## FENCING ADJACENT TO THE KEN STIMPSON ACADEMY STATEMENT PRESENTED TO CABINET 15th October 2024

On 15<sup>th</sup> October the decision about the fence was returned to that Cabinet for a decision. As Peterborough Telegraph reports

Many residents spoke at this meeting and Werrington Neighbourhood Council's Statement is below.

As a result of this meeting the decision will be sent to Full Council following a Section 123 consultation and review of any compromise with the Acadamy and the Dept for Education.

I am representing Werrington Neighbourhood Council which is the resident's elected representative group in the absence of a Parish Council including being an official planning consultee.

The Neighbourhood Council have been involved right from the start when we supported the original proposal of the fencing of 2.5 football pitches believing that the school needed a safer area for its outside pitches. We cannot however support the recommendation that Area C (8 football pitches) is leased to the Academy.

We are once again telling you that you have NOT been provided with enough nor the correct information to enable you to make an appropriate and correct decision today.

These fields have been used by the community for nearly 50 years. It is an important open space It is clear that this historic use gives the fields a dual use designation. There was a certain amount of legal evidence given to you at the last Cabinet Meeting. In the last few days you have been sent even more legal information to show that these fields cannot be classed as solely Education Use. A dual use designation affects your ability to fence these fields ... It also calls into question the decision that the Department for Education gave to you ...and also means that this is a change of use which will require a Planning Permission.

We cannot dispute that the Academy needs a fenced area but five years ago 2.5 pitches was considered to be suitable to deliver the curriculum ... more recently this demand increased to 4 pitches ... and now it is 8 pitches. The Academy has access to a lot of extensive sports facilities. Day time community access has recently been removed giving the Academy sole use of the gym as well. So in real terms how many extra students and hours of sport will this field accommodate in the course of its limited term time activities. Why does the Academy need what appears to be double the space it really needs. The report that you have in front of you gives such a negative reaction to any suggestion of

negotiation and compromise. It effectively dismisses the option to reach a negotiated settlement with Academy.

It is being said that the proposed Community Use Agreement is an appropriate compromise. But it is only giving a minority access to these fields –those who are a member of a club and those who can afford the fee. The suggestion that Cricket East is interested is also going to undermine the availability of the fields for so called public hire.

You have one decision here and that is not to approve the fencing of Area C at this time. This will give time to review the legal arguments, review the options for negotation and if necessary to review a Planning Application route with appropriate Public Consultation

Thank you