

## **Playing Pitch Strategy Response Schedule – November 2015**

The tables below set out all of the responses that were received to the consultation in relation to the draft Playing Pitch Strategy and Artificial Grass Pitch Scenario Paper. The full questions to which they relate are provided below, but not repeated for each of the respondents. A response to the comments is provided at the end of each table.

### ***The questions***

<b>Question 1</b>	Do you agree with the Vision for the draft Gloucester Playing Pitch Strategy?
<b>Question 2</b>	Do you agree with the Aims and Recommendations of the draft Gloucester Playing Pitch Strategy?
<b>Question 3</b>	Do you have any views on the sport-by-sport recommendations?
<b>Question 4</b>	Are there any other sport-specific recommendations that you think should be included?
<b>Question 5</b>	Do you have any views on the Action Plan and hierarchy of sites?
<b>Question 6</b>	Do you agree with the recommendations for specific playing pitch sites? (please identify which of the playing field sites you are referring to in your response)
<b>Question 7</b>	Do you have any views on the three scenarios for the delivery of AGPs in Gloucester?
<b>Question 8</b>	Are there any other scenarios that you think should be considered?
<b>Question 9</b>	Are there any other comments you would like to make?

## ***The responses***

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Longlevens Football Club</b>
<b>Question 1</b>	I think so (although the document is very long!!)
<b>Question 2</b>	Yes, there is a need for increased AGP's in Gloucester.
<b>Question 3</b>	Football - Some of the data has since become out of date, for example our club, Longlevens Infants FC have increased their teams and are now struggling to fit the matches in whereas the report shows we have spare capacity?
<b>Question 4</b>	It would be good if the use of AGP's for clubs is free or heavily subsidised as there is no money in the clubs!!!!
<b>Question 5</b>	Traditionally the adult section of clubs has the louder voice!! Beware that if the youth sections are not heard then the adult teams of the future may not exist!!!! Do not assume that clubs liaise closely. Adult sections nearly always are the key consideration in clubs.
<b>Question 6</b>	No, Longlevens Infant School does not have spare capacity due to an increase in participation.
<b>Question 7</b>	There needs to be more AGP's - simple! These to be available for all clubs to use for training and matches in the event of poor weather or over capacity.
<b>Question 8</b>	No comment.
<b>Question 9</b>	No comment.
<b>Steering Group response</b>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Overall, the response supports the outcome of the PPS in that there is need for more Artificial Grass Pitches in Gloucester.</p> <p>With regard to the survey information, it is important to note that they represent a snapshot in time. Assessment data supporting the Strategy was collated within the relevant 2014/2015 sport season. The PPS, once adopted, will be subject to regular monitoring and review (at least annually) by the Council and the proposed 'Delivery Group'. This will ensure that the supply and demand information is as up to date as possible and allow for circumstances such as those identified in this response to be factored in.</p> <p>With regard to communication within different sections of clubs, this has been noted by the National Governing Bodies (NGBs) and Active Gloucestershire and efforts will be made to address this through their day-to-day work.</p> <p>Addition text added at Part 3 to communicate this more clearly.</p>

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Chris Ansermoz</b>
<b>Question 1</b>	No comment.
<b>Question 2</b>	No comment.
<b>Question 3</b>	Football - greater AGP provision - junior & mini football.
<b>Question 4</b>	No comment.
<b>Question 5</b>	No comment.
<b>Question 6</b>	King George V - AGP provision which could be utilised by Hucclecote Youth FC & the rugby club as well as Dinglewell school. Improve facilities at the location - clubhouse/changing rooms/parking.
<b>Question 7</b>	See above - scope to consider pitch at King George?
<b>Question 8</b>	Provision at King George V for both football, rugby and the school.
<b>Question 9</b>	No comment.
<b>Steering Group response</b>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Overall, the response supports the outcome of the PPS in that there is need for more Artificial Grass Pitches in Gloucester.</p> <p>With regard to King George V playing field, the Assessment Report has shown this to be operating at capacity when considering its important function in providing for both the sporting needs (rugby, football and cricket all played) and open space needs of the local community. A small section of the playing field that isn't marked out with pitches at present is regularly used as a training or warm up area. It is considered that the PPS Action Plan (site entry 36) represents the most appropriate priorities for the location at this time.</p> <p>No change.</p>

