



# **NORTHLEACH WITH EASTINGTON TOWN COUNCIL**

# **REPORT**

from the

## **MULTI USE GAMES AREA WORKING GROUP**

**November 2008**

## **The background to the report**

In February 2007 the Council was approached by PCSO Mark Williams with a request to review sports provision for the youth of the Town and to consider installing an all weather multi function sports court. Members considered this at the Council meeting on 27 February 2007 when it was stated that a feasibility study should be carried out.

At the Council meeting on 27 March it was agreed to set up a Working Group involving residents and interested parties to carry out a feasibility study and report its findings to the Town Council. Members of the Working Group are listed in Appendix 1 and the Terms of Reference for the Working Group at Appendix 2.

The Town Council owns land adjacent to the Westwoods Centre that has been allocated for community / sports use since 1999. The Council also manages land known as King George V Playing Field (KGV) and the adjoining Water Meadows on behalf of the National Playing Fields Association (Fields in Trust – FiT). All sites would be considered during the process of the feasibility study.

This report has therefore been prepared to provide the Town Council with evidence and recommendations on which to decide whether and if so how this request should be progressed. The conclusions to this report and recommendations appear at pages 11 and 12.

## **The preparation of the report and the consultation process**

A working group was formed in September 2007 and local residents from properties surrounding Westwoods were invited to join the group by letter in August 2007. Two Westwoods residents joined the working group. As well as local residents, the working group has comprised other members of the local community, in particular those interested in promoting sport and youth facilities.

Following establishment of the working group, a questionnaire was prepared and circulated to the town. In addition, an open day was held at Westwoods at which possible suppliers of a facility were invited to demonstrate their proposals for the two sites identified for possible development.

Questionnaires were returned by nearly 200 households and elicited around 540 individual responses representing a response rate in the region of 25-30% by number of households and population. In addition, some 90 feedback forms were returned from the open day. Organisations who might be potential users were also canvassed for their opinions. Copies of the questionnaires and of the analysis of the household questionnaire arranged by Gloucestershire Rural Community Council (GRCC), appear at Appendix 3 together with the responses received from organisations canvassed for their views.

Points to be made on the analysis undertaken of the household questionnaire are as follows;

Of all those responding, irrespective of whether they would use the facility, 52% would prefer Westwoods and 45% KGV as the chosen site.

Of the 197 households responding, 59% stated that they would use a MUGA, 25% at least once a week.

Of the 544 responses, of those who expressed a preference for location and who stated that they would use it for the sport they indicated they would most like to play 126 would prefer Westwoods as a location, whilst 60 would prefer KGV. (A further number were content with either location.)

Of those, a number expressed a wish for a tennis facility, already catered for on the KGV (though not flood lit). Excluding that group, 96 preferred Westwoods and 42, KGV, i.e., 69% favoured Westwoods.

Of those who responded to the questionnaire and said they would use the facility, a majority in excess of 2:1 prefer Westwoods over KGV.

No professional analysis was carried out of the open day feed back forms. One member of the working group has analysed these to provide the following statistics;

Of those responding, 54% would use a MUGA, 38% at least once a month.

Of the potential users, 78% preferred Westwoods as a location, whilst 22% preferred KGV.

The results of the two surveys appear broadly consistent and indicate a significant number preferring Westwoods as the site.

Of the organisations responding, all are in favour of a facility, the [vast majority] at Westwoods. Copies of the analysis of the household questionnaire and a copy of the open day questionnaire are at Appendix 3.

## **Demand and need**

The genesis of this report was the request from young people in the town for provision of a Multi Use Games Area (MUGA) which could be used for free play and for training and team games. Excluding tennis, the household survey indicates around 150 potential users from the numbers indicating a preference for one or other site. There are also those who expressed no preference. In addition, [a number of] organisations have indicated that they would use such a facility for recreation or training. Copies of their responses are at Appendix 3.

In addition to what is indicated from the consultation process, Northleach has been listed as a Priority 1 area for the provision of such a facility, along with four other Cotswold towns and villages. (Graham Ross, Gloucestershire Playing Fields Association and Appendix 4 ).

