

Community Infrastructure Levy: Gosport Draft Charging Schedule

Statement on Issues and Questions

Question 13: *Can the Infrastructure Delivery Plan be regarded as sound when it does not include all of the recommendations for sport identified in the Playing Pitches and Sport Facilities Assessment?*

Date: 23rd February 2015



GOSPORT
Borough Council

1 Introduction

- 1.1 The Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Draft Charging Schedule (Submission Library CIL-1) and the Gosport Borough Local Plan 2011-2029 (GBLP) (CIL-14) is supported by various evidence studies which relate to infrastructure provision and the need for further infrastructure associated with new development. The Infrastructure Assessment Report (CIL8) provides an analysis of the current infrastructure in the Borough and identifies future requirements where known as a result of proposed growth over the Plan period.
- 1.2 The Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) (CIL -9) itself provides a more focussed assessment of proposed infrastructure and what infrastructure has been delivered during the Plan period to date (CIL - 9). Infrastructure included in the IDP is considered to be important in delivering the proposed objectives of the GBLP including the identified regeneration areas and other development allocations.
- 1.3 The proposals in the IDP include basically two categories:
 - Those where an infrastructure provider have set out intended infrastructure provision in a public document; or
 - Those known infrastructure requirements which are required to develop a development allocation identified in the emerging Local Plan. These would normally be set out in the relevant policy.
- 1.4 The IDP sets out details of how, when and where the necessary infrastructure is to be provided and by who. In some instances the IDP does include certain types of infrastructure where the Council has identified in broad principle that there is a need to provide that type of infrastructure but where specific details are not yet known. This would include allotments and indeed the provision of the small scale open space improvements.
- 1.5 Proposals that would not necessarily be required as part of a major development or where there is no known provider are not included in this report. The document is linked to the Infrastructure Assessment Report (IAR) (CIL -8) which summarises the infrastructure issues and identified needs in the Borough including those identified in the 2014 Planning Pitch and Sports Facility Assessment.
- 1.6 The IAR states (para 1.18) that the IDP is a live document and that it will be regularly updated and will form part of the Council's AMR. Consequently as new schemes emerge proposals can be included in the IDP.

2.0 Recommendations of the Playing Pitch and Sports Facilities Assessment

2.1 The Playing Pitch and Sports Facility Assessment 2014 (PPSFA) can be viewed in the Local Plan Submission Library (LP/E9/3). It has been prepared by independent consultants, Strategic Leisure, for the Council. It has been produced to provide evidence for the GBLP and associated infrastructure documents which support the CIL evidence in order to:

- analyse and assess the current level and quality of indoor sports and outdoor pitch provision in the Borough;
- identify levels of demand for pitches and identify any surplus or deficit;
- provide strategic options and recommendations for future pitch and indoor sports provision in the Borough.

2.2 As highlighted above the IDP includes those schemes that currently have some certainty of being delivered not aspirational requirements, or indeed management issues or justification to protect existing provision. Consequently for reasons set out in this response it is not considered appropriate to include all the recommendations of the PPSFA in the IDP. Instead the recommendations are included in other Council documents for potential action.

2.3 It is also important to recognise that the Draft Regulation 123 List (CIL2) has the flexibility for any of the projects that arise from the PPSFA to be funded from CIL if the Council was minded to do so. The priorities for using the funds accumulated through CIL will be set out in a protocol which will be produced by the Council.

2.4 The list of each recommendation identified in the PPSFA and a corresponding Council comment is included in Appendix 1 and demonstrates that only those recommendations that are appropriate are included in the IDP.

3.0 Conclusion

3.1 It is considered that the IDP is a sound piece of evidence which includes the latest information on those requirements that are required as part of a major development or where there is a firm commitment by the infrastructure provider to deliver it. The document is a 'living' document and will be updated annually as part of the Annual Monitoring Report process. It is supported by the Infrastructure Assessment Report which provides an analysis of infrastructure issues in the Borough.

APPENDIX 1: Recommendations contained in the Playing Pitch and Sports Facility Assessment 2014 (Strategic Leisure) with GBC's comment on whether it is appropriate to include it in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan

Recommendation F1: *Maintain and protect the unsecured community use pitches that exist currently [as] football pitches for future community use including the Civil Service Sports Ground, MOD sites and school and college sites, this will allow for the expansion of the new Gosport, Fareham and Solent League*

- 1 GBC Comment: This recommendation is not about securing new infrastructure but maintaining existing infrastructure in the form of sports pitches. It is clear from the GBLP that these sites are indeed being protected.

Recommendation F2: *Ensure that 10% of Council owned pitches are rested on a regular basis.*

- 2 GBC Comment: This is a management issue of how the Council uses its pitches rather than an item in the IDP.

Recommendation F3: *The quality of Stokes Bay pitches need to be improved, including increasing the carrying capacity of the pitches and providing much needed changing facilities. Improvements at Privett Park may be considered a priority to enhance the quality of facilities at this site. This could be carried out by use of Developer Contributions.*

- 3 GBC Comment: The Council recognises that the quality of Stokes Bay pitches is an issue and this is acknowledged in Table 8.4 of the Infrastructure Assessment Report and in the Open Space Monitoring Report (OSMR) (Table 2) (LP/E9/1) as well as the Suggested Improvements in the Alverstoke Ward Profile of that document. It is important to recognise that many funded projects from developer contributions have arisen from being identified in the OSMR of which the Stokes Bay site could be one in the future. Indeed the potential for other small scale schemes related to sports pitches, other outdoor sports and children play facilities are identified in the IDP (p22), which will be ongoing throughout the Plan period.

