Committee Report Checklist

Please submit the completed checklists with your report. If final draft report does not include all the information/sign offs required, your item will be delayed until the next meeting cycle.

Stage 1
Report checklist – responsibility of report owner

ITEM	**Yes / No**	**Date**
Councillor engagement / input from Chair prior to briefing	yes	29/9/26
Relevant Group Head review	Shared for comment	29/9/26
MAT+ review (to have been circulated **at least 5 working days before Stage 2**)	Shared for comment	29/9/26
This item is on the Forward Plan for the relevant committee	yes	29/9/26
	Reviewed by	
Finance comments (circulate to Finance)	AB	03/11/26
Risk comments (circulate to Lee O'Neil)	LO	07/10/26
Legal comments (circulate to legal@spelthorne.gov.uk)	LH	23/09/26
HR comments (if applicable)	n/a	

For reports with material financial or legal implications the author should engage with the respective teams at the outset and receive input to their reports prior to asking for MO or s151 comments.

Do not forward to stage 2 unless all the above have been completed.

Stage 2
Report checklist – responsibility of report owner

ITEM	**Completed by**	**Date rec'd**
Monitoring Officer commentary – at least **5 working days before MAT**	L Heron	23/09/26
S151 Officer commentary – at least **5 working days before MAT**	T.Collier	14/09/26
Commissioner engagement	J. Kingston	11/11/2026
	Delete as applicable:	No issues
Relevant MAT member sign-off		
Report reviewed by Management Team		

Environment & Sustainability Committee

Date of meeting Thursday 19 November 2026

Title	Options paper alternative locations for a Multi-Use Games Area following the decision not to proceed at Memorial Gardens
Purpose of the report	To consider four alternative locations for a Multi-Use Games Area and select one site for public consultation.
Report Author	*Jackie Taylor, Group Head Neighbourhood Services*
Ward(s) Affected	All Wards
Exempt	No
Exemption Reason	Not applicable
Corporate Priority	Community Environment
Recommendations	**Committee is asked to:** 1. Note that the Environment & Sustainability Committee has resolved not to proceed with the proposed Multi-Use Games Area (MUGA) at Memorial Gardens, Staines-upon-Thames. 2. Consider the following four potential locations for a MUGA, listed alphabetically: Laleham Park, Lammas Park, Moormede Recreation Ground and Staines Park. 3. Consider the options to select one of the four potential locations for officers to consult on and agree that the consultation outcome, site-specific feasibility findings, estimated financial implications and recommended next steps be reported to a future meeting of the Environment & Sustainability Committee. 4. Note that, if no location is selected, no further action will be taken to pursue a MUGA through this options process.
Reason for Recommendation	To present Members with four alternative potential locations for a Multi-Use Games Area and for the Committee to consider and, if appropriate, select one potential location for a single site to be taken forward for public consultation. The Environment & Sustainability Committee has resolved not to proceed with the proposed MUGA at Memorial Gardens. In doing so, the Committee instructed officers to return to the November meeting with an options paper setting out alternative potential locations.

1. Executive summary of the report

What is the situation	Why we want to do something

• On 10 September 2026, the Environment & Sustainability Committee agreed not to proceed with the proposed MUGA in Memorial Gardens, Staines-upon-Thames, and instructed officers to return in November with an options paper setting out alternative potential locations.	• The Council should consider whether improved free-to-access recreation for young people could be provided in a more suitable location. National physical activity evidence and local strategies identify inactivity, health inequalities, parks and open spaces, and community wellbeing as priorities, supporting further proportionate investigation without committing the Council to delivery.
This is what we want to do about it	**These are the next steps**
• This report sets out four potential locations for Members to consider, listed alphabetically: Laleham Park, Lammas Park, Moormede Recreation Ground and Staines Park. It does not seek approval to deliver a MUGA at this stage; its purpose is to enable Members to identify one site for public consultation.	• If the November Committee selects one of the four sites, officers will begin a consultation exercise on that site and will report back with the outcome, site-specific feasibility considerations, estimated funding implications and any recommended next steps. If Members do not select any of the four sites, no further action will be taken to pursue this matter. • This staged approach supports the Council's Best Value duty by avoiding any premature commitment to expenditure, construction or delivery. If a site is selected, local need, community support, site suitability, capital and revenue costs, deliverability and long-term management implications will be tested through consultation and reported back to Committee before any further decision. If no site is approved, the matter will conclude with no further action.