## **Planning issues**

Sketch plans showing the potential positioning of a MUGA on each site are attached, together with possible access routes. (Appendix 5)

### **Restrictive covenants and planning restrictions**

Both the KGV field and the Westwoods site are subject to restrictions on use aside from the general planning regime. The KGV field is to be retained as a playing field and is held in trust for FiT. The Westwoods site, is subject to a covenant to the effect that it must be used only for community purposes.

The FiT has confirmed that it would have no objection to the construction of a MUGA on the KGV field.

Construction of a MUGA at Westwoods requires careful consideration as to its siting because the area within the curtilage of the building is subject to a planning restriction preventing use for anything other than sport. This is a separate restriction from the general requirement for use of the area as a whole for community purposes. In effect, it means that any MUGA would have to be built on the existing grassed area between the centre and the old tennis courts. CDC have

advised that planning would be refused for any alternative use that impinges upon the sports land. Sport England would be a consultee to any planning application and would also object to any loss of sports land.

Aside from the restrictions mentioned above, Cotswold District Council (CDC) advise that: no planning permission is required for the construction of a MUGA on the grassed area at Westwoods but that; planning permission would be required for a MUGA on the KGV field. (It should be noted however that the General Permitted Development Order (annexed) allows certain development on land maintained by a local authority so that in fact permission is unlikely to be required on the KGV field.)

## **Other planning considerations**

### **The Westwoods site**

If Westwoods is the chosen site, then any scheme also needs to address the adequacy of car parking which the Council has already resolved to improve in order to relieve occasional congestion caused by larger events. This would require planning permission from CDC.

The only land available for improved parking facilities and in respect of which CDC would be able to give consent (because it is not zoned for sports use) is in the area of the old tennis courts. Siting the car park at the surgery end of the site has the advantage that the MUGA would be sited between the centre and the car park and so reduce any noise impact.

In that configuration, the issue of access to the car park arises. Taking the access road from the shallowest slope nearest the centre (as proposed by the Council) would not gain planning without making good the area of sports land lost. CDC have confirmed that it would be possible to achieve this by exchanging a similar area of land from the old tennis court equal to the area required for the roadway. This would require CDC and the Council to enter into a planning agreement under S106 of the Town & Country Planning Act.

The alternative to this would be to facilitate car park access from the embankment close to the surgery, which would also require the consent of Medcentres as freeholders and their tenant, the surgery. Not only would it be costlier to construct but it would also be visually unappealing.

### **The KGV site**

If the KGV field is the chosen site, planning permission would probably not be required either for a MUGA but also for any associated infrastructure. There is a question mark over the adequacy of parking, given the very small car park by the school, (23 spaces) particularly if there were to be visiting teams competing for space with each other and or with the school or Sports & Social Club. Access also presents a problem in that there is no lit path from the car park, or any other access point to the proposed site behind the tennis courts. Consequently, use of the MUGA in hours of darkness would require significant additional lighting infrastructure in addition to flood lighting.

Consideration has also been given to the possibility of placing a MUGA on the KGV field itself. There is inadequate room if the current pitches are to be maintained. At least one of the two childrens' pitches is already undersized. The cricket field also requires considerable space – 111metres by 107-128metres. Those dimensions can only just be accommodated in the existing space

### **Lighting of the two sites**

For both sites, there are considerations of noise and light pollution to be contended with. A MUGA on the KGV field would be situated on the side of a hill, at a higher level than the nearest

housing, meaning that noise would be more likely to carry and also giving the possibility of greater visibility of lighting from any flood lighting, even if downward facing. The nearest housing is however further away than the nearest housing at Westwoods.

The Westwoods site is significantly below the level of existing housing, albeit closer. This would mean that downward floodlighting would be largely contained at a level below the level of the existing housing.

