

WRA response to Draft Master Plan for Mill Lane Sports and Recreation site

Master Plan component	WPC rationale	WRA response (in blue = positive; in red = negative; in black = neutral)	Recommendation
<p>Adult size artificial turf football pitch</p>	<p>None is given beyond stating that the pitch would be used for local adult clubs for matches and training.</p> <p>No pitch standard specification is stated.</p>	<p>Positive: There are no positives for the village or parish at large</p> <p>Neutral: no comments</p> <p>Negative:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The WRA Survey demonstrated that 91% of over 650 residents do not support this proposal 2) Despite the clear “decision” of the people, WPC has ignored their views 3) There is no demand for a pitch of this standard in the Winchester Council Playing Pitch Strategy 4) WPC states that the pitch is not a “Wessex League Stadium”: it is not – in all but name. It is a pitch of Wessex League standard so the “stadium” element (stands etc) could come later 5) No local team plays on a pitch requiring a boundary fence 6) Pitches requiring a boundary fence of minimum 1.83 metres (according to the FA Ground Grading specifications) are in place to prevent spectators viewing from outside the ground: hardly community friendly 7) Boundary fencing is required by teams playing in Grade H and above – i.e. Wessex League and above 8) Boundary fencing must be <i>permanent</i> if for teams playing in Grade G or above 9) Wickham Dynamos have stated that they would not afford to play on a pitch of this standard (costs too high) 10) The only rational conclusion is that WPC wants to provide a home for a club in the Wessex League OR they think that offering this standard 	<p>REJECT</p>

Master Plan component	WPC rationale	WRA response (in blue = positive; in red = negative; in black = neutral)	Recommendation
		of pitch is the only way to secure grant funding. BUT if we don't need that standard then the grant funding isn't necessary either.	
Junior 11 v 11/7 v 7 junior football pitches	None given	<p>Positive:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The WRA Survey strongly supported the provision of junior pitches (37% of respondents) 2) The Winchester Playing Pitch Strategy states that there is a shortage of such pitches in the area 3) It is understood that there is high demand from genuinely local junior football clubs which are expanding and increasing demand. 4) This could be an artificial turf pitch of the spec proposed for the adult pitch ensuring greater all-weather use: grants would be available to support this facility 5) No boundary fence 6) Will not detract from the MUGA at Wickham Primary school which is of much smaller dimensions 7) Floodlighting (if acceptable to SDNP) would be an advantage 8) Excellent facility for our young people <p>Neutral: none Negative: none</p>	SUPPORT this proposal AND REPLACE THE PROPOSED ADULT PITCH WITH A SECOND JUNIOR PITCH
Multi-sports pitch		<p>Positive:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Presumably for netball, basketball etc 2) Supported by residents in the WRA survey (33% of respondents) 3) 21% of residents in the survey specifically mentioned they would like to see netball and basketball provision <p>Neutral: none Negative: none</p>	SUPPORT
Bowling Green		<p>Positive:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) supported by residents in WRA survey (26%) 	SUPPORT subject to direct

Master Plan component	WPC rationale	WRA response (in blue = positive; in red = negative; in black = neutral)	Recommendation
		<p>2) not included in the original Need Assessment commissioned by WPC but heartening to see that the recommendation of WRA to include it at Mill Lane has been taken up</p> <p>Neutral: None</p> <p>Negative:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Winchester Playing Pitch Strategy stated that bowls provision in the area is already sufficient. 2) No evidence presented from local bowls clubs or players to support the proposal 3) Will need adequate professional greens management: that is expensive and so a business case needs to be built to be convincing 	<p>engagement with local bowls clubs (e.g. Wickham Indoor Bowls) and potential new users that demand is sufficient</p>
Cricket Nets		<p>Positive:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) 19% of respondents supported cricket in the WRA survey 2) Not identified in the WPC commissioned Need Assessment but identified by WRA Survey 3) there is no provision of quality net practice pitches within the village 4) there is no provision for junior cricket in the village and is not provided by the local team 5) there is an ideal youth catchment (boys and girls) in the village who have no obvious introduction to the national summer game 6) ideal for outdoor practice sessions by Wickham CC (subject to them confirming interest) 7) brings cricket to within walking distance of the village <p>Neutral: None</p> <p>Negative:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) grants are probably available but proper coaching will need to be provided and expensed 	<p>SUPPORT AND propose that some of the ground freed up by the replacement of the adult football pitch with a second junior football pitch is given over to junior cricket match play (all weather wicket)</p>