2. Key issues

2.1 In March 2026, the Environment & Sustainability Committee considered proposals for a semi-informal, open-access MUGA within Memorial Gardens, Staines-upon-Thames. Following consultation and consideration of the outcome, the Committee agreed on 10 September 2026 not to proceed and instructed officers to return in November with an options paper setting out alternative potential locations.

2.2 As instructed by the Committee, officers have identified four potential locations for Members to consider, listed alphabetically: Laleham Park, Lammas Park, Moormede Recreation Ground and Staines Park.

2.3 The Spelthorne Health and Wellbeing Strategy 2022–2027 supports accessible and affordable physical activity, greater use of parks and open spaces, and stronger communities. It records that 26.3% of children in Spelthorne are inactive. The Corporate Plan 2024–2028 Action Plan and Open Spaces and Biodiversity Strategy 2025–2035 also support healthier lifestyles and high-quality, accessible open-space provision that responds to community need.

2.4 National guidance recommends that children and young people average at least 60 minutes of moderate to vigorous physical activity each day across the week. Sport England's Active Lives Children and Young People Survey shows that a significant proportion do not meet this benchmark, supporting consideration of accessible opportunities for physical activity.

2.5 Together, the local and national evidence provides a rationale for exploring free or low-cost outdoor recreation for children and young people but does not establish that a MUGA is the only or preferred response or justify a delivery decision at this stage.

2.6 The previous proposal demonstrated interest in improved informal sports and recreation space, but the consultation and Committee decision established that Memorial Gardens was not the right location for that scheme. This report does not revisit that decision; it considers whether the underlying need for accessible youth recreation could be met more appropriately at an alternative location.

2.7 The evidence base is therefore sufficient to justify a proportionate next step, but not sufficient at this stage to justify a delivery decision. Members are not being asked to approve construction, funding or planning. They are being asked to consider and, if appropriate, select one potential location for consultation so that local need, likely users, accessibility, community impact, environmental constraints, safety concerns, management issues and deliverability can be tested before any future recommendation is made. This would form part of any business case for pursuing any further work.

2.8 In considering whether to take one site forward for consultation, Members should have regard to the Council's Best Value duty and the need to secure economy, efficiency and effectiveness in the use of public resources. At this stage, the proposed approach is proportionate because it does not commit the Council to construction, funding or procurement. Instead, it allows the Council to test whether there is sufficient local need and community support, whether the selected site is suitable and deliverable, what capital and revenue costs may arise, what long-term management and maintenance implications would need to be funded, and whether the likely community benefit would justify any future investment.

2.9 The consultation will be developed in line with the Council's consultation, communications and data protection requirements. Materials should show the indicative siting, scale, fixed-fencing approach, proposed operating arrangements and whether lighting is proposed. Engagement should include young people, schools, park users, disabled users, nearby residents and people without digital access. A further report will be brought back before any decision on design, funding, planning or delivery.

3. Options appraisal (sites listed alphabetically)

Criteria	Laleham Park	Lammas Park	Moormede	Staines Park
Strategic fit and local need	Could provide additional recreation within a large park setting. Its ability to meet the intended community need would need to be tested.	Could complement existing play, leisure and recreation uses. Local need and the effect on the overall mix of uses would need to be tested.	Could provide free-to-access recreation for the surrounding neighbourhood. Local need and the relationship with other provision on that site would need to be tested.	Could complement the park's existing recreation role. Local need and the relationship with current activities would need to be tested.
Accessibility	Walking, cycling, public transport, parking and inclusive access require assessment, including access for young people without private transport.	Existing park access and nearby leisure use may assist access, but walking, cycling, public transport, parking and inclusive access require assessment.	Walking, cycling, public transport, parking, safe routes and inclusive access require assessment.	Walking, cycling, public transport, parking, safe routes and inclusive access require assessment.
Site capacity and existing uses	Potential locations may be available, subject to confirmation of dimensions, ground conditions, park character and effects on existing users.	Potential locations would need to be assessed against existing facilities, activity levels, informal recreation and park capacity.	Available space, dimensions and an appropriate location require confirmation. Effects on informal open space and existing users would depend on detailed siting.	Potential locations would need to be assessed against existing pitches, informal recreation and other land constraints.
Residential amenity and community safety	Proximity to homes, natural surveillance, noise, lighting, evening use and management require assessment.	Existing footfall may contribute to natural surveillance, but proximity to homes, noise, lighting, evening use and management	Proximity to homes, noise, lighting, natural surveillance, evening use and anti-social behaviour risks require assessment.	Proximity to homes, noise, lighting, natural surveillance, evening use and anti-social behaviour risks require assessment.

