

Public Participation

**Question from Mr Michael Sprules, - Chairperson RADAR
(Residents Against Development Affecting Recreational Land)**

Statement

**Non Mitigation of Cricket Facilities due to lack of a Grampian Condition
prior to development**

Cabinet Members and attending Elected Members

As many of you will be aware, the 16th November 2011 saw the potential granting of permission, (Subject to the S106 Agreement), for the unwanted loss of the Westinghouse Sports and Recreation Ground, in favour of Housing.

During my visits to Cabinet, over the past year or so, I have tried to express my **“Concerns”** that, a decision, where **“Mitigation”** has been slanted in favour of a different sport, does not in itself constitute **“Mitigation”**, but rather **“Other Facilities”**. Moreover, Non Mitigation of the correct sport could potentially prove disastrous for the long term future of that sport.

Whilst I would wish to express my utmost gratitude to Cabinet Member for Development Control, Councillor Sturgis, for granting RADAR, and local residents, the opportunity to view and comment on a number of the Planning Conditions, prior to their Discharge, it is with a heavy heart that I wish all Cabinet Members to know that local residents have now received an update from representatives to the developer.

This update only reinforces the resolve of the developer to **“Re-Home”** the Cricket Club without first having provided the **“Much Needed Cricket Facilities”** for the Cricket Club.

As Cabinet Members will see, from the attached PDF, the representative to the developer makes it clear that **“Linden has already delivered a portion of the sports mitigation package allowing the Rugby Club to begin building their much needed new changing rooms”**. This reinforces the complete misunderstanding of **“Mitigation”** in this instance. Furthermore, the representative then goes on to state that **“Next steps include relocating the Cricket Club to their new home and allocating the rest of the financial backing for other facility improvements”**, thus reinforcing the fact that the Cricket Club will be **“Re-Homed”** prior to any **“Other Facility Improvements”** being provided !

As a result of this update from the Representatives to the Developer, I have contacted Sport England, regarding my **“Concerns”**, and I am able to confirm that Sport England are seeking clarification on a number of issues within the Section 106 and the replacement cricket facilities.