Respondent	KC
Question 1	No comment.
Question 2	No comment.
Question 3	No comment.
Question 4	No comment.
Question 5	No comment.
Question 6	No comment.
Question 7	No comment.
Question 8	No comment.
Question 9	<p>It's quite clear that the City has neglected its responsibility towards all sports except rugby over the last 20 years. I don't care what anybody says, but the lack of proactive assistance given to GCAFC since the floods in 2007 is an embarrassment. You stick rugby posts up in fields though.....! What is anybody meant to do with them? Anybody that is interested in rugby are involved with the notoriously seedy private clubs. They don't go in playing fields to kick a rugby ball about! Waste of money. Sport could be massive in Gloucester but its inhibited by serious lack of facilities and investment. I can only welcome this report which has obviously been forced on this council and hope that it addresses the huge problems Gloucester faces in this area. One other highlight of the report was that more people play football than rugby, something that is obvious to many and yet actively dismissed by the people trying to promote Gloucester as a rugby city. It could be a great City for all sports, but if you continue on your blinkered, pretentious path, we've got no hope! 3000 days and counting for a level 2 football club in a city of 150,000 people in the greater suburban area. Disgrace.</p>
Steering Group response	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>The role of the PPS is to ensure there is adequate provision for all pitch-based sports in the City between 2015 and 2025, based on an understanding of how people in and around Gloucester play all pitch sports. The PPS sets out a framework for how sports pitches and facilities can be improved and provided so as to provide for this.</p> <p>No change.</p>

Respondent	Julia Hurrell
Question 1	Mostly. The overall strategy appears to be limited by sports which are currently played. I think it is important to ensure that all playing pitches could have multiple uses. The city needs to ensure there is capacity to encourage other sports to be played such as lacrosse, American football and even sports aimed at older people like walking football. The vision appears to be comprehensive for what happens now but lacking in sport development opportunities.
Question 2	Yes so long as the strategy can be flexible to meet needs of other sports.
Question 3	A wider range of sports bodies should be consulted to see if other sports could be attracted to the city with the right facilities.
Question 4	The university has proposed using the Debenhams sports field for lacrosse, which is not included in the recommendations.
Question 5	Plock court will always be a problem site, too wet in winter and rock hard and cracked in summer. This area is part of the natural flood plain for the river Severn and should not be tampered with, despite the need to improve the playing surfaces of pitches located on it. There is no comment on the effect of the infrastructure, ecology or wildlife of improving this area.
Question 6	I believe the Debenhams Sports field should be retained for sport use. Ideally, it should be returned to being a cricket pitch in summer and a football pitch (to the side of the outfield) for winter. This arrangement has worked well for many years. The infrastructure is already available and a newly developed pavilion would provide excellent changing rooms and toilet facilities. If the access from the bottom onto Plock Court was improved, then the playing fields at that end of Plock Court could also use the pavilion. Plock court would make an ideal location for other sports such as frisbee or disc golf, as well as having an outdoor gym set up. This would be of real advantage for team who train there, providing for more activities than just training on the actual pitch.
Question 7	No comment.
Question 8	No comment.
Question 9	I think this is a missed opportunity to review options for other sports, which may not be played at the moment, but which could add to the range of sports available for the future. The other issue that does not appear to be covered is access, public transport and parking. It is essential to ensure that all pitches have good access and parking. This makes them more useable and so worth investing in.
Steering Group response	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Whilst the PPS focuses on the pitch sports that are primarily played in and around the City, it does also consider the needs of other more 'peripheral' sports such as American Football and Lacrosse. It is a fair comment however that this is not communicated as well as it could be in the PPS itself, featuring instead more heavily in the associated Assessment Report.</p> <p>In addition, it is important to note that the PPS has addressed the needs for the different sports where there is a proven demand for them. Where this is not the case, it would not be appropriate to make specific provision in the PPS. However, the PPS is to be reviewed on a regular basis and if, at the time, demand was identified and PPS will be amended accordingly.</p> <p>With regard to the Debenhams Playing Field, it should be noted that the Assessment Report and PPS identifies it as 'disused'. This is where a site has previously accommodated playing pitches but they are no longer available for formal or informal sports. The PPS Action Plan makes clear that the City Council should work with the University as landowner to establish the best options for the provision of pitches and that if the pitches were to be lost on this site, adequate provision should be re-provided elsewhere.</p> <p>Additional text added to Part 1 of the PPS to explain how the more 'peripheral' sports have been considered and how the PPS makes allowances for them.</p>

