

Notes of meeting of FPMOS and SMBC held on 8th February 2023

Present: Peter Appleby (FPMOS), Ann Sharrock, Richard Booker (SMBC), Rebecca Nedeljkovic (SMBC), Wayne Bardsley (SMBC)

1. What is the SMBC vision/ambition for this site over the medium to long term ?

To cap as per the planning application, the PMOS is intended as an informal recreation area. When FPMOS asked if a Skate Park or Cycle track would be permitted it was stated the site was inappropriate and did not conform to the criteria for " wheeled recreation" facilities.

The planning application does not mention the presence of rubber crumb. Under the section 'Does the proposal involve any of the following? Land which is known to be contaminated'. The 'No' box is ticked. Similarly 'Land where contamination is suspected for all or part of the site', the 'No' box is ticked. 'A proposed use that would be particularly vulnerable to the presence of contamination, the 'No' box is ticked. These responses negate the need to submit an appropriate contamination assessment. The content of harmful substances in rubber crumb is a well known and much discussed topic. FPMOS would like more information on the scientific information that has informed the council's planning application and proposals.

2. Is the tender and contract for Phase 2 complete.

No, when it is it will likely be let to one of the SMBC pre selected contractors.

3. What is the scope for amendments ?

Crumb cannot be excavated from the pitch and relocated to form low lying mounds on site due to potential toxic issues.

Spoil excavated from the ditch, either the original dimensions or the extended ditch, can be relocated on site to conform with the FPMOS proposal. Edibles cannot be planted with the exception of in raised beds, there is no objection to planting fruit trees.

It is understood a further soil chemical survey will take place. The SMBC stance on the toxicity needs clarification and FPMOS request the following:

- a) Written statutory/EA documentation/sources cited on the amount of capping the rubber crumb should have for future use involving informal recreation, which will likely include football and other forms of recreation.
- b) Budgetary constraints were mentioned and £135,000 was given as the initial budget, of which £35,000 was used to remove the floodlighting. This leaves £100,000. FPMOS would like the individual costings you have outlined for works on the pitch, i.e. cost of removal of 'Astroturf', import and spread of top soil etc.

4. What is the scope of amendments to the Council planning application proposal ?

In principle SMBC will work with FPMOS to achieve a jointly agree immediate and medium term plan, once that agreement is reached SMBC do not expect to be consulted on every step of implementation by FPMOS.

5. Once the soil and grass capping is in place is the plan to put a temporary fence up to keep the public off whilst the grass takes ?

Yes

6. Are cut throughs of the existing residents/Greenbelt owned wooden fence as per the FPMOS plan supported ?

In principle yes on the proviso there is local residents agreement and consent.

Heaton Manor Residents Association have been briefed on the FPMOS plan and will write to SMBC with their comments.

SMBC informed Sport England had objected to their plan, but they believed this objection could be overcome, although possibly this could result in a delay to the intended start date for Phase 2.

In principle extending the planned ditch as per the FPMOS was possible, SMBC informed they are considering the addition of a soak away .