

CHAPTER 7: RECREATION AND OPEN SPACE	
QUESTION NO.	SUMMARY OF REPS
<b>QUESTION 11: Which of the site options for open space do you support or object to and why?</b>	
<p>R1: Land known as Bypass Farm, West of Cottenham Road, Histon</p> <p>Support: 48 Object: 2 Comment: 14</p>	<p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More green space for active recreation the better and necessary as population continues to grow.</li> <li>• Support if it is going to benefit residents in village.</li> <li>• Better than filling spaces with houses.</li> <li>• Support provided it is on a network of cycle routes to give good access. Cycle access essential. Another cycleway needed on north-bound carriage way of Cottenham Road. No car parking at this site to promote recreational use.</li> <li>• As the area is gradually being urbanised it will be important to have significant green spaces which are permanently protected.</li> <li>• Encouraging gentle and safe exercise has to be a good thing. Important for residents to take part in sports and recreational activities.</li> <li>• Excellent to hear Parish Councils talking about such amenities.</li> <li>• Villages must breathe and have space to exercise outdoors. Encourage creation of nature reserves, for the wild life and for the pleasure for residents.</li> <li>• The current provision of recreation ground too limited. Proven shortage in current POS position.</li> <li>• Something needed at that end of the village.</li> <li>• Failed to provide additional recreational space in this part of South Cambridgeshire despite permitting ridiculous amounts of new developments.</li> <li>• Better to walk in more 'natural' than planned areas.</li> <li>• Good location and would provide open space for the village in an area that doesn't have anything for walkers/children.</li> <li>• <b>Histon and Impington Parish Council:</b> made case for this as recreation space - chronic shortage, two previously designated areas not available and lack of alternative. Land owner willing to discuss long term lease. Working group has examined potential uses and pre-application planning advice sought to determine which of proposed changes are acceptable in planning terms. To date, clear that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Extensive need for informal recreation space.</li> <li>• Some activities not catered for which have support to be provided.</li> <li>• Other uses still being considered:</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

