



Date of Meeting	11 September 2019
Portfolio	Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods, Community & Culture
Report Author	Paul Harris/Faith Crompton
Public/Private Document	Public

## Wardle Football Club

### 1. Executive Summary

- 1.1 Wardle Football Club has plans to extend the lower pitch from a junior size to an adult/open age sized pitch and to improve the drainage which must comply with the Football Association Charter Standard Programme. A planning application was submitted at the same time as the scheme was put out to tender.

During the planning process, officers had concerns that there was a risk of waste material being brought to the surface by bioturbation (mixing of materials by the actions of soil organisms and growth of plant roots). To prevent bioturbation between the existing landfill material and the proposed pitch surface, a suitable separation layer has been added in the interest of protecting human health and to provide a better playing surface.

#### 1.2 Options

The options for the geotextile material include:

- a. A non-woven geotextile, suitable to prevent bioturbation, coloured to provide a visual warning of underlying contaminated material.
- b. A non-woven geotextile, suitable to prevent bioturbation, standard (identical specification).

Quotes for the design options for the separation layer and suitable geotextile have been sought from the appointed contractor, based on an area to be covered by the separation layer (pitch and runoff and surroundings) of 9445.7 m<sup>2</sup>. The total costs of the options include:

Option 1: A non-woven geotextile, suitable to prevent bioturbation, overlain by 50mm depth washed, clean gritstone (no fine material).

a. 9445.7 M2 Terram T1000 Hi Viz Geotextile	£14,357.46
6-14mm clean Limestone to a depth of 50mm	£26,649.06
	<b>£41,006.46</b>
b. 9445.7 M2 Terram T1000 Standard Geotextile	£11,145.93
6-14mm clean Limestone to a depth of 50mm	£26,649.06
	<b>£37,794.99</b>

Option 2: A non-woven geotextile, suitable to prevent bioturbation, overlain by additional 50mm depth topsoil (i.e. 100mm topsoil buffer between the geotextile and slit drainage)

a. 9445.7 M2 Terram T1000 Hi Viz Geotextile	£14,357.46
Additional topsoil to a depth of 50mm	£22,726.59
	<b>£37,084.05</b>
b. 9445.7 M2 Terram T1000 Standard Geotextile	£11,145.93
Additional topsoil to a depth of 50mm	£22,726.59
	<b>£33,872.52</b>

Option 3: A non-woven geotextile, suitable to prevent bioturbation, overlain by 300mm topsoil as specified, with an amended drainage system comprising 200mm slit drainage and additional 50mm blinding to underground piped drainage system (i.e. 100mm topsoil buffer between the geotextile and slit drainage).

a. 9445.7 M2 Terram T1000 Hi Viz Geotextile	£14,357.46
Amended drainage systems (primary & secondary)	£5,239.12
<i>Reduced depth of slit drainage</i>	
<i>Additional blinding to lateral drains</i>	
	<b>£19,596.58</b>
b. 9445.7 M2 Terram T1000 Standard Geotextile	£11,145.93
Amended drainage systems (primary & secondary)	£5,239.12
<i>Reduced depth of slit drainage</i>	
<i>Additional blinding to lateral drains</i>	
	<b>£16,385.05</b>

<b>2. Recommendation</b>
--------------------------

- 2.1 It is recommended that that option 3b is approved for funding to ensure the requirements put forward by the Planning Department's Environmental Health Senior Officer are met.

<b>3. Reason for Recommendation</b>
-------------------------------------

- 3.1 To ensure the sufficient funding is made available for the additional requirement to meet planning requirements.
- 3.2 Remove the risk of any pitch users and to mitigate any health and safety concerns.
- 3.3 Option 3b has met the requirement of the Environmental Health Officer. Costs were saved by exhausting a number of options which still met those requirements.
- 3.4 Future maintenance regimes will benefit from the 300mm topsoil above the separation barrier understanding there should be no impact of disturbance of waste material.

<b>4. Key Points for Consideration</b>
--

- 4.1 Consideration given for the allowance of on-site validation of the separation layer and the testing of all imported topsoil for contaminants, to comply with a planning condition in the interest of protecting human health. A cost will be associated with this element of work which could put existing contingencies under pressure.
- 4.2 Risk of a budget shortfall. Contingencies highlighted for the management of Knotweed and the overall scheme will be under pressure if required to contribute to the separation layer as part of option 3b.
- 4.3 Alternative options were considered and options 1a and 1b and 2a and 2b more than met the requirement of the environmental health officer however costs did not seem to be feasible.

<b>5. Costs and Budget Summary</b>
------------------------------------

5.1	9445.7 M2 Terram T1000 Standard Geotextile	£11,145.93
	Amended drainage systems (primary & secondary)	£5,239.12
	<i>Reduced depth of slit drainage</i>	
	<i>Additional blinding to lateral drains</i>	

Budget required **£16,385.05**

**This would be funded by the Pennines township capital budget.**

<b>6. Risk and Policy Implications</b>
--

- 6.1 Risk of budget shortfall, utilisation of any existing contingency may leave other elements of work exposed especially the management of Knotweed.
- 6.2 The provision of the separation layer will ensure that the club continues to comply with the FA Charter Standard Programme and protect the health and safety of the pitch users.
- 6.3 Overall scheme would be at risk of non-delivery if the funding for the separation layer is not approved.

<b>7. Consultation</b>
------------------------

- 7.1 The planning application was subject to consultation.

<b>Background Papers</b>	<b>Place of Inspection</b>
None	N/A

<b>For Further Information Contact:</b>	Paul Harris, Tel: 01706 923269 paul.harris@rochdale.gov.uk Faith Crompton, Tel: 01706 923253 faith.crompton@rochdale.gov.uk
---	--