



## Sports Review – Minutes

Meeting at 9.30 a.m. Friday 22<sup>nd</sup> April 2016 in the Mayor's Parlour, Town Hall, Tenterden.

### **Present:**

TTC: Cllr Mike Carter (**MC**), Cllr Roy Isworth (**RI**).

TLC: Chris Cheesman (**CC**) & Victoria Crosbie. (**CK**)

Homewood School: Mark Seymour (**MS**).

Sport Tenterden : Graham Smith (**GS**)

Ashford Borough Council: Cllr Paul Clokie (Chair) (**PC**) & Simon Harris (**SH**)

KCC: Chris Metherell (**CM**)

In attendance: Town Clerk, Phil Burgess (**PB**) (Minute taker).

### **1. Apologies for absence.**

TTC: Cllr Roy Isworth (arrived later) and Cllr Alan Sugden

ABC: Ben Moyle, Len Mayatt, Cllr Mike Bennett. Mark Cartt has now retired.

KCC: Cllr Mike Hill, Jo Vos

Tenterden FC. Stuart Saunders

TLC: Craig King

Homewood School: Ian Kirkland

### **2. Appointment of New Members.** None.

### **3. Minutes of the last meeting.** Agreed.

### **4. Matters Arising from the minutes.** All issues covered later in the minutes.

### **5. Appledore Rd site – A report by Graham Smith**

TGMS had carried out a feasibility survey including soil and levels on the plot funded by the town council. Costings for both fields (page 21 of the TGMS report) were £194,000 exclusive of VAT if options 1 and 3 were to be taken up. (option 2 is a less extensive treatment of Field A and does not include drainage. Option 2 will not be adopted as Field A could be unplayable after heavy rain. The other options included full drainage.

Some levelling of the area needs to be undertaken to comply with Sport England requirements. The levels have been superimposed on plan so that the engineers can work on it and plan the drainage etc. **CM** advised that because of clay soil the field should not be

too flat so as not to attract standing water. **GS** agreed but the undulations need to be corrected. The application of sand will also break down the effects of clay.

An approach had been received from Kestrels Gymnastics who have been looking for premises for some time. They have 260 members at TLC at moment and are at maximum capacity. They have 180 on the waiting list at present and are likely to expand their membership to nearly 700 over the next 5 years. **GS** met with Gary Crawford and British Gymnastics who are very keen on improved facilities. This does not necessarily come with extra funding from British Gymnastics but will considerably help the case with Sport England if it has their backing.

Plans were shown with a new larger building to the south east corner of the site near the cadet hut. The requirements of the gymnasts would include an area, which would need to be permanently set up to avoid dismantling and re-assembly. They also have a requirement for a 10m high ceiling in the trampoline area (6m elsewhere). Internal plans were also shown. In total the new proposed building is 25 x 35 metres. Some of these factors could be mitigated, by sinking part of the building below ground level and it would not be higher than the tree line.

**MS** advised that Homewood school was excited about the Appledore Rd project but had concerns about the much larger building if the gym facilities were included.

Cllr Carter entered the room at this point.

The building costs excluding the gym facilities would be £700,000. All costs including pitches and larger building were £3,188,000

Cllr Isworth entered the room at this point.

**PC** asked that proper costings be obtained for all elements and consideration should be given to the gymnastics facility going elsewhere.

**GS** stated that the lack of facilities for football was particularly pressing as they had not been able to use the front area of the recreation ground over winter. This was causing promising players to look elsewhere.

## **5. 3G pitch at Homewood – A report from Mark Seymour**

Additional information has been circulated in the form of a feasibility study. This includes the expected Income and Expenditure for the first years. A sinking fund for carpet replacement must be retained. Homewood School has engaged in pre-planning advice with ABC and the proximity to residential properties on Silver Hill may stop the development. The existing Red Gra site might be considered (100m x 60m)– but would be slightly smaller. **CM** advised that a full size pitch would attract more funding – more options with the pitch give an increased funding potential. **PC** asked if the pitch could go elsewhere on the site. **MS** replied that a different site would make access for public more difficult. **GS** said that a minimum of 100m length would be preferable. A smaller pitch would, of course, be less expensive (£420 instead of high £500 thousands)

The two issues with regard to the proximity to residential properties were the light pollution and the noise (and foul language). **SH** advised that the noise was normally the cause of most complaints. **CM** advised that floodlights should ideally be 50m away from residences. To mitigate these situations an acoustic fence could be used and floodlighting could be variable output (most matches do not require full 250 lux and training sessions could be carried out at 100 lux). In addition the floodlights could be mounted on retractable posts, which again are not always required at full height, and lights can be directional. Modelling this facility could reduce local opposition. The residents would need to be consulted but it was agreed that this was best done once more information regarding a reduction in light and noise nuisance could be obtained and demonstrated.

The option to place the 3G pitch elsewhere was rejected by **MS** as the school is keen to have it on their site and the Appledore development is conditional on this.

Ben Moyle had made comments on the feasibility study and these should be referred back to the report's authors. *PB to forward e-mail to Mark Seymour.*

**CC** asked if the ABC playing fields strategy was complete. **SH** replied that the draft should be available next month.

**RI** enquired whether the site the other side of the old railway line had been considered. **GS** stated that the site was originally rejected as the access costs were prohibitive (around £800,000). **MC** felt this would be worthwhile long term as it would open up many opportunities.

Cllr Isworth, Mark Seymour and Simon Harris left the meeting at this point

**6. TLC Update –** A report from Chris Cheesman (copy of report also circulated)

The squash court had been removed and gym extended at the end of last year. Further gym facilities will be needed with the anticipated growth in population and that facility will be built to the south of the current entrance and the existing gym will be used as a clip and climb facility. Soft play facilities will also be added. These plans were instigated as a result of the needs identified within the Max Associates Sports Review.

TLC is currently evaluating the likely income derived from new facilities. A funding gap exists (see report) but a capital injection from a funder at the outset would remove the need in full or part for payment of the interest included in the costing. An alternative method of funding would be to arrange this through a public body such as the Town or Borough Council. These organisations have access to reasonable interest rates through the Public Works Loan Board. This facility may not be available to outside organisations but could be investigated.

Some of the funding from TENT1 Section 106 and the resultant developer contributions from the Tilden Gill development (either CIL or section 106) could be diverted to these projects.

Victoria Crosbie left the meeting at this point.

**7. Recreation Ground Reordering -** A report from Phil Burgess

The sub-committee had considered some uninspiring designs for the recreation ground and had later been advised that the project should be community rather than design-led. This would result in the maximisation of funding and better public support for the finished product.

The council would be seeking tenders very shortly from contractors who offered a full package from the consultation stage through funding, design and construction.

**8. AOB.** None

**9. Date of Next Meeting** TBA when the Silver Hill consultation had been undertaken.