Master Plan component	WPC rationale	WRA response (in blue = positive; in red = negative; in black = neutral)	Recommendation
		<p>2) there will have to be some safety provision to prevent injury to other users of the site. Perhaps some form of safety netting?</p> <p>3) sadly there is no provision for junior match cricket on the site.</p>	
All weather fitness/gym equipment		<p>Positive:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1) good use of space and may encourage more adult fitness 2) frequently seen in urban parks <p>Neutral: None</p> <p>Negative:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1) only supported by 3% of respondents in the WRA survey 2) use may be minimal 	WRA is neutral on this element
Running route		<p>Positive:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1) fitness trail supported by 42% of respondents to the WRA survey 2) suggested addition: instead of a designated area for gym equipment consider spacing the gym equipment at intervals along the running route (many serious trainers prefer to do “interval” training” interspersing running with exercises on static equipment) 3) positioning gym equipment along the route will free up space on the site for other activities <p>Neutral: none</p> <p>Negative: none</p>	SUPPORT with request to reconsider siting of gym equipment
Recreation/picnic area		<p>Positive:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1) 8% of respondents to the WRA survey preferred to see the site left as open space 2) WRA concluded that had the survey not specifically pointed to sporting options for the site that the percentage suggesting “do nothing” would have been even higher 3) provision for non-organised/official sporting uses is important and so the space proposed is supported 	SUPPORT but seek provision for walking routes

Master Plan component	WPC rationale	WRA response (in blue = positive; in red = negative; in black = neutral)	Recommendation
		<p>4) provision of hedgerow planting/native species is supported</p> <p>Neutral: none</p> <p>Negative:</p> <p>1) there is no provision for walking/woodland/open space</p>	
Missing from Masterplan			
Tennis/pickle ball		<p>Positive: none. There is no provision for tennis on the Mill Lane site.</p> <p>Neutral: it could be argued that demand is insufficiently high, but no evidence is provided for that by WPC. Note: the results of the survey conducted by Wickham Community Tennis Club are not known but should be taken into consideration.</p> <p>Negative:</p> <p>1) the Fieldform Need Assessment commissioned by WPC recommended provision of on-court and off-court facilities for tennis</p> <p>2) the WRA survey supported these recommendations: 20% of residents</p> <p>3) the current and increasing demand for variations of tennis (e.g. pickle ball) among all age groups, young and old, would not be provided for under the current Masterplan proposals</p> <p>4) the current facilities in Wickham Recreation ground will be subject to possible loss when the lease of the recreation ground expires in 40 years' time</p>	QUESTION why there is no tennis provision despite the recommendations of the Need Assessment

FOOTNOTE. WRA, in addition to the comments in the table, is concerned about the following about which residents are encouraged to ASK FOR ANSWERS:

- 1) why is it necessary to allow such a short time for consultation?
- 2) why has WPC changed the nature of the consultation Forum from what they promised (i.e. a steering group of local representatives to guide what is put on the site)?

- 3) the claim that the proposal does not include a Wessex League “stadium”. WPC must believe that the fact that the proposal does not include “stands” (at least in the initial proposal) does not mean that they cannot be added later. In all other respects the proposals fit a Wessex League team’s requirements. Agreeing to the proposals as they stand open the possibility that such changes might be made in future in support of a non-local team. Does WPC deny that this is a possibility? Does WPC think that residents do not suspect, from all that has gone before, that this is in fact their aim?
- 4) safety of pedestrian access at the busy surgery/Community Centre access
- 5) safety of a vehicle access half-way up Mill Lane
- 6) unsuitability of Mill Lane for increased vehicle movements
- 7) the nature, structure and terms of reference of the Forum. These are completely different from the format proposed to WRA by Councillors. Why is that?
- 8) will WPC commit to change the masterplan if residents want it changed?
- 9) does WPC put the apparent need to raise funds for the facilities being placed higher than the needs of residents?
- 10) does WPC not agree that as there is no need support for a Wessex standard adult football pitch among residents that finance cannot be found for the other solutions favoured by residents?