- 4 The Council currently has no plans to invest significantly in the Stokes Bay pitches and that other sports pitch priorities have been identified, and consequently it would be inappropriate to show this specifically in the IDP. As previously mentioned the IDP is a 'living' document and could be updated at a later date to include this provision. What is important is that the recommendation has been taken up in the IAR and particularly the OSMR and therefore remains as a potential improvement scheme.

- 5 The Council is currently considering proposals to create a health-focussed park at Privett Park and it is likely that this proposal which includes the potential for improved pavilion provision would be on a future iteration of the IDP in the near future (2015). Similarly it is identified in the IAR and OSMR.

Recommendation F4: *Developer contributions off-site could refurbish changing rooms to accommodate male and female and improve drainage at some Council sites in the future*

- 6 GBC Comment: Similar to previous comments, such improvements have been identified in the OSMR for various sites and would come under the category 'other small-scale schemes' identified in the IDP on an on-going basis. No specific schemes are currently identified by the Borough Council (nor funding available) and consequently it is not appropriate to mention specific schemes in the IDP.

Recommendation C1: *Existing Cricket pitches should be protected by Planning Policy and the cricket pitch at the Civil Service Sports ground should be retained due to its quality and brought back into use.*

- 7 GBC Comment: This recommendation is not about securing new infrastructure but maintaining existing infrastructure in the form of sports pitches. It is clear from the GBLP that these sites are indeed being protected.

Recommendation C2: *The Rowner Field cricket outfield requires drainage improvements. Off-site developer contributions would assist in rectifying this issue.*

- 8 GBC Comment: This is a similar issue to the Stokes Bay football issues. The improvement of drainage has been identified as a suggested scheme in the OSMR.

Recommendation C3: *Developer contributions should be used to refurbish Privett Park Pavilion.*

- 9 GBC Comment: See F3 above.

Recommendation R1: *There is a future requirement in 2021 for 2 additional junior rugby pitches. Developer contributions could help Gosport and Fareham Rugby Club improve the quality of its pitches by providing drainage and levelling or discussions could be held with Bay House School on the development of its two rugby pitches for future use to meet demands of Gosport and Fareham Rugby Club.*

- 10 GBC Comment: This is a largely a management issue of existing provision and the potential to use pitches controlled by a school. It also provides evidence of the potential need to retain other pitches in the Borough such as the Brockhurst Gate site (also known as the Civil Service Sports Ground). It is not considered appropriate in the IDP as it is not yet clear how this would be delivered.

Recommendation H1: *There will be a future requirement for an additional Sand Based AGP for hockey as the Hockey Club develops this is envisaged to be beyond 2021.*

- 11 GBC Comment: This is identified in the IAR and Table 2 of the OSMR. As with previous comments there is no known provider or funder of this project at this stage and consequently not appropriate to be included in the IDP. This would be included at a later date if a scheme progressed.

Recommendation H2: *Off-site developer contributions would assist in replacing the current St Vincent's AGP carpet in the future.*

- 12 GBC Comment: This could be included as a small scale scheme as highlighted in the IDP and does not need to be included specifically in the IDP.

Recommendation AGP1: *The demand modelling identifies a need for 2.65 pitches in 2013 and 2.65 pitches in 2021.*

- 13 GBC Comment: One pitch has recently been provided at Bridgemary School (since the completion of the PPSFA and 2014 version of the IDP). This will be shown as being completed in the next iteration of the IDP.

- 14 It is not currently known where additional facilities will be provided and consequently it is not appropriate to include in the IDP. However it is accepted that this will need to be added to a future iteration of the OSMR and IAR (less the provision provided at Bridgemary.)

Recommendation AGP2: *There is currently a sand dressed artificial grass pitch at St Vincent's College which is used for hockey and football. Bridgemary School will be providing a 3rd generation artificial pitch in Gosport*

- 15 GBC Comment: Bridgemary School now has a 3rd generation pitch and this was identified in the IDP (p22) as being under construction; as mentioned above will be shown as being completed in the next iteration of the IDP.

Recommendation AGP3: *Where possible the Council should support the replacement / refurbishment of the St Vincent's College carpet on the sand dressed ATP.*

16 GBC Comment: See Recommendation H2

Recommendation AGP4. *Additional AGP sand based would help meet future demands on hockey which will be required beyond 2021.*

17 GBC Comment: See Recommendation H1

Recommendation T1: *Retain the current provision of tennis courts and work with key partners, the Lawn Tennis Association and Gosport clubs to maintain quality and improve access for potential new participants*

18 GBC Comment: These are largely management of assets and sport development issues and not appropriate for the IDP. Such open spaces are being protected in the emerging Local Plan.

Recommendation T2: *Ensure Gosport Council owned public courts have appropriate fencing, quality nets and posts – all weather nets where appropriate, markings are clear and surfaces are clean and free of debris.*

19 GBC Comment: This is largely a management issue and not appropriate for the IDP. Small scale projects can be funded on an on-going basis

Recommendation T3: *Gosport Council to encourage tennis clubs in the development of club facilities and courts to increase participation and quality of facilities.*

20 GBC Comment: This is a sports development issue not relevant for the IDP.