	<p>Highways advice obtained from Cambridgeshire County Council officers and no objections to access to site, uncontrolled pedestrian/cycle crossing from walkway/cycleway on B1049 and, possibly, lay-by for north bound bus-stop.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Histon and Impington Village Action Group:</b> We want to retain our open spaces so that we don't lose our rural feel and to make sure we have enough parks and outdoor places for the whole community to enjoy. We need a community centre which is large enough to serve the whole community and more employment opportunities. We may need limited new housing but it is important that we don't grow so large that we become a town and just another suburb of Cambridge.</li> <li>• <b>Natural England:</b> Four sites options suggested by Parish Councils to provide new public open space. Support provision for appropriate quality and quantity of green space to meet identifies local needs as part of wider open provision. Recommend use of ANGSt as tool to ensure adequate provision of accessible natural green space, (should be linked to Green Infrastructure networks). ANGSt Standards can be found: <a href="http://www.naturalengland.org.uk/regions/east_of_england/ourwork/gi/accessiblenaturalgreenspacestandards.aspx">http://www.naturalengland.org.uk/regions/east_of_england/ourwork/gi/accessiblenaturalgreenspacestandards.aspx</a>. Welcome allocation of all four potential recreation and open space sites identified. Allocation of these sites has the potential to enhance the Borough's biodiversity assets with further tree planting. All of the sites are accessible by public transport which reduces the reliance on the private car.</li> <li>• <b>Orwell Parish Council:</b> We would support all if the majority of the local population in the respective Parishes agree.</li> <li>• <b>Campaign to protect rural England:</b> No objection.</li> <li>• <b>Oakington and Westwick Parish Council:</b> We support this.</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cottenham Road at this location is a busy 40mph road with significant road noise and no pedestrian access on the west side of the road. I own land that borders the proposed site, so I would want to know what provisions the council would make to protect my property from any development in terms of physical access and spoilt views across open countryside.</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If local people wish this.</li> <li>• We must keep some open spaces in the village.</li> </ul>
--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It would offer important recreation for that end of the village and protect a certain amount of green land; it will however reduce the amount of available land for agriculture.</li> <li>• On the face proposals appear benign.</li> <li>• It would be useful to know what uses are being proposed for the site. For instance mention is made of the 40mph road crossing and of the Green Belt meaning that a changing room would be unsuitable. But if the intent is to have green space, a running track, a sports pitch (formal or informal) or a fit trail (such as at Girton), or even a community orchard and green space, I think it sounds a useful provision for people nearby, and possibly with a bench for people jogging or cycling along the local cycle infrastructure to rest.</li> <li>• Can't see the need for Histon and Impington site.</li> <li>• Histon and Impington have great facilities near football club, why are more required? IVC also offer good facilities.</li> <li>• Although I appreciate the benefit of recreational facilities, given the need for housing perhaps the land could be put to better use for both housing and a recreational area.</li> <li>• Support in principle but any development of this site for playing pitches will need to be supported by adequate ancillary facilities (changing rooms, car parking etc).</li> <li>• Reservation about the proposed recreation area west of Cottenham Road. When I asked a parish councillor exactly what was planned for this area I found replies given extremely vague and I still have no idea of their intentions.</li> <li>• This site is very near very busy B1049. Can't see the need there when Histon's field and recreation ground already exist? Guess it's precursor for 'allowing' development of Buxhall Farm site, despite local protest (Traffic over development of villages!)</li> <li>• <b>Sport England:</b> Sport England supports the principle of allocating additional land for sport/recreation purposes where there is an identified local demand for additional facilities.</li> </ul>
<p>R2: East of Railway Line, South of Granhams Road, Great Shelford</p> <p>Support: 54 Object: 0 Comment: 8</p>	<p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The existing playing field is an excellent community facility and well used to the point of overcrowding on occasions. An extension on this would offer significant benefits.</li> <li>• Support provided it is on a network of cycle routes to give good access.</li> <li>• More space for recreation the better.</li> <li>• More recreational areas, parks, walks and cycle ways the better.</li> <li>• Area is gradually being urbanised it will be</li> </ul>

	<p>important to have significant green spaces which are permanently protected.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would like to see development of parkland south of Granhams Road, Grange Field and Church Street.</li> <li>• Great Shelford has grown over time and is drastically short of leisure space which will be made worse as planned development continues. The need for this area to come into public ownership is essential to enable its use by the village.</li> <li>• Recreational facilities are important.</li> <li>• Site is unsuitable for formal recreation because of its general appearance, its proximity to local housing, its potential impact on local roads, especially close to level crossing and the difficulty of providing on-site parking. As part of its development for informal recreation the opportunity should be taken to enhance its potential for wildlife in association with local groups and school. Support Parish Councils proposal to develop this site as public open place.</li> <li>• Villages must breathe and have space to exercise outdoors. Encourage creation of nature reserves, not only for wildlife but for the pleasure of residents too.</li> <li>• Support this option as you have completely failed to provide additional recreational space in this part of South Cambridge despite permitting ridiculous amounts of new developments.</li> <li>• Support if sensitively carried out. Needs a 'green link' from Stapleford to the Magog Downs. It is dangerous for children to walk on the existing path next to the road.</li> <li>• There are few public footpaths in the village and some new open spaces would be good. They would enhance the environment and protect green space. An area south of Grahams Road would be good for exercise.</li> <li>• Better to walk in natural areas than 'planned' ones.</li> <li>• Important for existing residents to be able to take part in sports and recreational activities.</li> <li>• Open space and facilities are important.</li> <li>• Recreation is well used and could do with more room.</li> <li>• Support use for walking (incorporating dog-free areas) or as a nature reserve if this change has low impact (no building).</li> <li>• <b>Natural England:</b> Four sites options suggested by Parish Councils to provide new public open space. Support provision for appropriate quality and quantity of green space to meet identifies local needs as part of wider open provision. Recommend use of ANGSt as tool to ensure adequate provision of accessible natural green space, (should be</li> </ul>
--	---