Respondent	Alan Stanfield
Question 1	This does not include recognition of the needs of those in their third age I.e. Those who are retired or no longer in full time employment for playing tennis, walking football etc. They need facilities usually during weekdays and usually within a short walk of main bus routes.
Question 2	This does not include recognition of the needs of those in their third age I.e. Those who are retired or no longer in full time employment for playing tennis, walking football etc. They need facilities usually during weekdays and usually within a short walk of main bus routes.
Question 3	This does not include recognition of the needs of those in their third age I.e. Those who are retired or no longer in full time employment for playing tennis, walking football etc. They need facilities usually during weekdays and usually within a short walk of main bus routes.
Question 4	No comment.
Question 5	There is insufficient detail on how engagement with primary schools will be achieved.
Question 6	No comment.
Question 7	No comment.
Question 8	No comment.
Question 9	No comment.
Steering Group response	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>The PPS takes into account the use of playing pitches and ancillary facilities for formal sport, training and casual use. Quantifying demand for informal use of playing pitches is often difficult but where identified it is factored in or referenced but it does not form part of Sport England's Playing Pitch Strategy guidance. The National Governing Bodies will take a lead on this as and when relevant.</p> <p>With regard to primary schools, it is intended that there will appropriate representative on the PPS 'Delivery Group', but at the time of writing this has yet to be established. However, Active Gloucestershire, an organisation that has close links with Gloucestershire schools and their representatives, will be represented on this group.</p> <p>No change.</p>

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Abbeymead Rovers / Stuart Langworthy</b>
<b>Question 1</b>	Generally, yes. At Abbeymead Rovers we do not have enough pitches of sufficient quality. The pitches we do have are generally on public open space and are over used significantly.
<b>Question 2</b>	There is a need for more good quality grass pitches with good changing facilities and also affordable artificial pitches.
<b>Question 3</b>	Some of the adult 11 a side pitches are really not good enough. The changing facilities are often poor. At Abbeymead Rovers we have 4 11 a side pitches in need of serious maintenance urgently. At Windfall Way there is little or no grass. Just weed. It is a mud bath after rain. The brambles behind the one goal cost us a fortune in punctures. At heron park the pitch was over used and is now lacking grass. Glevum way gets unplayable on one side where water runs off a bank. The clock tower has very long grass on one side and gravel on the other side.
<b>Question 4</b>	Improving changing facilities. Making more affordable all weather pitches.
<b>Question 5</b>	I think I have included this. More purpose built sports pitches and changing facilities needed.
<b>Question 6</b>	I have mentioned this above. We also need two new changing rooms to be built above the existing ones at Abbeydale Community Centre.
<b>Question 7</b>	So long as they are affordable.
<b>Question 8</b>	No comment.
<b>Question 9</b>	No comment.
<b>Steering Group response</b>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>The comments support the overall conclusions of the PPS in that some grass pitches are overused, changing facilities are at times poor, and there is a need for more Artificial Grass Pitches.</p> <p>No change.</p>

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Winget Bowls Club / Mrs Gerry Hartin</b>
<b>Question 1</b>	No comment.
<b>Question 2</b>	No comment.
<b>Question 3</b>	No comment.
<b>Question 4</b>	No comment.
<b>Question 5</b>	No comment.
<b>Question 6</b>	No comment.
<b>Question 7</b>	No comment.
<b>Question 8</b>	No comment.
<b>Question 9</b>	<p>Having seen the article in the Citizen a few weeks ago regarding the above and also being secretary and player in Winget Bowls Club I thought I would look at the full assessment on the gloucester.gov.uk website. Firstly I would like to say that when I and other members of Winget Bowls Club read the summary in the Citizen we were rather surprised to see that our green (at Tuffley Park) was the only standard one when all the others were rated good - our green has always been known as one of the best in the city. But then I read the actual assessment on page 85 and this rates the Tuffley Park green as standard and the Glos Pk green as standard (in the bowls fraternity, this would seem the most likely rating). On getting to the Summary on page 89, this is obviously where the Citizen got its quote and facts from. We admit that our changing facilities are somewhat Dickensian but the green is always good. It would be sad indeed if prospective players have read that summary and decided against looking at our club for a venue. Shame on you Knight Kavanagh and Page and GCC for not being more diligent in producing a correct and non-conflicting document and shame on the Citizen for being willing to publish it. I challenge you to come along to our bowling green, we would welcome you and show you around though in the winter months it is not looking its best but nevertheless it still looks darned good!</p>
<b>Steering Group response</b>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>The respondent has identified a discrepancy in the quality assessment for Winget Bowls Club which differs between page 85 and 89 of the Assessment Report.</p> <p>The bowls summary on page 89 of the Assessment Report has been amended so as to correct this error and can confirm that the correct quality rating has been included within the PPS Action Plan. A comment has also been added within the Action Plan to reflect the need for an updated clubhouse facility.</p> <p>The confusion appears to have arisen between our independent non-technical assessment of the green which assessed it as good quality and the club view of the green. On receipt of a survey from the Club it indicated that several aspects of the green's quality were only acceptable (standard) quality rather than good so the overall score was altered to reflect the views of the Club. Apologies for the misinterpretation.</p>



