**Present**

Dai Lewis Russell Bailey

Sharon Glyde Charlie Brain

Darren Meir Richard Thomas

Christine Smith Elwyn Roberts

Rhian Roberts Elizabeth Wills

Nick Colmsee Abigail Phillips

Andy Newton

John Bennett

Vanessa Adams

**Apologies**

Dave Chapman Paul Greest

Paul Teddar Karen Visser

It was noted that no-one from the community council was able to attend the meeting.

**Minutes**

* AP gave a brief background to the project
  + Tennis courts require resurfacing
  + Not enough people active in tennis court for maintenance and running costs of the tennis courts (even if money was awarded to refurbish courts)
  + Proposal to increase use by making multi - games area
  + Proposal taken to community council, questionnaires and community engagement over last 2 years.
  + EOI for grant accepted – potentially £125,000 which would require match funding of 20%
  + Notts Sports recommended and subsequently asked to provide a specification – for discussion tonight.
* John Bennett from Notts Sports, provided an outline of his company and the services they provide:
  + over 40 projects in South Wales
  + specialists in design, advice and supply of synthetic surface systems for sport
  + Leicestershire based but work across the UK and internationally
  + Company established for over 30 years
  + John has 15 years’ experience in the industry
  + John has provided AP with references of sites where the project has been managed by Notts Sports, which can be circulated.
  + Notts Sports will draw up final specification, put this out to tender and oversee capital works
* ER expressed disappointment that he was not informed of previous meetings and that no one had been to see him personally - he stated that this was the first time he had heard of the proposals. VA apologised for this and explained that a lot of work had been undertaken over the past two years to ensure as many people knew about the proposals as possible. Flyers advertising previous meetings had been given to the postman to distribute to all households as well as posts displayed in the village shop etc. VA said every effort would be made going forward to keep nearby residents informed.

Actions:

1. AP to circulate local sites managed by Notts sports which have the Notts sports surface proposed for PsE.
2. VA to add attendees to email distribution list for the MUGA project

**Preparatory works required on-site**

JB outlined his assessment of preparatory worth that would be required prior to development commencing:

* **P**reparation of existing surface would be required because the courts are showing signs of root damage – potentially remove 3m of existing surface at far end from Church Hall and level out. Also works needed to reinstate other areas of the tarmac, such as around the existing tennis posts sockets.
* It is proposed barriers are used to stop root damage - using a membrane rather than concrete.
* NA confirmed that a tree surgeon has looked at the tree by the corner of the courts and stated the inserting a root barrier would not harm tree and that its roots do not spread very wide.
* Options for stumps around the courts were discussed – leave and insert a barrier, or remove, drill out roots and apply root killer to ensure there would be no subsidence as the roots decompose.
* Surface would be cleaned moss killer applied
* Holes will be drilled into existing tarmac and filled with small stone to ensure drainage.
* New perimeter kerb would be installed (replacing the existing brick edging).
* New layer Tarmac applied
* Grass astro laid on top
* Notts sports will come back and inspect for life of project (during and on completion of project)
* JB confirmed contingency plan/costs are in contract to manage any on-site problems arising from the contract. This is currently 5% of the contract value though could be increased if preferred.

**Specification**

The following was discussed with regards to the specification:

Area

* New MUGA will cover the existing area with recessed goals at either end and also to the small sided football pitch across the pitch width (refer to drawings)

Surface

* AP confirmed with JB not to include a shock absorber layer (currently detailed in the proposal). Shock pad slows ball down in tennis, surface still more forgiving than tarmac. JB Confirmed that the shock pad layer will be removed from the spec.
* Proposed surface short green astro with sand infill. This is ‘Notts Sward’ sand filled synthetic carpet
* JB suggested some lines can permanently in laid by cutting into the carpet. This can cause a weakness so would only be cut for some of the main sports - proposed for tennis and football. Remaining lines would be painted on. Require re-painting every 12 months – not a specialist job, could be done locally. Any markings that were painted on could be left to fade in the future if it was found that the facility was not being used for these sports. Equally markings for other different sports could still be painted on in the future as required.
* Surface is not frost susceptible. Only weather which causes problems is snow. If there is snow on court do not move as this will also move the sand. Leave to melt.
* Special shoes not required but studs will cause damage.