Whichever site is chosen, care will need to be taken to ensure that there is no light pollution nuisance to neighbouring properties. CDC have advised that the current generation of sports ground flood lighting, downward facing, would meet their requirements. Provision of flood lighting at Westwoods would be regarded as work ancillary to the provision of a MUGA and would not require separate permission. Provision of lighting at KGV would be similar. Permitted development however cannot exceed 4m in height. Flood lighting would have to meet that height requirement unless permission is to be sought.

So far as operating times are concerned, whilst CDC might seek to limit use of lighting they would not generally be concerned so long as lighting is operated considerately. A 10.00pm switch off time would generally be considered acceptable.

The attached graph, (Appendix 6) shows the likely spread of light from modern flood lighting. This indicates vertical illumination in the direction of the lighting only, i.e., there is darkness behind the light source and the potential to achieve very limited upward glow commensurate with the needs of rural locations and areas of outstanding natural beauty. (See the guidance note at Appendix 6)

### **Noise pollution from the two sites**

So far as noise is concerned, the FiT Six Acre Standard (2001), sets out minimum standards for outdoor play space. This standard requires a buffer zone of a minimum of 30 metres between the activity zone and the boundary of the nearest property containing a dwelling.

This standard applies to a facility similar to that proposed, combined with a play area, giving a total activity area of 1000 sq metres. The approximate distance from the nearest boundary at Westwoods is 30 metres – 45 metres, depending on size and orientation. In any event the facility proposed is around 30% smaller than the sort of facility to which the standard applies. The nearest boundary on KGV is considerably further away – in the region of 50-60 metres.

### **Comparative sizes of the two sites**

The Westwoods site is considerably larger than the KGV site. Westwoods would accommodate a facility in the order of 20m x 35m, (700 sq metres, well exceeding the FiT minimum standard of 465 sq meters for 5 a side football). A width of 20m would also ensure the facility was well beyond the 30m buffer zone.

Sport England recommends that if possible a facility should be oriented in a North-South direction to minimise the effects of sunlight on players. For guidance on sizing of courts, Sport England suggest a size of 37m x 18.5m for 5 a side football. A court of such a size would also accommodate netball, tennis, cricket training and volleyball and netball. (See Sport England MUGA dimensions guidance at Appendix 7.)

The remaining space would be sufficient for considerable extra parking, in the region of 20 plus spaces and a suitable access road running along the existing embankment. This would roughly double existing capacity. (Car parking standards generally require a space 2.4m x 5m plus turning and access space – see attached note extracted from Sport England guidance.) In addition, considerable space – more than taken up by a 30m x 15m MUGA – would be available as a grassed area for other recreational purposes.

The KGV site, boundary to boundary, provides useable space of the order of 25m x 25m. This is barely enough to provide a sufficient size court to meet the FiT minimum standard for five aside football. With a North-South orientation a court of 30m x 15m would be very difficult to achieve, particularly with any sense of balance with the existing tennis courts. Depending on exact width and length requirements, a court of something like 15m x 26m metres would be required using the Sport England proportion of 1.75:1. Westwoods would sustain a facility of the order of 25% larger.

For the purpose of comparison, it should be noted that the present quote received from Lightmain is for a facility 30m x 15m.

## **Construction and infrastructure issues**

Provision of a MUGA at Westwoods will require provision of suitable foundations on the existing grassed area and fencing, together with flood lighting. A car park on the site of the old tennis courts will require provision of a suitable surface with reuse of much of the existing base course. CDC advise that a permanent car park will also require an interceptor trap and drainage to deal with run off which might otherwise enter the river. It might however be possible to include such work in a grant application to include that improvement work as part of the overall project.

Construction at KGV will require digging out the existing embankment and backfilling to provide a level surface. Given the additional cost involved in that activity and in the provision of lighting from the access point, it seems clear that there will be significant additional cost involved in construction on this site.

Fencing at either site should be made to blend with the surrounding landscape and be in keeping with the surrounding rural setting. There is a compromise to be made between the height of lighting poles and lighting coverage. A greater number are required if poles are short. If possible, poles should not exceed 4 in number and should not exceed the height of existing lamp standards at Westwoods. Shorter, but a greater number, perhaps 6 lighting poles, might be a better option on KGV. Whichever site is chosen, advice should be taken on the most aesthetically acceptable lighting layout available.