<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Natural England / Mr Tom Amos</b>
<b>Question 1</b>	No comment.
<b>Question 2</b>	No comment.
<b>Question 3</b>	No comment.
<b>Question 4</b>	No comment.
<b>Question 5</b>	No comment.
<b>Question 6</b>	No comment.
<b>Question 7</b>	No comment.
<b>Question 8</b>	No comment.
<b>Question 9</b>	Natural England is a non-departmental public body. Our statutory purpose is to ensure that the natural environment is conserved, enhanced, and managed for the benefit of present and future generations, thereby contributing to sustainable development. Natural England does not consider that this consultation poses any likely risk or opportunity in relation to our statutory purpose, and so does not wish to comment on this consultation. The lack of comment from Natural England should not be interpreted as a statement that there are no impacts on the natural environment. Other bodies and individuals may wish to make comments that might help the Local Planning Authority (LPA) to fully take account of any environmental risks and opportunities relating to this document. If you disagree with our assessment of this proposal as low risk, or should the proposal be amended in a way which significantly affects its impact on the natural environment, then in accordance with Section 4 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006, please consult Natural England again.
<b>Steering Group response</b>	Comments noted.  No change.

Respondent	Redrow Homes – Planning Prospects / Jason Tait
Question 1	No comment.
Question 2	No comment.
Question 3	No comment.
Question 4	No comment.
Question 5	No comment.
Question 6	No comment.
Question 7	No comment.
Question 8	No comment.
Question 9	<p>Thank you for your recent correspondence inviting comments to the draft Gloucester Playing Pitch Strategy. This response is on behalf of Redrow Homes who are the landowners of the former Gloucester Civil Service Sports Club on Denmark Road. The Playing Pitch Strategy correctly identifies that the former Civil Service Sports Club is no longer an active Sports facility. The Draft Strategy refers to lapsed and disused sites and the requirement for any future development to offer like for like mitigation for the loss of the sports facilities. Whilst the provision of playing pitches within the City is important, a more pragmatic approach to the reinstatement of disused sites is needed, especially where development on part of a site may facilitate or enable re-instatement or enhancement of a facility which is currently redundant. Like for like replacement facilities may not be the most appropriate solution, given that sports needs have changed since the Civil Service Sports Club was last in use. For example, the evidence base behind this strategy suggests that there is a shortfall of 3G pitches in the City. Such facilities were never provided on this site. The re-development of redundant sites (in part with enhanced facilities or including off site provision or financial contributions) could provide the opportunity to introduce alternative pitches and sports provisions which are in high demand in the City, which were not previously provided for. This would assist in the delivery of playing pitches which closely match the future needs of the City and enable redundant sites to be appropriately developed in accordance with the Development Plan.</p>
Steering Group response	<p>NPPF paragraph 74 states that existing open space, sports and recreational buildings and land, including playing fields, should not be built on unless:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An assessment has been undertaken which has clearly shown the open space, buildings or land to be surplus to requirements; or</li> <li>• The loss resulting from the proposed development would be replaced by equivalent or better provision in terms of quantity and quality in a suitable location; or</li> <li>• The development is for alternative sports and recreational provision, the needs for which clearly outweigh the loss.</li> </ul> <p>The PPS Assessment shows that all currently used playing field sites require protection or replacement and therefore cannot be deemed surplus to requirements because of shortfalls now and in the future. Lapsed, disused underused and poor quality sites should also be protected from development or replaced as there is a requirement for playing field land to accommodate more pitches to meet the identified shortfalls.</p> <p>No change.</p>