	<p>linked to Green Infrastructure networks). ANGSt Standards can be found: <a href="http://www.naturalengland.org.uk/regions/east_of_england/ourwork/gi/accessiblenaturalgreenspacestandardangst.aspx">http://www.naturalengland.org.uk/regions/east_of_england/ourwork/gi/accessiblenaturalgreenspacestandardangst.aspx</a>.</p> <p>Welcome allocation of all four potential recreation and open space sites identified. Allocation of these sites has the potential to enhance the Borough's biodiversity assets with further tree planting. All of the sites are accessible by public transport which reduces the reliance on the private car.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Foxton Parish Council:</b> We support proposals for Great Shelford because more recreational space is needed for the size of the village.</li> <li>• <b>Orwell Parish Council:</b> We would support all if the majority of the local population in the respective parishes agree.</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If Great Shelford Parish Council wishes to have formal play arrangements on site option R3, then going for open space designation may be the most appropriate way forward, given that recreation use is an allowable use of land in the Green Belt. However, since site option R3 is in the Green Belt, the parish council may not wish to have formal play arrangements here, in which case the route set out in question 13 (having an appropriate community-led policy for such areas) may be more appropriate. Designating the two sites as open space (as in question 11) is therefore one option but including appropriate community-led policies for Important Green Spaces in the Local Plan (see question 13) is an alternative approach. We would support the approach that gives the greatest protection to these two important sites.</li> <li>• The Parish Council of Great Shelford seems to think the village ends at the railway bridge-why have they not considered land between Westfield/Stonehill? Give the people 'over the bridge' a sense of village identity.</li> <li>• Land South and West of Granhams Road should remain green belt as far as 'nine wells'.</li> <li>• Parking is difficult in both areas. Site adjacent to the existing recreation ground could be developed as a mix of informal recreation area and some sports pitches.</li> <li>• Parking is already very well used-where would there be more parking?</li> <li>• <b>Sport England:</b> Sport England supports the</li> </ul>
--	---

	<p>principle of allocating additional land for sport/recreation purposes where there is an identified local demand for additional facilities. Graham Road, Great Shelford (3.5ha) - accept that this site may not be suitable for formal sport given its parkland setting. If it were to be used for pitches then changing accommodation and car parking would be required.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Campaign to Protect Rural England:</b> We have no objection.</li> </ul>
<p>R3: Grange Field, Church Street, Great Shelford</p> <p>Support: 55 Object: 0 Comment: 8</p>	<p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The existing playing field is an excellent community facility and well used to the point of overcrowding on occasions. An extension of this would offer significant benefits.</li> <li>• Support provided it is on a network of cycle routes to give good access.</li> <li>• The Grange field has been on the agenda for a long time, it would be good to add it to the rec. which is very well used. Coming from a dog owner any other walking areas would be a bonus.</li> <li>• The more green space for active recreation the better.</li> <li>• Shelford recreation should be preserved and enlarged.</li> <li>• Support as area is gradually being urbanised it will be important to have significant green spaces which are permanently protected.</li> <li>• The more recreational areas, parks, walks and cycle ways the better.</li> <li>• Support all sites as long as they are well considered.</li> <li>• Great Shelford has grown over time and is drastically short of leisure space which will be made as planned developments continue. The need for this area to come onto public ownership is essential to enable its use by the village.</li> <li>• The Parish Council have been working to extend the recreational facilities of this growing and popular village. Grange field is not used for agriculture and grazing at present.</li> <li>• Excellent to hear Parish Councils talking about such amenities.</li> <li>• Recreational facilities are important.</li> <li>• This site is adjacent to the existing recreation ground and has easy access to existing facilities so it is ideal for additional formal and informal recreation use.</li> <li>• On the Western boundary of existing recreation ground is a mature tree belt which partially screens the proposed site. In any development this tree belt must be maintained and ideally enhanced and</li> </ul>

