

Report to	Chippenham Area Board
Date of Meeting	7 th January 2013
Title of Report	Skatepark Project Report

Purpose of Report

To ask Councillors to approve the following recommendations from the Chippenham Skatepark Task Group:

- The addition of 2 new volunteers to the Task Group
- The Public Protection Team to carry out a review of the design criterion
- The Task Group commission a second noise assessment of the area near to The Olympiad Leisure Centre from another independent noise expert
- The Task Group engage specialists to create a design for a Skatepark near The Olympiad Leisure Centre that will mitigate against noise
- The Task Group to include CCTV in the project brief

1. Background

- 1.1. Young people in the community area have been actively campaigning for a new Skatepark since the removal of the previous facility in 2001.
- 1.2. Chippenham Community Area has the largest population of the 18 Community Areas within Wiltshire Council but despite this, is one of the few towns without a Skatepark.
- 1.3. The provision of a Skatepark in Chippenham is a priority in the Community Plan.
- 1.4. The Task Group is cogniscent of the negative history with the previous steel constructed facility installed in Monkton Park by North Wiltshire District Council.
- 1.5. Following the formation of the Skatepark Task Group in November 2010, approximately 20 sites were considered on land owned by Wiltshire Council, land owned by Chippenham Town Council and land in private ownership.
- 1.6. The Task Group found most unsuitable for a variety of reason e.g. Risk of flooding, landowner declined permission, too remote, overhead cables etc
- 1.7. An indoor facility has been considered and in the opinion of the Task Group should not be pursued instead of an outdoor facility. Ideally the group would wish to see both indoor and outdoor options in Chippenham as is the case in other areas. The group does not view an outdoor facility as in conflict with an indoor offer, it is viewed as complementary.
- 1.8. Indoor Skateparks require ongoing running costs for resources, heating, lighting, maintenance and qualified staff. There is no identified budget for this.
- 1.9. Indoor Skateparks will inevitably exclude some users unable to afford entrance fees.
- 1.10. The Task group is focussing on an outdoor facility which it is confident will provide:
 - a) Free access to everyone wishing to use it
 - b) A key facility for a large number of young people
 - c) Encourage healthy outdoor physical activity
 - d) It would help to move skaters (skaters, scooters etc) away from public car parks and other public sites thereby reducing conflict with other members of the public
 - e) A well designed park of concrete construction can enhance a public area as well as providing a resource for those involved in the sport. It would provide a focus for skaters that presently skate in/on areas for which they are not designed.
 - f) A well designed and sited Skatepark provides a safe place for young people to go, meet with others of a similar interest. It helps foster a sense of identity, culturally, geographically and personally
 - g) A well designed facility will enable the space to continue to be used for other occasional events and activities
 - h) Concrete Skateparks offer designers the opportunity of engineering the facility into the landscape. Bunding that flows with the contours of the facility can create an aesthetically pleasing public space and something that people can be proud of