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Jane Ramsell</b>
<b>Question 1</b>	No comment.
<b>Question 2</b>	No comment.
<b>Question 3</b>	No comment.
<b>Question 4</b>	No comment.
<b>Question 5</b>	No comment.
<b>Question 6</b>	No comment.
<b>Question 7</b>	No comment.
<b>Question 8</b>	No comment.
<b>Question 9</b>	I see that a report on the sports facilities in Gloucester is currently out for consultation and whilst I have not yet had time to read and digest the detail, I note with some concern that you seem to be including a number of areas which have for various reasons been decommissioned much against local wishes for example Debenhams field which I understand is under consultation for development by the university although it should be used for cricket amongst other activities. Given this anomaly how can your strategy be approved if your baseline is incorrect.
<b>Steering Group response</b>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>As part of the PPS, Debenhams Sports Ground is identified as 'disused'. This is where a site has previously accommodated playing pitches but they are no longer available for formal or informal sports. Whilst the site is included in the study therefore, it is not on the basis that it forms part of the supply of sports pitches in the City at this time.</p> <p>The PPS Action Plan makes clear that the City Council should work with the University as landowner to establish the best options for the provision of pitches and that if the pitches were to be lost on this site, adequate provision should be re-provided elsewhere.</p> <p>No change.</p>

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Severnvale School / Louise Kingscott</b>
<b>Question 1</b>	No comment.
<b>Question 2</b>	No comment.
<b>Question 3</b>	No comment.
<b>Question 4</b>	No comment.
<b>Question 5</b>	No comment.
<b>Question 6</b>	No comment.
<b>Question 7</b>	No comment.
<b>Question 8</b>	No comment.
<b>Question 9</b>	Following last week's meeting and subsequent discussion at school level, Severn Vale would like to present the following view with regards to the proposed scenarios. Our preferred option for all the proposed scenarios would be to retain our Sand AGP with a surface upgrade.
<b>Steering Group response</b>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>The retention of the sand AGP at Severnvale School, with a surface upgrade, has been identified in the Artificial Grass Pitch Strategy.</p>

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>St Peter's Catholic High School</b>
<b>Question 1</b>	High quality and readily accessible (location, availability, affordability) infrastructure is essential for sustainable development of sport in Gloucester. Whilst the vision aspires to provide this, we would welcome recognition, and therefore the inclusion of some amended wording, of the need for a high quality schools' sports program both in curriculum and extra-curricular sport. This is essential given that; 2 of the sites in the strategy are school-based i.e. SPHS and Severn Vale; Sports participation in schools provides the inspiration to students who ultimately become future community-based paying customers and in effect the key stakeholder group.
<b>Question 2</b>	Yes we agree with the aims of the Strategy. The concern is there is no mention of the development of facilities in schools. Every child in Gloucester attends school and therefore any facility development should be based around schools to meet high-quality core curriculum needs as well as those of the community.
<b>Question 3</b>	Most school sport takes place on inadequate grass pitches which have to support curriculum as well as school sports' fixtures. Schools therefore face similar problems to sports clubs. At St. Peter's High School (SPHS) it is currently impossible to open up the use of our grass pitches without considerable investment / improvement. We think that the proposal of a central equipment bank by the school's grounds-man is very positive.
<b>Question 4</b>	All sports-specific recommendations link to local clubs. There is no mention of how these recommendations will improve / develop school sport in Gloucester.
<b>Question 5</b>	We believe that schools should be considered as actual/potential hub sites. We would suggest that St. Peter's High School is already a hub site for the south of the City with sporting, changing, meeting, parking and catering facilities already available. Facility investment must also be accessible during the school day for curriculum use.
<b>Question 6</b>	We are concerned about how the recommendations would impact upon our current facility hire / future development of business. St. Peter's could lose a considerable income stream to the Blackbridge site from football hire. Furthermore there is no firm commitment from Gloucester Hockey for use of the St. Peter's facilities, even if the sand-dressed AWP pitch was simply upgraded.
<b>Question 7</b>	Ultimately individual sites will wish to meet their own priority needs e.g. St. Peter's require facilities fit for purpose for the delivery of the PE curriculum and extra-curricular sport. That said making facilities available for community hire provides much needed income streams to enable the provision of such facilities. In this respect it is critical to ensuring sustainability of all facilities that there are guaranteed income streams from different clubs/organisations. Achieving this will only be possible if there is holistic service delivery model that negates commercial competition between different providers. This will ensure that the finite demand for different sporting needs is met and that each provider is not competing for the same customer base. Please note that West Bromwich Albion is not a "stakeholder" in St. Peter's High School but hires the facilities like any other customer. In this respect we would gratefully ask for this inaccuracy to be corrected in the Strategy Paper. We strongly recommend that the facilities provision in Gloucester is driven by the current/future demand for each sport and that a holistic approach can only be achieved if duplicate adjacent facilities are avoided (such that each site becomes a specialist provider for a different sport(s)). This will strengthen business cases for capital funding because the revenue sustainability of each facility will be more secure / viable. The obvious strategy for achieving this is a clear understanding of current/future demand (including curriculum demand) for each sport and dedicated facilities at different sites that do not compete for the same finite customer base in what is a relatively small catchment area. Ignoring this will make facilities unsustainable and in 10 years' time sinking funds will once again be insufficient. Access to professional help in bid-writing for funding will be essential. We believe the following facilities would meet curriculum and community needs: Upgrade of current sand-dressed pitch (for football / hockey); Replacement of current grass-pitched rugby pitch with a new AWP rugby-compliant playing surface priority use for Rugby Union/Rugby league.
<b>Question 8</b>	St. Peter's High School should be considered as a hub site including upgraded/new facilities as described in the response to question 7; Upgraded sand dressed pitch for Hockey; IRB Rugby compliant AWP for Rugby Union/Rugby League. Could a partnership/ access agreement between local schools and clubs please be considered?
<b>Question 9</b>	The strategy makes no mention of the impact upon school sport. Demand during weekdays is at schools. The proposed hub sites are not located at schools. AGPs are not accessible to school sport. SPHS is grateful for the opportunity to contribute its views on the strategy.