	<p>expanding. Support to develop this site as public open space.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I support green spaces and recreation grounds. Villages must breathe and have space to exercise outdoors. I would encourage the creation of nature reserves, not only for the wildlife but the pleasure of residents too.</li> <li>• Having formal play arrangements on site option R3 means going for open space designation may be the most appropriate way forward, given the recreation use is allowable use of land on the green belt. However since the option is on the green belt the Parish Council may not wish to have formal play arrangements here, in which case the route set out in question 13 (having an appropriate community-led policy for such areas) may be more appropriate. Designating the two sites as open space is therefore an option but including appropriate community-led policies for Important Green Spaces in the local plan is an alternative approach. We would support the approach that gives the greatest protection to these two important sites.</li> <li>• I support this option as you have completely failed to provide additional recreation space in this part of South Cambridge despite permitting utterly ridiculous amounts of new development.</li> <li>• Support if it is sensitively carried out. Needs a 'green link' from Stapleford to the Magog Downs. It is dangerous for children to walk on the existing path next to the road.</li> <li>• In order to protect Green Belt and provide facilities for community.</li> <li>• Much nicer to walk in natural areas than 'planned' areas.</li> <li>• It is important for existing residents to take part in sports and recreational activities.</li> <li>• Recreation is well used and could do with more room.</li> <li>• Recreational space is better than filling the space with homes.</li> <li>• Support if it will benefit the people in the village.</li> <li>• Happy for the land to be used for healthy reasons.</li> <li>• <b>Natural England:</b> Four sites options suggested by Parish Councils to provide new public open space. Support provision for appropriate quality and quantity of green space to meet identifies local needs as part of wider open provision. Recommend use of ANGSt as tool to ensure adequate provision of accessible natural green space, (should be linked to Green Infrastructure networks). ANGSt Standards can be found: <a href="http://www.naturalengland.org.uk/regions/east_of_e">http://www.naturalengland.org.uk/regions/east_of_e</a></li> </ul>
--	---

	<p><a href="http://england/ourwork/qi/accessiblenaturalgreenspacestandardangst.aspx">ngland/ourwork/qi/accessiblenaturalgreenspacestandardangst.aspx</a>.</p> <p>Welcome allocation of all four potential recreation and open space sites identified. Allocation of these sites has the potential to enhance the Borough's biodiversity assets with further tree planting. All of the sites are accessible by public transport which reduces the reliance on the private car.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Foxton Parish Council:</b> We support proposals for Great Shelford because more recreational space is needed for the size of the village.</li> <li>• <b>Orwell Parish Council:</b> Support all if the majority of the local population in the respective parishes agree.</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If local people wish this.</li> <li>• On the face these proposals appear benign.</li> <li>• Parking is already very well used-where would there be more parking?</li> <li>• <b>Sport England:</b> Sport England supports the principle of allocating additional land for sport/recreation purposes where there is an identified local demand for additional facilities. Support R3 in principle as it will extend an existing community recreation ground and therefore will already benefit from ancillary facilities. An assessment will be needed to see if changing rooms and car parking will need to be extended or enhanced to cater for additional demand.</li> <li>• <b>Campaign to Protect Rural England:</b> We have no objection.</li> </ul>
<p>R4: North of former EDF site, Ely Road, Milton</p> <p>Support: 39 Object: 0 Comment: 7</p>	<p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support providing it is on a network of cycle routes to give good access.</li> <li>• Support EDF site as currently not in use/useful in Milton.</li> <li>• The more green space for active recreation the better.</li> <li>• Area is gradually becoming urbanised so it is important to have green areas which are permanently protected.</li> <li>• The more recreational areas, parks, walks and cycle ways the better.</li> <li>• Recreational facilities are important.</li> <li>• Excellent to hear Parish Councils talking about such amenities.</li> <li>• Villages must breathe and have space to exercise</li> </ul>