- i) It helps to create a positive relationship with and between young people contributing to local social capital and social cohesion. It contributes to a sense of self worth by recognising and responding to the needs of young people
- j) It can have economic benefits for the town centre as users are likely to purchase refreshments in the town, and parents may be encouraged to shop in town whilst their children play
- k) It contributes to a reduction in anti-social behaviour by focussing energy and attention into a more productive and rewarding outlet
- Young people of Chippenham have actively campaigned for the facility. Responding to their request would encourage their engagement and participation in developing their community.
- m) It would contribute to a reduction in travel to other towns to access appropriate facilities.
- 1.11. At the Area Board meeting on 9th January 2012 the Area Board agreed to support the following recommendations made by the Skatepark Task Group:
 - a. Chippenham Skatepark Task Group to formally ask Chippenham Town Council to consider whether they have any objections to a public consultation exercise to install a concrete construction Skatepark in Monkton Park.
 - b. Consultation to include a public meeting specifically for residents adjacent to the proposed site and consultation with the wider community area.
 - c. Acoustic guidance from the Public Protection Team will be followed and a comprehensive noise impact assessment will be commissioned
- 1.12. Chippenham Town Council Amenities Committee formally responded following their meeting on 14th March 2012 to confirm the following: <u>Recommendation</u> that: The Head of Service Delivery responds to Chippenham Area Board via the Skatepark Task Group, confirming that Chippenham Town Council has no objection to a public consultation exercise being undertaken to install a concrete construction Skatepark in Monkton Park.
- 1.13. The initial phase of consultation began with an article in the "Talk of the Town "newsletter published by Chippenham Town Council and an on line survey: https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/ChippenhamSkateparkSurvey Residents have been invited to indicate whether they support the proposed site of River Island.
- 1.14. Noise Assessment was commissioned from an independent company MACH Acoustics. Guidance and advice from Senior Officers in the Public Protection team was followed.
- 1.15. At the request of the Task Group, the Noise assessment has been scrutinised by Senior Officers in the Public Protection Team. The existing noise report lacks clarity. A clearer report has therefore been requested, to solely assess the River Island site which, in the professional opinion of Public Protection, will not adversely impact on residential amenity."
- 1.16. The Chairman of the Task Group and a Senior Public Protection Officer met with a

local resident at his request to address concerns raised. The resident did not accept reassurance that the proposed site of River Island would not have an adverse impact upon amenity or cause statutory nuisance.

- 1.17. The Task Group is confident that the guidance received from Professional Officers in the Public Protection Team & Independent Acoustics experts is accurate.
- 1.18. The Task Group agreed that in view of the past history with the Monkton Park site, a final further Noise Survey would be commissioned at No. 40 Sadlers Mead. It was felt that this would illustrate the efforts of the Task Group to be open and transparent and would reinforce earlier findings.
- 1.19. The Task Group agreed that response to queries must be proportionate and no further exceptions should be made. Any subsequent queries should be addressed through the Planning process.
- 1.20. As part of the consultation, a survey was carried out via "Survey Monkey" on line and an article in the Town Council "Talk of the Town" Newsletter:

On line responses	Postal	Total
727	285	1012

Support	Did not support	Did not state
628	376*	8

- a) Many of those who did not support the proposed site suggested instead sites that had been considered by the Task Group e.g. Monkton Park near to the Olympiad Leisure Centre, Stanley Park, Westmead.
- b) A large proportion of those who did not support the site were attendees of the Folk Festival.
- c) *It should be noted that a significant number of those who did not support the site do not live locally. As not everyone provided their address, exact numbers are not available.
- 1.21. A public consultation meeting was hosted by the Task Group on Monday 26th November. The purpose of the meeting was to:
 - a) To give an overview of the work of the Task Group
 - b) Presentation of noise assessments results
 - c) Present the results of the survey/consultation
 - d) Have experts available to answer questions
 - e) Provide reassurance about proposed site
 - f) Provide potential design options to enhance the area and enable the space to continue to be used for other activities on occasion (e.g. Folk Festival)

- g) Discuss concerns
- h) Provide an opportunity to hear all views; those who support the site and those who do not
- i) Provide an opportunity for young people to comment
- j) To outline the next phase

A summary of the meeting is available and can be found at Appendix 1.

- 1.22. As the summary of the meeting shows, attendees at the meeting urged the Task Group to reconsider siting the Skatepark in the main body of Monkton Park near to The Olympiad Leisure Centre.
- 1.23. As the summary of the meeting shows, attendees at the meeting urged the Task Group to review the design criterion.