Fencing

* Fence reinforced and fixed with sound dampener (will not completely stop noise)
* 3m high – bottom 1.2 m rebound panel for 5 a side usage, top 1.8m wider mesh.
* Proposed colour is green (can be any colour).

Flood lighting

* Specification as currently stands, is to integrate the floodlighting on 6 Nr raised height fence 8m high fence columns with 12 luminaries. Columns would be a galvanised grey which is recommended colour to blend into the sky.
* Proposed specification is to fix lights to fence.
* Floodlights can be operated independently so that only half pitch is illuminated if required.
* Lighting 120 lux – not as bright as LTA standard but sufficient for casual play.
* Glow with white rather than yellow light (halide metal lights)
* could be timed to suitable cut off time and operated via pre-paid tokens.

A number of people expressed concern about addition of floodlighting to the village. Questions were raised as to whether the project needed to include floodlighting or whether would be used sufficiently without floodlighting. Key issues included:

* Proposed site is a conservation area;
* Beauty of living in a rural area is the lack of light and ability to see stars, enjoy darkness;
* Would impact negatively on overlooking properties;
* Would bring undesirables into the village from outside, potentially leading to more crime and vandalism in the village.

The following points summarise the resulting discussion:

* AP explained that floodlighting has been part of consultation process and most people felt that they would use the facility more if it was available year-round. She has also had discussions with environmental health at the Vale of Glamorgan Council who confirmed they would be happy to look at and comment on any light spill diagrams in relation the the impact of the floodlights on residential amenity.
* Requirements for grants is to be able to demonstrate significant increased use which, without floodlights, would be much more difficult;
* AP had discussed issue with Sports Wales, and had met them on-site in the village with other members of the design team. They advised the project would not be successful for the Capital Development grant without inclusion of floodlights. In their view it would’t be able to demonstrate a sufficient increase in participation of sports without them;
* ER said he had also discussed the project with Sport Wales who had given a different view and advised project would be viable without floodlights;
* CB also considered it essential to provide year round facilities so that the use of the MUGA would be sufficient to be able to cover maintenance costs. Floodlights would enable the tennis club to operate a year round training facility and football training could re-locate from fairwater to the village - both of which would attract significant revenue to help cover the maintenance costs. Estimated maintenance costs are in the region of £5,000.
* It was confirmed that there would be a specified cut of time for floodlights. The community questionnaire had confirmed that a time of 9pm was acceptable to those completing the questionnaire. Further discussions can be had with residents before this is confirmed. The Vale Local Planning Authority is also likely to place conditions on any potential permission. There would also be scope to move the cut off time earlier, different cut off times on different nights and to constantly review the cut off time and alter as appropriate to the requests and needs of the community.
* It was confirmed tokens would be required to operate the floodlights for a set period of time. This would avoid the area being lit when not in use, cover cost of electricity and prevent nuisance switching on and off. It is proposed that tokens would be available to buy from the village shop and pubs (if in agreement) – which should have the benefit of increasing trade.
* DE confirmed that there is no requirement for a bat survey and that impact would be minimal on surrounding ecology. He would like to discuss proposals for how the project could enhance wildlife in the area.
* Use of landscape buffers were discussed to decrease the visual impact of the floodlights on surrounding residential properties. DE agreed to look at this as part of the planning application.
* Other types of floodlighting than those in draft specification were discussed:
  + Lowering the height of the floodlights, although it was noted that this would increase light spill. The higher the lights, the more directly they shine on the MUGA. But they may be less visually intrusive when not in operation if they are lower.
  + Telescopic lights – these automatically raise when switched on, problem of visibility remains when extended (and thus on). If telescopic the lights would be on a column separate to the fence (fixed flights would be attached to the fence). Also these are likely to represent a significant increase in cost.
  + Lowering proposed height of floodlights – which would produce greater area of light spill but may be less obtrusive for surrounding residents.

Power supply

* Specification does not include running power to courts for flood lights. RB explained proposal was to run power from main supply rather than from village hall (existing supply to tennis clubhouse).
* CS advised to contact Western power distribution now to estimate cost of providing power as this can be very expensive and needs to be accounted for in the project costing.