Criteria	Laleham Park	Lammas Park	Moormede	Staines Park
		require assessment.		
Environmental considerations	Flood risk, drainage, biodiversity, trees, landscape character and loss of open space require site-specific assessment.	Flood risk, drainage, ecology, trees, landscape and loss of open space require site-specific assessment.	Trees, ecology, drainage, flood risk, landscape and loss of open space require site-specific assessment.	Trees, ecology, drainage, flood risk, landscape and loss of open space require site-specific assessment.
Deliverability	Legal title, flood risk, access, services, planning, ground conditions, cost and operational requirements require confirmation.	Legal title, flood risk, access, services, planning, park capacity, cost and operational requirements require confirmation.	Legal title, access, services, planning, ground conditions, cost and operational requirements require confirmation.	Legal title, Fields in Trust status, access, services, planning, existing uses, cost and operational requirements require confirmation.
Consultation focus	Test local need, accessibility, preferred siting, effects on park character and users, and proposed management arrangements.	Test local need, accessibility, effects on existing facilities and park users, park capacity, and proposed management arrangements.	Test local need, accessibility, preferred siting, effects on neighbours and park users, and proposed management arrangements.	Test local need, accessibility, effects on existing sport and recreation, effects on neighbours, and land constraints.

3.1 The appraisal identifies potential benefits and constraints for each of the four sites. The information currently available does not provide a sufficient basis to identify one site as demonstrably preferable overall. Each option would require further site-specific assessment, and Members should consider the criteria in the round when selecting one location for consultation.

3.2 Officers are not recommending one location over another at this stage. The purpose of the report is to enable Members to consider the relative merits and constraints for Laleham Park, Lammas Park Moormede Recreation Ground and Staines Park and if appropriate, to select one site for public consultation.

3.3 This is a high-level screening appraisal rather than a comparative feasibility assessment. The consultation findings and site-specific work, including accessibility, legal and land constraints, environmental impacts, residential amenity, effects on existing users, costs, funding and operational

arrangements, will be reported back to Committee before any recommendation is made on whether or how to proceed.

4. Risk implications

Risk	Issue	Mitigation
Consultation and community support	Any of the four sites may attract objections from residents, park users or stakeholders due to perceived loss of open space, changes to park character, noise, lighting, anti-social behaviour, parking pressure or displacement of existing activities.	Consult on only the one site selected by Members, provide clear information on siting, scale, management and alternatives considered, and report the outcome back before any delivery decision is made.
Planning, legal and land constraints	Each site may have constraints relating to covenants, Fields in Trust protections, planning policy, permitted use, access, highways, flood risk, ecology or other site-specific restrictions.	Undertake legal, planning, title, flood risk, ecology and highways checks before a final recommendation or planning application is progressed. There is currently no budget for these costs, and this would need to be considered.
Ground conditions	Site-specific ground conditions or existing below-ground features may need to be considered as part of any future feasibility work. These could affect the detailed design, programme or cost.	Review available site information and, if the proposal progresses, undertake proportionate surveys or ground investigation where appropriate. Any findings would be considered through the design, cost planning and delivery process.
Environmental and open space impact	Installing a hard-surfaced MUGA with fixed fencing could affect grassed open space, trees, biodiversity, drainage, landscape character and climate resilience at any shortlisted park.	Select the least harmful location within the chosen site, avoid sensitive habitat or trees, assess drainage and flood risk, and include appropriate landscaping, materials and maintenance measures.
Community safety and anti-social behaviour	A MUGA could become a gathering point and may increase concerns about noise, litter, vandalism, intimidation, misuse, evening activity and conflict with other	Design in natural surveillance, involve community safety partners, and confirm maintenance, cleaning and inspection arrangements before delivery.

	park users if not suitably designed and managed.	
Financial and funding risk	The previous CIL bid was withdrawn as it was specific to the Memorial Gardens MUGA proposal. Any of the four alternative sites would require a new cost estimate, surveys, design work, planning costs, site preparation and a new CIL bid. A separate funding route would also be needed for costs that are not eligible to be met from CIL.	Do not commit to construction until a full business case, revised cost plan, funding route and revenue maintenance implications have been approved.
Operational and delivery risk	Delivering a MUGA at any of the four sites may be affected by procurement timescales, surveys, planning, local government reorganisation, contractor availability, ground conditions and ongoing maintenance responsibilities.	Prepare a staged project plan after consultation, including gateways for feasibility, funding, planning, procurement and successor authority approval where required.

5. Financial implications

5.1 The March 2026 report identified indicative costs of up to £500,000 for the Memorial Gardens MUGA, plus early-stage survey, assessment and planning costs. The previous CIL bid was specific to that proposal and has been withdrawn.