<b>Steering Group response</b>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>The adequacy and development of sports facilities for curriculum use lies outside the role of the PPS. Indeed, Sport England's Playing Pitch Strategy guidance does not focus on the adequacy of sports facilities for curriculum use, instead relating to that for the local community.</p> <p>Funding opportunities for provision of new facilities, or upgraded to existing, for curriculum use would not be provided by either Sport England or the National Governing Bodies; this is provided through the Education Authority. However there is a link where facilities at schools are made available for community use outside of school operating hours and the PPS addresses this.</p> <p>However, there are links within the PPS, in that it acknowledges that a large number of sporting facilities are located at education sites. Recommendation C of the PPS is to 'Maximise community use of outdoor sports facilities where there is a need to do so', and sets out that, '...in order to maximise community use of educational facilities it is recommended to establish a more coherent, structured relationship with schools'. It is intended this will be addressed through the PPS 'Delivery Group'.</p> <p>Comments regarding the school's relationship with West Bromwich Albion noted - amendment made to correct that West Bromwich Albion 'hires' the AGP rather than being a 'stakeholder'.</p>
--------------------------------	---

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Gloucester City Football Club</b>
<b>Question 1</b>	No comment.
<b>Question 2</b>	No comment.
<b>Question 3</b>	No comment.
<b>Question 4</b>	No comment.
<b>Question 5</b>	No comment.
<b>Question 6</b>	No comment.
<b>Question 7</b>	No comment.
<b>Question 8</b>	No comment.
<b>Question 9</b>	<p>Gloucester City Football Club (GCFC) support the draft Playing Pitch Strategy (PPS) and offer the following comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GCFC will not be progressing with an artificial 3G pitch as part of their stadium redevelopment plans. This is primarily due to changes to funding requirements introduced by FIFA and the FA. I note that you have picked this point up already and the draft PPS will be amended accordingly.</li> <li>• GCFC fully support the ongoing work relating to the southern 'sporting hub' at Blackbridge and they have been fully involved with this important initiative since its initial gestation. GCFC are also reassured that the Waterwells suggestion is no longer an option being pursued.</li> <li>• GCFC think it would be helpful if the draft PPS included policies/provisions which are tied to the emerging JCS and the City Local Plan with particular reference to CIL funding requirements and/or S106. In this way, there is a better opportunity (as part of the approved development plan) to secure funding from the large scale strategic developments on the edge of the City.</li> <li>• GFCF are interested to establish whether the draft PPS (once approved) will form part of the Development Plan for the area.</li> </ul>
<b>Steering Group response</b>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>As presented in the PPS, the strategy will form a key piece of evidence that will inform the Council's emerging development plan and act as an important material consideration in the assessment of planning applications.</p> <p>The Artificial Grass Pitch (AGP) Scenario Paper has now been reworked as the AGP Strategy. Gloucester City AFC is no longer identified as a potential location for 3G pitch provision.</p>