Concerns were also raised re:

* Noise pollution: it is proposal would seek to minimise noise through restricting times of floodlight/booking times, providing dampeners on fencing and not to include a lower board area to reduce noise from five a side ‘rebound’. The mesh fence design incorporates a rebound panel which performs the same rebound function but without the noise impact of a ball striking a timber board. The mesh rebound panel also enables the whole area to be viewed from the outside.
* Parking: there was already a concern about the amount of traffic on market days, and when away teams visit for football games. The two village pubs may offer use of their car parks for ‘overspill’ It is hoped that in return this would increase pub trade. Potential use of part of field for temporary parking was discussed but was not considered preferable and may also be outside terms of use for the community field.

Actions:

1. JB to remove shockpad surface from the spec
2. JB to provide details of floodlights and 3D diagram of lights in local setting
3. JB to provide alternative option of lower lights to compare light spill
4. JB to provide costs and details of telescopic lights including maintenance costs
5. CC to contact Western Power re electricity supply
6. DE to consult with neighbouring residents to assess visual impacts from their properties and undertake assessment on visual impact on conservation area
7. DE to look at options for landscape buffers in the playing field
8. CC to undertake pre application consultation before final planning application submitted.
9. CC to ask pubs about use of car parks
10. CC to check status of temporary parking in part of the fields

**Access road/path**

* Path was originally proposed by Community Council following village consultation.
* Path will need to be minimum of 3.5m wide and lit to provide safe access and access for disabled people.
* Proposed path to run from main entrance to community field directly to tennis courts but taking into account area designated for football and spectators.
* Potential to run electricity supply under path.
* Would be ideal to run extension of path from courts around the perimeter of fence to gate to adjoining field and onto playground. This could be the section path which is lit so that lights can be adjacent to the hedge, preventing problems for mowing and other activities central to the field. This would also mean that light could be shielded by the hedge.
* Solar lights will be looked into but unlikely to provide sufficient light when required.
* The tender document specifies a macadam path - but to save money could just use bound gravel (like that used on much of the Taff Trail for example)?
* Access road will be required during construction phase. This could be along line of path and form sub-base for the path which would then be narrowed on completion.
* Andy – informed meeting that steel mats are also available to provide an access road. This might be preferable to creating a temporary road.
* NA asked if the contractors would reseed or turf the access road when make good? This would need to be decided and part of the specification if required. May have cost implications.

Actions:

1. Andy – to provide further information on options and costs for metal road (see below re delays in completion).
2. JB to cost for bound gravel surface
3. CC to confirm route of path and whether it needs to wrap around the park
4. JB/CC to investigate lighting options

**Contractual arrangements and Management of Project**

* RB highlighted usually a clause included in specification detailing penalty which will apply if work takes longer than agreed. JB confirmed this is in specification.
* NA asked who would enforce penalty, would Notts sports be on site all the time, how would management of delivery work, would Notts sports check specifications met (eg of sand quality)?
* JB confirmed regular inspections, although not on site continually. Standard practice for weekly weather reports and updates. If contractors are likely to go over schedule this would be discussed at time. If weather caused delay this would not be part of penalty as long as reason submitted at the time.
* This would need to be considered and factored into costs if opting for metal road as this is normally paid for on a weekly basis
* JB confirmed it would be decision of the project team to set evaluation criteria.
* Chris concerned re contingency – usually 20% of total project cost – specification costs currently allowed for 5%. Also need to consider costs of planning and mitigation.
* The financial viability of the proposal without having to rent the area to people from outside was discussed:
* Design team have dome some initial feasibility work to determine the estimated running costs and therefore revenue required each year. Confirmed that estimated running costs are dependent on the type of surface. Additional costs included insurance, lighting, and utilities. A rough estimate with proposed surface would be that £5,000 each year would be to cover cost and raise the extra year-on-year to allow surface replacement when required (12 – 15 years).
* NA stated work to date demonstrated that it would be unlikely that funding would be available to replace facility as grants depend on demonstrating increased use thus aware scope of project needs to be within constraints of potential for annual finance.
* Currently 5 PsE junior football teams who spend approx £2,000 per year hiring astroturf pitches elsewhere. If this money, money from people in the village who hire facilities elsewhere, increased tennis memberships etc where redirected to the PsE facility and a couple of annual fundraisers where supported by the community there would be little or no need to hire to clubs outside. The success and requirement to hire to outside clubs would be dependent on the use and support of the community.
* The CC propose ‘open access’ for the majority of the time with named bookable slots. This could be managed through the village website and principally for village teams / lessons.
* Concern was expressed that a new modern facility would attracting people into village and that this would bring an increased risk of burglary and crime.