There is no power at the KGV site. This would be required to provide a lit path to the car park or other access points and also for flood lighting. This is likely to be expensive, but might provide an opportunity to install flood lighting for the existing tennis courts at the same time. Possible alternative positions on the KGV site might be in the area of the existing cricket nets or in front of the Sports & Social Club. Both would interfere with the available space for the Cricket outfield and the latter would create a narrow corridor between the club and any facility as well as obscuring the view from the club.

In either case, thought must be given to the cost and type of surface to be used, relative to the capital and maintenance costs and the suitability of the surface for a variety of sports. The attached table, produced by Sport England, shows which surface may accommodate which sport. (Appendix 8)

### **Emergency access**

Access for emergency vehicles also needs to be considered. Westwoods is easily accessible. A MUGA, situated some way from the road on KGV is much less readily accessible in an emergency, particularly if emergency vehicles are unable to gain easy access onto the field if the car park is full and, or, there are matches in progress on the main pitches.

## **Environmental impact**

This section is the product of two reports – what follows below and a document headed “Westwoods Estate Residents’ Concerns Regarding the Impact of a MUGA in Northleach”, which is attached. The council should consider both equally. Each addresses largely the same areas.

### **Vehicular and pedestrian flow**

Construction of a MUGA on either site will obviously result in additional pedestrian and or vehicular traffic flow. There must be safe access for pedestrians and vehicles and adequate parking.

The plans referred to in the planning section of this report identify access and parking facilities and, in the case of Westwoods, possible additional parking facilities as well as a possible pedestrian route via the playing field and Hamilton meadow, which the council has been pursuing for some time.

It should be noted that the Westwoods residents on the working group express concern over the possibility of increased pedestrian flow through Fallows Road via the alleyway to the main road and the effect that may have in terms of noise and traffic safety.

Additional car parking at Westwoods will be sufficient to serve the facility and will also help relieve congestion already being experienced, by providing in the region of 20 additional spaces.

There is no real prospect of additional parking being provided at KGV as it is unlikely that the FIT would allow any part of the field to be used for that purpose if it interfered with the existing pitches. The car park on KGV is already congested, particularly during sports matches and during the school day, especially when children are delivered to or collected from school. There is little scope for on street parking in the immediate vicinity.

### **Noise**

Both sites will very likely meet the FIT 30m buffer zone requirement for a facility of up to 1000 sq. metres. Such a facility would be expected to provide “8 types of play equipment and opportunities for ball games or wheeled activities”. A facility of 400 sq metres would be expected to provide “5 types of play equipment and a small games area” with a buffer zone of 10m. If the decision is to construct a MUGA along the lines of the Lightmain quote, then, at 30m x 15m it would be less than half the size of a facility with a recommended buffer zone of 30m and only 12.5% larger than a facility with a recommended buffer zone of 10m only.

The anticipated facility, depending on the site chosen, will be up to 700 sq. metres. Given that the anticipated facility is considerably smaller than 1000 sq. metres and will accommodate far fewer people at any one time, it will clearly meet the FiT buffer zone requirement on either site.

Many authorities have provided MUGAs for their neighbourhoods over the years. Noise and anti-social behaviour are always concerns. The attached minutes (Appendix 9) from a meeting of South Lakeland record the experiences of 5 other Councils. None report any significant concerns. In addition, it is proposed that this should be a managed facility, restricting free play to certain hours so that it should not become a place for people to congregate late at night.

### **Lighting**

Lighting for the facility would very likely require a maximum of four downward facing floodlights. Modern lights are shielded to prevent escape of glow. Upward glow can be kept to as little as 1%. Lighting standards and guidance notes extracted from the FiT website are attached and

include The Institution of Lighting Engineers guidance notes on reduction of light pollution. (Appendix 6)

Either site should aim to ensure that lighting provided falls within environmental zone E1 or E2 and this standard should be made a requirement of any contract for the provision of lighting. Unless permission is to be sought for flood lighting, any contract should also stipulate that that lighting poles and lights do not exceed the 4m height restriction. Such measures, coupled with the FIT suggestions for light intensity at a distance of 30 – 40m from the side of the facility should ensure sufficient protection for local residents.

