

Reserved Matters application pursuant to outline application APP/10/00828/ (and WCC 10/02862/OUT) and approval of conditions 6 (i) a), b), c), and d), and conditions 3, 6 (ii) a), b), e), f), i) o), 7, 10 and 11, for approval of landscape detail and access for the town park and layout and appearance of the park and multiple sports area.

Dear Kayleigh,

Thank you for reconsulting Sport England on the above reserved matters application. We welcome the agent's response and the submission of the ball strike risk assessment report.

Sport England has consulted the ECB as the governing body for cricket.

Sport England and the ECB have some concerns about the clarity of the report and the inconsistency in places. The report is not clear about the location and heights of the ball stop solution. Specifically, the diagram on pages 2 and 12 is not clear about the location; length and heights of the mitigation with some of the annotation is missing. The table above states that a 10m solution is recommended on the eastern orientation. However, this is different to the diagram below on Pages 2 and 12 which seems to recommend a more staggered approach with varying heights.

While the ECB is not opposed to the proposed junior/senior split of the wickets, how will this be managed with no active cricket club on site?

We would not support the installation of ball stop netting/fencing in front of the proposed pavilion.

Can the report clarify that even with the recommended ball stop mitigation in place a senior/junior cricket split of the wickets is still required?

Also, it is understood that Hampshire Cricket Board recently visited the site. There are concerns that the fine-turf outfield and square are not being maintained and, are deteriorating. Can the applicant please advise further on this and the current site management plan?

I look forward to hearing from you.

Best wishes,

Owen Neal (MRTPI)

Planning Manager (Hampshire; Surrey; Wiltshire/Swindon)