	<p>outdoors. I would encourage the creation of nature reserves, not only for wildlife but for the pleasure of residents too.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support as you have completely failed to provide additional recreational space in this part of South Cambridge despite permitting utterly ridiculous amounts of new developments.</li> <li>• Useful to visit plus additional open space for local people to spend more leisure time.</li> <li>• Important for local people to be able to take part in sport and recreational activities.</li> <li>• Recreational space is better than filling it with homes.</li> <li>• Support if benefits residents in all these villages.</li> <li>• Support although Milton already has a country park.</li> <li>• <b>Natural England:</b> Four sites options suggested by Parish Councils to provide new public open space. Support provision for appropriate quality and quantity of green space to meet identifies local needs as part of wider open provision. Recommend use of ANGSt as tool to ensure adequate provision of accessible natural green space, (should be linked to Green Infrastructure networks). ANGSt Standards can be found: <a href="http://www.naturalengland.org.uk/regions/east_of_england/ourwork/gi/accessible_natural_green_space_standards.aspx">http://www.naturalengland.org.uk/regions/east_of_england/ourwork/gi/accessible_natural_green_space_standards.aspx</a>.</li> </ul> <p>Welcome allocation of all four potential recreation and open space sites identified. Allocation of these sites has the potential to enhance the Borough's biodiversity assets with further tree planting. All of the sites are accessible by public transport which reduces the reliance on the private car.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Oakington and Westwick Parish Council:</b> Also this site would be in a good location.</li> <li>• <b>Milton Parish Council:</b> Support proposal for recreation land at former EDF site.</li> <li>• <b>Orwell Parish Council:</b> Support all if the majority of the local people in respective parishes agree.</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Plentiful bicycle parking must also be provided, especially given that Milton is very well connected with the rest of Cambridge.</li> <li>• On the face of it these proposals seem benign.</li> <li>• If local people wish this.</li> <li>• All ok except Milton which already has good recreation and open space facilities.</li> <li>• No objections to this option we must keep some</li> </ul>
--	---

	<p>open spaces within the village.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Campaign to Protect Rural England:</b> We have no objection.</li> <li>• <b>Sport England:</b> Sport England supports the principle of allocating additional land for sport/recreation purposes where there is an identified local demand for additional facilities. Support R4 in principle as it also would extend an existing facility, but assessment of existing ancillary facilities will be needed to determine whether additional or enhanced facilities will be needed.</li> </ul>
<p>Please provide any comments.</p> <p>Support: 9 Object: 1 Comment: 37</p>	<p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Open space for public use should be planned. More parkland sites planned for walkers and cyclists encourage young and old to explore their environment. Woodland trust might be approached.</li> <li>• Positively approve any open space.</li> <li>• Support all, though I know the Shelford area best. The proposals fit my view that smaller and local recreational facilities are what are needed, not one huge stadium.</li> <li>• Support any new green sites accessible by the public.</li> <li>• Support open space but any connected building/parking should be avoided if possible; if absolutely necessary should be sited close to existing development.</li> <li>• <b>Shepreth Parish Council:</b> Shepreth has no objections to these proposals.</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fulbourn Parish Council have not formally suggested SHLAA site 162 for public open space purposes. Where sites have been suggested by Parish Council's, it is noted that South Cambridgeshire District Council advises that delivery is a matter for the relevant Parish Council. Delivery must be considered prior to any formal allocation. It is not acceptable for allocations to be made where delivery is not achievable.</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This is up to the villages involved as the need is for their communities.</li> <li>• Good ideas-priviso, infrastructure, parking can cope with it.</li> <li>• Sports facilities yes, pars no. Parks in Cambridge are totally over managed and expensive to run. Best leaving areas fallow as they may be needed for farmland.</li> <li>• Provided the areas are already designated recreation areas with no buildings, no all-weather</li> </ul>