Background documents used in the preparation of this Report

- Minutes of Chippenham Area Board meeting 9th January 2012
- Chippenham Town Council Amenities Committee minutes 14th March 2012
- Summary of Public Consultation meeting 26th November 2012

2. Main Considerations

- 2.1 The Task Group is of the opinion that the site in the main body of Monkton Park near to The Olympiad Leisure Centre is suitable for the following reasons:
 - a) It is central
 - b) It is a safe widely used park environment
 - c) Informal supervision (i.e. people using the park) will limit opportunities for anti-social behaviour
 - d) It is situated adjacent to a leisure centre (The Olympiad) which is entirely appropriate for an outdoor sporting facility
 - e) It is situated close to the town centre which may well bring economic benefits to local shops in the High Street
 - f) Monkton Park has frequent patrols by the Neighbourhood Police Team and the Team is now based in Monkton Park offices
 - g) Local young people engaging with the Youth Development Service have expressed preference for Monkton Park
 - h) Young people of Chippenham have actively campaigned for the facility. Responding to their request would encourage their engagement and participation in developing their community.
 - i) Chippenham Children's and Youth Parliament has indicated they support this location
 - j) It has been assessed as a suitable and preferred site by 3 independent contractors
 - k) Informal consultation at the River Festival identified Monkton Park as the preferred option with members of the public from a very wide age range
 - I) The Ombudsman report did not conclude that Monkton Park should not be the site for a future Skatepark. The Ombudsman stipulated that a redesign was required.
 - m) A new redesigned Skatepark will be of concrete construction and will reduce noise

- levels significantly and mitigate against noise issues that were a problem with the previous steel construction Skatepark installed by NWDC
- n) Good access to the site for emergency services and construction crew
- 2.2 The Task Group is aware that there are various potential plans for Monkton Park currently under consideration by Cherish Chippenham, Chippenham Vision Board and Chippenham Campus Development Team. The Task Group has therefore asked each of these stakeholders for a position statement regarding the proposal to install a Skatepark in Monkton Park near to The Olympiad Leisure Centre. These statements can be found at Appendices 2, 3 and 4.

3. Task Group Recommendations

Ref. 3.1	Anthony Milner Local resident, businessman and ex skater Former member of the National Committee of Skatesmart
	Dick Stanger Local resident and volunteer Years of experience working with young people

3.1.1 Appoint Anthony Milner and Dick Stanger to the Skatepark Task Group

- 3.1.2 Two volunteers have approached the Task Group and expressed an interest in joining the group.
- 3.1.3 The Task Group is of the opinion that both volunteers have skills and experience that will be of benefit to the project.

Ref. 3.2	Carry out a review of the design criterion
-------------	--

3.2.1 The Public Protection Team to carry out a review of the design criterion.

- 3.2.2 The Task Group note that the noise assessments of Skatepark facilities is not stipulated in policy or in law.
- 3.2.3 Attendees at the public meeting specifically requested the Task Group review the design criterion
- 3.2.4 The Task Group is of the opinion that it is appropriate to review the design criterion to establish whether it is reasonable and relevant

Ref. 3.3	Commission a second noise assessment of the area near to The Olympiad Leisure Centre from another independent expert
-------------	--

3.3.1 The Task Group commission a second noise assessment of the area near to The Olympiad Leisure Centre from another independent noise expert

3.3.2 The Task Group is of the opinion that it is appropriate to commission a second independent noise assessment to address any remaining concerns.

Ref. Engage specialists to create a design for a Skatepark near The Olympiad Leisure Centre that will mitigate against noise
--

3.4.1 The Task Group engage specialists to create a design for a Skatepark near The Olympiad Leisure Centre that will mitigate against noise

3.4.2 The Task Group is of the opinion that it would be helpful to have some specific designs created to illustrate how a facility can be designed to mitigate against noise

Ref. 3.5	CCTV to be included in the project brief
-------------	--

3.5.1 The Task Group to include CCTV in the project brief

3.5.2 The Task Group is of the opinion that the addition of CCTV will help to address concerns about anti social behaviour

Appendices:	Appendix 1 – Summary of Public Consultation meeting 26 th November 2012 Appendix 2 – Position statement form Cherish Chippenham Appendix 3 – Position Statement from Chippenham Campus Development Team Appendix 4 – Position Statement from Chippenham Vision Board

No unpublished documents have been relied upon in the preparation of this report.

Report Author	Chippenham Skatepark Task Group
---------------	---------------------------------