### **Guidance on requirements and standards to reduce environmental impact**

CDC provides no written guidance on construction of MUGAs. Many other authorities do. One particularly useful set of guidance notes is provided by the City and County of Cardiff and is attached at Appendix 10. As will be seen, they adopt a similar approach to the FIT. Their guidance would provide a useful guide to the council for provision of a MUGA on either site. Both sites appear to be capable of meeting the criteria set out.

### **General guidance on siting**

The points made above as to incorporation of buffer zones, access, lighting and orientation are some of the factors that will need to be taken into account in determining the siting of any facility. A useful checklist is provided by Sport England and is at Appendix 10.

### **Westwoods Estate Residents' Concerns Regarding The Impact Of A MUGA In Northleach**

The construction of any sporting facility adjacent to a residential area will inevitably have an effect on the residents in the immediate locality. The worries and concerns of those residents should be fully considered as part of the process of deciding on whether construction should proceed. Investigation and resolution of the concerns raised is of paramount importance to the success and acceptance of such a facility in the community should construction be approved, and significant efforts should be employed in the addressing and resolving those concerns. This will provide the necessary assurance to the residents that their views and needs are being listened to and understood.

Many pertinent concerns have been raised by residents living in the Westwoods Estate over the negative impact that locating a MUGA on the Westwoods site would have. To date no concerns have been raised by residents bordering the KGV playing fields over the location of a MUGA there.

Concerns that have been raised with regards to the Westwoods site are set out below. Although some concerns may apply to both locations, the impact at Westwoods would be greater as the starting point is zero sporting activity; at the KGV site, cricket, football and tennis are already played and the playing field has a readily accepted function.

1. Noise Pollution
2. Light Pollution
3. Anti-social behaviour
4. Littering
5. Increased pedestrian traffic through Fallows Road/Alternative access to site
6. Increased Car Parking requirement for the Westwoods Centre
7. Have other potential uses for the Westwoods site been explored?
8. The King George V Playing Fields alternative
9. The rationale for a MUGA and its ideal location

#### **1. Noise Pollution**

The extremely close proximity of the potential Westwoods MUGA development to residential dwellings in both Fallows Road and Bassett Road will cause a significant level of noise pollution for residents. The concerns centre on both the level of noise and the inevitable element of

swearing during sporting activity which, either in isolation or combined, will affect the quality of living for those residents. This concern is compounded by the fact that young families reside adjacent to the Westwoods site and the prospect of children being exposed to inappropriate language and having sleep disrupted (the intention is that a MUGA would not close till 10:00PM) is deemed by residents to be an unacceptable impact. Notwithstanding the issue of children being affected by the noise levels, any resident in the locality, most notably those with gardens bordering the site will have previously peaceful evenings and weekends in the garden blighted by noise and bad language. The following points on this subject have not been investigated by the Working Party:

- a. The potential level of noise generated by a MUGA.
- b. The minimum recommended distance between a MUGA and housing.
- c. Possible methods of reducing noise levels generated.
- d. Restricting times of opening.

## **2. Light Pollution**

The installation of floodlighting on a MUGA at either location will inevitably generate some form of light pollution. There has been anecdotal evidence provided at Working Party meetings that modern lighting will not impact surrounding areas however no factual information has been provided. Even the generation of a "halo" of light in an otherwise unlit area will impact and light up surrounding housing.

## **3. Anti-social Behaviour**

Concerns have been raised that a MUGA on the Westwoods development, where no on site supervision is present and a period of "free access" is provided, would generate a suitable environment for a permanent social gathering area for youths. The concerns are that unsupervised youths could not only cause a nuisance but this could also generate the perception of an intimidating environment for residents and other users of the area for other activities. This could therefore affect the usage and profitability of the Westwoods Centre.