	<p>pitches, no tall lights for night use, I would consider supporting leaving the land for recreation. Recreation is not just sport, it is also walking untroubled, enjoying God's green land and fresh air.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If Impington lose their green belt as planners want they will need much more than a recreation area.</li> <li>• Agree with Parish Councils.</li> <li>• How many people in the modern world use open spaces? Very few.</li> <li>• Local recreation is a good idea. Do protect good agricultural land.</li> <li>• If wildlife environment is not destroyed.</li> <li>• Support any proposals for public recreational facilities.</li> <li>• Do not know the sites well enough to comment.</li> <li>• If the local Parish Council wants it, it should be supported.</li> <li>• Recreation space is always good especially with more housing planned.</li> <li>• Do we really need additional recreation space? It costs Parish Councils and SCDC to maintain when money is tight.</li> <li>• No objections providing road links are improved.</li> <li>• Support as long as it's what the community wants.</li> <li>• There is housing and a field which are currently being used for dog walking when it should have sports fields on it.</li> <li>• It's nice to play on old pitches etc. not on bland featureless prairies.</li> <li>• Sports and recreation sites should be encouraged whenever the Parish Council want them, all are possible sites.</li> <li>• Access to the proposed recreation area in Histon and Impington should be such that it does not impede traffic on the very busy B1049. Traffic lights would not be appreciated.</li> <li>• Happy to use land for these healthy reasons.</li> <li>• Recreation and open spaces always a good idea for the benefit of physical and mental health.</li> <li>• Do not object to any, but think funds could be utilised for other projects of a higher priority.</li> <li>• SCDC clearly believe district a great place to live. Suggest that much amenity value is down to countryside, access to it and in it, river environment and wildlife. Recognise that many people from district visit Cambridge for work and play. Recognise much has been done encourage easier cycling into city, e.g. bridge near Milton, but more can be done. Green spaces/corridors have social benefits-recreation, rest and contemplation, play, exercises, reconnecting with nature, community cohesion, volunteering and reduction in anti-social</li> </ul>
--	--

	<p>behaviour and health improvements. Economic benefits-attracting tourists, space for flood alleviation/sustainable drainage, improving air and water quality. In 2006 Cambridge Horizons set up a Green Space planning strategy-a new strategy is needed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Environment Agency:</b> The Environmental Agency advises that green space should be considered for protecting land that is needed for flooding and drainage. Such land is a community asset for resilience to climate change.</li> <li>• <b>Comberton Parish Council:</b> It is up to local residents.</li> <li>• <b>Girton Parish Council:</b> It was questioned whether this would facilitate subsequent housing development on land thus removed from green belt.</li> <li>• <b>Dry Drayton Parish Council:</b> We do not have any views on the site options for open space. However, we draw attention to the fact Dry Drayton also has a shortfall of provision for recreation and open space against the Councils adopted standards.</li> <li>• <b>Countryside Restoration Trust:</b> SCDC clearly believe district a great place to live. Suggest that much amenity value is down to countryside, access to it and in it, river environment and wildlife. Access to rivers is important and quality of water and flows is linked to biodiversity. Meadows next to rivers should be protected and cared for. Encourage better cycle ways and car parking in district. Routes to Wicken have clearly improved making safer and easier access to countryside to north east of city. Recognise that many people from district visit Cambridge for work and play. Recognise much has been done encourage easier cycling into city, e.g. bridge near Milton, but more can be done.</li> <li>• Take into consideration the green belt delineation around the village of Sawston-specifically in relation to the former waste tip site of Dales Manor Industrial Park. Reason for seeking adjustment is Cambridge City Football Club due to the club having to move their Milton Road ground. Land in question was formerly a waste tip and is exceptionally well screened by tree belts. With more housing proposed for Sawston the demand for additional recreational space will become more intense.</li> <li>• Consideration needs to be given to extending recreation ground with Fulbourn. We are already below the recommended ratio for resident to recreation ground and this is only likely to worsen as the population grows. There are two fields which abut the existing recreation ground. They are east</li> </ul>
--	--

	<p>of the present rec, south of Stonebridge land and north of Barsnfiel/Jeeves Acre. Both fields were offered for development SCDC have rejected both. Can consideration be given to how they could be secured for future recreation ground use.</p>
--	--