of community use (hours/duration)
- **Action: RW to send RG link to guidance for noise consultant**

Sports Hall

- SE would support this provision which would be an exception to SE Policy E5
- Two entrances are a good solution would be supported by SE
- Two changing rooms (indoor/outdoor) would be supported by SE
- Dimensions of sports hall appear to be satisfactory for the sports listed
- Normally reception area is adjacent to office use (consider re-positioning)
- Foyer size is good and would be supported by SE

- Check on viewing into hall
- First floor Judo – check Judo club are happy with current design especially storage and obtain this in writing for planning submission
- Judo/dance – to what extent will the school use the space for Judo and dance? – meet school needs first, community needs second
- The current configuration may prejudice the long –term potential for the additional swimming pool which would effectively be segregated from main reception (and would imply the need for 2 separate receptions which could be difficult to fund and manage); consider whether reception could be re-positioned to service future swimming pool and current sports hall
- Check out affordable leisure centres design guidance by SE
- **Action: RW to send RG link to leisure centre guidance for architect**
- **Action: RG to speak to School about formal written consultation with netball and judo clubs on current scheme design ahead of a pre-application submission**
- **Action: RG to clarify extent of school use of Judo/dance**

Tennis courts

- SE would support this provision which would meet exception policy E5
- Look at marking out for netball use
- Look at floodlighting which could meet the weekday evening needs of League netball (the site has the potential to be a community hub for league netball)
- **Action: RW can consult netball facilities manager about design specification**

Conclusion: Beldams Lane

Sport England would in principle deploy exceptions policies E4 and E5 and would not object to the application taking account of the above comments. As such no off site provision would be required at Bowling Lane. However there would be increased support of the Beldams Lane proposal if the qualitative loss of the grass playing fields was re-provided at Bowling Lane. Even though SE may not object RFU and FA may object to loss of playing fields due to loss of community use potential (if the quality of the pitches were improved) – a planning authority may choose to pick this out of a sport England non-objection as a reason for refusal (this has happened elsewhere). Also, if no replacement playing field is proposed at Bowling Lane this position is subject to the school demonstrating how it will meet its grass pitch needs for athletics, football and rugby as we would need to assess how the impact will be mitigated even if our overall view is that we would not object.

BOWLING LANE MASTERPLAN

Overall the package on Bowling Lane would be supported by Sport England. It would need to be supported by a reasoned argument that PE curriculum can be effectively delivered with the walking distance between the Warwick Road site and the Bowling Lane site (with the changing facilities at Beldams Lane being a potential stopover). RG explained that this has been addressed and will be covered in the application. In particular, how will time taken to get to changing facility and then to pitches be addressed.

Running track/Rounders'/summer use

- SE would support this provision as it replaces what would be lost at Beldams Lane and recognises that it could be used for fixtures during the summer months
- Could this area be marked out for summer cricket too and used for cricket fixtures e.g. artificial wicket?
- Does the school really need the whole of the Bowling Lane site?
- What is the community need for summer use grass pitches?

- The playing fields will need to be constructed to withstand the proposed intensity of summer community use
- **Action: RG to discuss mix of summer uses and potential for community/school cricket use/ explore needs of adjoining Cricket Club – do they need extra facilities which could be shared here?**

Football pitches/winter use

- SE would support this provision as it replaces what would be lost at Beldams Lane and could be used during the winter months
- Is there a need for rugby?
- Could there be one rugby/one football?
- The playing fields will need to be constructed to withstand the proposed intensity of winter community use

Other matters:

- RG set out Green Belt issues and need for VSC which was agreed by RW
- RW explained that school curriculum need was the key to the need case in the absence of pupil numbers need
- RW supported the BB103 assessment as the means to formalising the schools 6FE quantitative and qualitative playing pitch needs plus confirmation of school pitch needs to meet curricular/extra-curricular needs which could be used for the VSC case and RW noted that other COU GB applications were being approved on this basis providing the level of GB impact was acceptable and consider landscaping scheme for visual protection
- RW considered that this could be supplemented by community need (generally and specifically)
- RW advised to beware BS Football Club – were they looking still and did they have an option to purchase this land? – what would their reaction be to a planning application by the School (they are looking for AWP + clubhouse facilities) – check this out
- **Action: RG to look at Ploszajski Lynch report (EHDC) – methodology not supported by SE but “issues” of playing pitch deficiencies may be useful supporting arguments**
- **Action: RG to speak to School about BS Football Club intent and minimise risk of objection and also consider BS Town Council (Neighbourhood Plan)**
-
- **Action: progress BB103 assessment to support qualitative argument – which will form the basis of the needs justification + potential need for landscaping**

Conclusion

Sport England would support any package of re-provision here if playing fields are properly constructed to enable the proposed level of school and community use.