## **4. Littering**

The Westwoods site has already been blighted by individuals utilising the area for recreation and leaving behind significant volumes of litter. The construction of a MUGA will serve only to increase this problem unless suitable arrangements are provided and maintained, and utilisation of these facilities enforced. Broken bottles, glasses and drinks cans are incompatible with young children playing on the meadow; problems can already be identified on the KGV field which despite a much higher level of management attracts vandalism and litter around the Social Club, tennis courts and playground.

## **5. Increased Pedestrian Traffic Through Fallows Road/Alternative Access to Site.**

Any increase in pedestrian usage of the Westwoods site will have the inevitable effect of increasing pedestrian traffic through Fallows Road from the old school gates down to the path between properties onto the Westwoods car park. The majority of Fallows Road has no pavement on either side requiring pedestrians to use the road thus exposing themselves to danger from cars accessing or exiting the area. This is currently a manageable problem in Fallows Road, but an increase in footfall will precipitate the need for significant expenditure on improvements to the pavements. The potential noise and disturbance generated by groups using this thoroughfare late at night has also been raised as a concern.

The idea of alternative pedestrian access to the Westwoods from the West of the site (adjacent to the Doctor's Surgery) has been suggested, as has the reinstatement of a crossing of the River Leach at the site of the weir. The provision of this route was suggested by a representative of Northleach Junior School to enable safe direct passage of pupils to the facility along the water meadow when required. This alternative route would significantly reduce unnecessary pedestrian traffic on Fallows Road and would result in school children having to cross only one road en route to the Westwoods. The Working Party has not investigated the costs involved in making such a route available. The choice of the Westwoods site some considerable distance from the school

would be avoided if the alternative at KGV were investigated properly and found to have merit.

#### **6. Increased Car Parking Requirement For The Westwoods Site**

Events held at the Westwoods Centre increasingly generate a demand in excess of the present car parking provision. Currently Bassett Road and the top of Fallows Road are forced to provide this overflow parking to the dismay and inconvenience of the local residents. Concerns have been raised that the construction of a sporting facility will put even more strain on the parking space available. The need for additional car parking spaces would be an integral element of any proposed development of the Westwoods site. The physical capacity of the Westwoods site to accommodate the demand for the additional car parking that would be generated, and the cost are factors that have not been explored.

#### **7. Have Other Potential Uses For The Westwoods Site Been Explored?**

There is little doubt amongst residents in the Fallows/Bassett Road area that the site between the Westwoods Centre and the Doctors' Surgery need developing in some way or another for the benefit of the Northleach community. There has however been doubts raised that the construction of a MUGA at Westwoods is the most appropriate development for the area, and would conflict with the current use of the Westwoods Centre itself. No other potential uses have been explored by the MUGA Working Group, and the Town Council is under an obligation to make best use of the asset that this space represents. The very real concern is that the development of a MUGA will exclude improper consideration being given to more appropriate uses of the site, more compatible with the Westwoods centre, the Doctors' Surgery and the residents on the Westwoods Estate.

#### **8. The King George V Playing Fields alternative**

No serious consideration has been given to situating a MUGA on the KGV playing field. The presentation of alternatives at the Summer Funtastic on 23 July explored only the Westwoods site, ignoring completely the suitability of the KGV site, the assumption having been conveyed to the company's that the only available site was behind the tennis courts, and the inevitable conclusion being that the Westwoods was the only affordable site. The glaring suitability of the field in front of the Social Club having been dismissed, as the football field could not be displaced eastwards as the cricket nets would be lost. With a willingness to overcome this small matter, the obvious benefits of the KGV site being next to the school, changing rooms and a car park could be made to work in the community's favour.

#### **9. The rationale for a MUGA and its ideal location**

The questionnaire circulated to residents has produced a great deal of data, some of it confused and contradictory. However, the analysis of that data is incomplete. "*The CDC analysis does not consider the site preference of potential users*" (Cllr C Hancock). The Working Group must report to the Town Council and cannot at this stage support a decision to locate the MUGA at Westwoods site. The residents of The Westwoods Estate and Northleach are entitled to know that the right site has been chosen on rational grounds, and the Town Council have a responsibility to see that the alternative sites have been properly weighed and the benefits of each quantified. The need for a MUGA in Northleach has not yet been quantified empirically, nor the most suitable site identified. The Westwoods Estate residents are concerned that a decision made on the basis of the MUGA Working Group's deliberations to date will produce the wrong result to the detriment of the whole community.