Actions

1. CS to share examples of management structure for running of facility.
2. CS to advise and warn of potential problems she has encountered in similar projects.
3. CS to advise further on specification and project management.

**Maintenance Costs**

Warranties:

* CB asked if it was possible for the warranties to be extended? JB stated warranties in the specification are standard but could amend if required. Increasing length of warranties does not usually increase price. It would be up to contractors to agree and compile with the specification we draw up.

Surface:

* Question re life of surface. JB stated Porthcawl surface has been down for 16 years although now requires replacing. Average life time of surface this 12 – 15 years.
* Drinks spilled on the surface should not damage surface.
* Maintenance required - brushing to redistribute sand & ensure ‘grass’ is upright– 1 hour once a week or once a fortnight; need to clear leaves otherwise can decompose surface.
* Moss killer may be required periodically.
* Top up sand twice within first 12 months.
* CS commented that would require a maintenance gate for sand top up. This is already included for within the specification (3m wide double leaf gate)
* JB confirmed that no large construction traffic would be required to travel to the side of the facility for sand top ups or following initial construction. Sand infill could be transported via a small dumper along the new access pathway.
* JB confirmed that no construction traffic is required for sand top ups or following initial construction.
* RB queried why sand needed to be transported long way? (expense and environmental impact). JB explained sand is a specific grade, silica sand of which there are only 2 or 3 suppliers in UK – important sand is rounded sand so not damaged by frost.

Flood lights:

* CB asked about Light bulb replacement. JB detailed that metal halide lights are normally used as less over Lspill. LED lights have longer 10 yr warranty but produce more over spill.
* Life span of bulb dependent on use. Turning on and off shortens life compared to constant use.
* Cost to replace lamp currently £400.

Storage area:

* Need to look at requirement for a storage area for tennis nets, bowls mat and cricket mat.
* Proposed to have tennis nets which are easily transported, fold into 3 rather than holes and posts. Disadvantage of holes – heavy to move which will prevent people playing tennis (especially younger and older players), present trip hazard which used for other sports.

Dividing net:

* John advised against a dividing net – easy to add later if decide required.
* Some nets have leaded line wire at bottom to give taut net but problem with running into these and causing injury. Nets without a wire at the bottom tend to blow into playing areas in wind.
* Boards can be used with sockets to fit in but these are heavy (Johns experience too heavy to use in practice) and present a tripping hazard when not in place.
* Charlie suggested permanent fence dividing courts as 2/3 space would be sufficient for men’s 5 a side and allow 1/3 for tennis or another sport. This would be an additional expense and may preclude use for children’s cricket?

Action

1. RB/CC to look at storage container possibilities and other storage options.
2. Design team to further discuss permanent division of courts.

**Meeting close**

\* Please see overleaf for summary of actions

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Circulate local sites managed by Notts sports which have the Notts sports surface proposed for PsE. | AP |
| Add meeting attendees to email distribution list for the MUGA project | VA |
| Remove shockpad surface from the spec | JB |
| JB to provide details of floodlights and 3D diagram of lights in local setting | JB |
| JB to provide alternative option of lower lights to compare light spill | JB |
| JB to provide costs and details of telescopic lights including maintenance costs | JB |
| CC to contact Western Power re electricity supply | CC |
| DE to consult with neighbouring residents to assess visual impacts from their properties and undertake assessment on visual impact on conservation area | DE |
| DE to look at options for landscape buffers in the playing field | DE |
| CC to undertake pre application consultation before final planning application submitted. ` | CC |
| CC to ask pubs about use of car parks | CC |
| CC to check status of temporary parking in part of the fields | CC |
| AN – to provide further information on options and costs for metal road | AN |
| JB to cost for bound gravel surface | JB |
| CC to confirm route of path and whether it needs to wrap around the park | CC |
| JB/CC to investigate lighting options for the path | CC |
| Share examples of management structure for running of facility. | CS |
| Advise and warn of potential problems she has encountered in similar projects | CS |
| Advise further on specification and project management. | CS |
| Look at storage container possibilities and other storage options. | CC/JB |
| Discuss permanent division of courts | Design team |