

From: Owen Neal <Owen.Neal@sportengland.org>
Sent: 06 December 2019 21:55
To: Grandfield, Andy <Andy.Grandfield@eastleigh.gov.uk>
Cc: 'Simon.Jones@ageasbowl.com' <Simon.Jones@ageasbowl.com>; 'Ben.Thompson@ageasbowl.com' <Ben.Thompson@ageasbowl.com>; Lee, Harry <Harry.Lee@eastleigh.gov.uk>; Robert Chambers <Robert.Chambers@ecb.co.uk>
Subject: Re: GE Hamble - Sports Provision

Dear Andy

Thank you for your further email. I think there is a slight misunderstanding as I was seeking clarification for the sake of completeness in terms of what the mitigation package would include. I accept that a lot of this is covered in the agent's mitigation strategy document and would agree that the detail of this can be addressed through a suitably worded section 106 agreement.

The main issue is that the "feasibility study" commissioned by 4Global for the works required to bring the College Playing Field up to an equivalent good standard for cricket comparable with that at Follands was not carried out by a suitably qualified person nor was it sufficiently detailed or at the required technical level to constitute a proper and robust feasibility study as set out by the ECB. My understanding is that the ECB provided detailed comments to this effect at the beginning of the year. The ECB did acknowledge that this study was sufficient to recommend that a new square construction project was required (as opposed to a renovation), but it did not provide the detailed ground conditions assessment and scheme of works needed.

Sport England would therefore consider that the requirement to carry out a feasibility study by a suitably qualified person from the ECB's list of approved contractors should be specifically included within the Section 106 agreement.

Sport England is of the view that the Playing Pitch Strategy (PPS) is getting towards the end of its life. The 2017 update was a refresh of the 2014 version. However, the PPS does support the need for additional pitch provision in the north of the borough in line with the approach we have discussed in respect of Horton Heath and the SGO.

Subject to agreeing the detailed wording of the Section 106 agreement, Sport England is content to withdraw its objection on the basis that the proposal is broadly considered to be capable of meeting our E4 exception policy. This is set out below:

'The playing field or playing fields, which would be lost as a result of the proposed development, would be replaced by a playing field or playing fields of an equivalent or better quality and of equivalent or greater quantity, in a suitable location and subject to equivalent or better management arrangements, prior to the commencement of development'.

I hope that clarifies our position.

Best wishes,

Owen