## **Management and maintenance**

Any facility will require good management to prolong its life, to ensure that it is self sustaining in terms of running costs; can generate sufficient income to cover renewal of capital equipment, such as artificial playing surfaces and to avoid the potential for any anti-social behaviour. An indication of work involved and anticipated cost is at Appendix 11.

It is anticipated that clubs will pay for use, subsidising an element of free play, possibly provided by external providers. Electricity could be provided by means of tokens with timers. Lighting can be controlled to switch off at predetermined times to minimise any potential nuisance. The facility can be locked when not in use.

## Cost

The quotes (Appendix 12) give an indication of the likely cost of a facility for either site, based on a size of 30m x 15m. (Not all quotes are based on that size.) Westwoods could sustain a larger facility if required. There are significant additional costs involved in developing the KGV site due to lack of appropriate access, the necessity to cut and fill to create a level site out of the side of the hill and to provide lighting for the MUGA and access way.

The lowest quote is £39,766 for a 30m x 15m facility. This however anticipates siting it at Westwoods on the old tennis court tarmac, in close proximity to the surgery. The highest is £176,599, for a facility 25m x 35m at Westwoods.

## Conclusions

1. The KGV site is capable of sustaining a MUGA, but is hampered by poor access for users, in particular disabled and for emergency services. It would also hamper other activities if placed on the field itself.
2. KGV would require considerable additional infrastructure expenditure in order to provide adequate lit access and in order to provide a flat site – see quotes for comparative costs. Additional infrastructure costs would be incurred even if sited on the field.
3. KGV is not easily capable of supervision otherwise than by organised groups.
4. Owing to the slightly elevated position, KGV flood lighting would be more obvious to local residents who would look across at it rather than over it as would be the case at Westwoods.
5. KGV suffers from many of the facets listed by Sport England as indicators against choosing that location. See Appendix 10.
6. The majority of potential users would prefer the facility not to be located on KGV.
7. KGV has the advantage that a MUGA would be located close to existing sports facilities and complimentary to the area.
8. KGV has the advantage that it would allow a MUGA to be located further away from dwellings than at Westwoods.
9. Westwoods is capable of sustaining a MUGA of a greater size than on KGV if required and is easily capable of accommodating a MUGA of the size contemplated by the quotations obtained and has good access for all users and emergency services.
10. Westwoods provides a cheaper option than the KGV site as less infrastructure work is required – see quotes.
11. Westwoods is capable of easier supervision and has the advantage of proximity of changing and toilet facilities within easy reach. However, some degree of self-policing would still be required.
12. Westwoods suffers from none of the indicators listed by Sport England as detracting from it as a choice of site. See Appendix 10.
13. The majority of potential users would prefer to see a facility sited at Westwoods.
14. Westwoods is the more environmentally sensitive site but is nevertheless capable of meeting existing recommendations to deal with issues noise and floodlighting nuisance.
15. With the widest sensible mix of sports and based on the costings provided, it is concluded that such a facility could be self-financing. See Appendix 11.

## Recommendations

1. Westwoods be chosen as the preferred site.
2. Funding be sought for a MUGA to include improved car parking facilities.
3. A surface be chosen which maximises the number of sports which may be played whilst minimising the detriment from the chosen surface to each sport.
4. Suitable buffer zones to meet or exceed the 30m requirement be incorporated. See Appendix 6.
5. Lighting be downwards only flood lighting with minimum upward glow. See Appendix 6.
6. Lighting be paid for by users and switched off at 9.30 – 10pm.
7. The facility be a managed facility with opportunity for free play.
8. The Town Council seek professional advice from a company capable of preparing detailed working drawings for the purpose of any planning application, costing, project management and selecting a provider.