Respondent	MY:UK
Question 1	No comment.
Question 2	No comment.
Question 3	No comment.
Question 4	No comment.
Question 5	No comment.
Question 6	No comment.
Question 7	No comment.
Question 8	No comment.
Question 9	<p>I am writing to you on behalf of MY:UK regarding the development of a sport and recreational facility in Barton and Tredworth which is underpinned by the desire to empower, inspire and regenerate the community it serves. The project prides itself on the greater good for all, whereby each user recognises their potential and has the opportunity to access pathways that typically they may of been disadvantaged from.</p> <p>MY:UK over the past four years have fostered sporting partnerships with the city's major Football, Rugby and Cricket clubs, facilitating their community coaching teams into hard to reach groups and working together to tackle inequalities in sport and the ability for grassroots to access sporting facilities. MY:UK have, and are, engaging with over 300 young people in Barton and Tredworth, providing a weekly timetable of sport and physical activity that contributes to the development of individuals and groups as well as communities as a whole.</p> <p>It is with this vision and desire to make a difference in mind, that it welcomes and supports the City Councils 'Playing Pitch Strategy.' We appreciate the need to keep all provisions in line with the Sport England criteria, considering throughout, how this may impact on the participation levels wider than our immediate community. Particularly concern is rooted with the lack of suitable football pitches in the ward for community or even school use. Barton and Tredworth have the lowest open green space in the county, it has no football team that plays or trains in the ward, with no youth teams from Barton represented in the Gloucester FA league. At present all of our activities take place away from the catchment area and are predominately indoors.</p> <p>MY:UK wishes to propose a scenario that sees an 'All Weather' facility in Barton and Tredworth that serves the need of it's residents and wider community, becoming a beacon of sporting opportunity, cohesion and excellence for the entire city.</p> <p>MY:UK alongside its partners and supporters; Gloucester City AFC Community Tigers, Gloucester Rugby, Active Gloucestershire and St James' School have identified a possible site which suits this community venture. The proposal is at an early stage with the strategy of having an all-weather facility at The Glebe, off Hatherley Road.</p> <p>The current grass provision is unused for majority of the year and remains largely derelict with the community or schools not making the most of this open space. The proposal hopes to offer this facility during term time to four local primary schools around the catchment area (St James Junior/Primary, Hatherley, Tredworth Junior and Al Ashraf) and for wider community use outside of school times. The facility will be managed by a community sport network and St James Primary School.</p>



	<p>MY:UK appreciate that in order for this to become a reality it must meet many planning regulations and secure funding, however at this stage it is felt that this scenario should form part of the consultation for the upcoming pitch strategy and subsequently, that the future steering group keep this proposal in mind. MY:UK look forward to its support and advice on this proposal and the potential impact in our local community.</p> <p>MY:UK are also keen to be involved in the process of the 'Playing Pitch Strategy,' to support any outcomes that may result from the consultation. MY:UK can help deliver an inclusive strategic plan including research and insight that reflects our diverse community and truly use sport to bring communities together, break down barriers and challenge hard to reach and disadvantaged communities in our city.</p>
<b>Steering Group response</b>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>The priority for the City Council, as expressed through the Playing Pitch Strategy, is that the provision of Artificial Grass Pitches (AGPs) should be strategically located so as to take into account emerging proposals and that these AGPs should be distributed to effectively service all areas of the City. The PPS further recommends that the Council adopts a tiered hierarchy of provision, including the identification of 'hub' sites. These would be strategically located, are likely to be multi-sport sites with associated facilities, and would accommodate at least 3 grass pitches and at least 1 AGP.</p> <p>With this in mind, the preferred strategy at this time is for the 3G requirements of the City to be directed to a northern and southern hub, based around proposals both at the University of Gloucestershire / Oxstalls Sports Park and Blackbridge Sports Hub, with the retention and improvement of existing sand-based pitches at both Severn Vale School and St Peters Catholic High School.</p> <p>However, it is also clear that this does not preclude proposals being developed in other locations (subject to appropriate funding and other considerations), but sets out the broad strategic context for how the City Council and National Governing Bodies consider, at this time, AGPs could be delivered within the City. The AGP Strategy, along with the PPS will be monitored over time, and if one of the priority locations is found to be undeliverable, a revised Strategy will be prepared.</p> <p>No change.</p>