5.2 For this options report, an initial indicative capital allowance, by way of a CIL bid of up to £300,000 will need to be progressed if a single alternative site is selected. Construction at an alternative location is expected to cost considerably less because of the revised specification, including fixed rather than removable fencing, better construction access, less environmental impact and greater design flexibility. The allowance remains indicative and subject to detailed design.

5.3 The allowance is not site-specific and does not indicate a preferred option. Final costs will depend on the selected location, detailed design, fixed fencing requirements, site conditions, surveys, planning, inflation and procurement.

Financial item	**Amount/position**
Indicative total project cost	£300,000
Estimated planning application and further studies revenue cost	Approximately £35,000 for planning application preparation and further studies. Funding has not yet been identified, and these costs cannot be funded from CIL.

Funding position	No delivery funding is currently approved. A new CIL bid would be required for any selected alternative site, and a separate funding route would be needed for any non-CIL eligible revenue costs.

5.4 No delivery funding is approved. If, following consultation, the Council wishes to progress a scheme, a new CIL bid would need to be submitted and assessed through the relevant governance processes before any delivery decision. CIL can fund only eligible capital expenditure; the estimated £35,000 cost of preparing a planning application and further studies, together with any other ineligible costs, would require a separate funding source which might be from revenue.

6. Legal comment

6.1 In making a decision on which alternative site should be taken forward for consultation, Members must have regard to relevant considerations including community need, accessibility, environmental impact, site constraints, deliverability, cost, consultation requirements and the previous decision not to proceed at Memorial Gardens.

6.2 The decision sought at this stage is limited to selecting one location for public consultation. It does not authorise design, planning, procurement, funding submission or delivery of a MUGA. Any future decision to progress a scheme would need to be supported by site-specific feasibility work, consultation feedback, legal and property checks, financial implications and any required committee approvals.

6.3 The Council should ensure that any consultation on the selected site is fair, clear and proportionate, explains the scope of the proposal and alternatives considered, and allows consultees a proper opportunity to comment before any further decision is taken.

Corporate implications

7. Commissioners' comments

7.1 There are no comments from Commissioners.

8. S151 Officer comments

8.1 The S151 Officer confirms that the financial implications have been identified in the report. There is also currently no funding provision for costs that are ineligible for CIL funding. The build costs could potentially be funded from capital receipts, but this would reduce the resources available to repay debt.

9. Monitoring Officer comments

9.1 Save as set out in the body of this report, there are no further legal implications arising from the recommendations in this report. All applicable issues associated with the selected location will be addressed in subsequent reports.

10. Procurement comments

10.1 There are no procurement implications arising from the decision to select a site for consultation. Procurement advice will be required if, following consultation and further approvals, the Council decides to progress design, surveys, works or delivery.

11. Equality and Diversity

11.1 The objective of improving access to free outdoor recreation for older children and young people remains relevant. Selecting one site for consultation will allow Members to test community views on whether that location would provide accessible, inclusive and appropriate recreation provision.

11.2 The consultation should consider access for different communities and users, including children and young people, families, disabled users, residents without private gardens, existing park users and nearby residents. The outcome will inform whether a future proposal should be developed and what mitigation or design changes may be required.

12. Sustainability and Climate Change Implications

12.1 Any selected site will require further assessment of ecological impacts, flood risk, drainage, trees, loss of grassed open space, sustainable materials, maintenance, climate resilience and the role of public open space. These considerations should inform the consultation material and any future recommendations to Members.

13. Other considerations

13.1 The four potential locations in the Staines area identified for consideration, listed alphabetically, are Laleham Park, Lammas Park, Moormede Recreation Ground and Staines Park. Before any decision is made on delivery, each location would require further site-specific assessment of accessibility, Fields in Trust considerations, planning requirements, environmental impact, flood risk, residential amenity, existing park use, operational management, cost and deliverability.

13.2 At this stage, Members are not being asked to approve a MUGA scheme or authorise expenditure on delivery. The decision is confined to identify, if appropriate, one selected location for consultation so that community feedback and site-specific implications can be understood before a further report is brought back.

Business Case Requirement

13.3 A detailed business case will be required before any decision is taken to progress a MUGA in Staines-upon-Thames. The business case needs to assess the strategic need for the facility, demonstrate alignment with the Council's corporate priorities and health and wellbeing objectives, quantify current and future demand, and evaluate the social, economic and community benefits that could be achieved. It also needs to consider capital and ongoing revenue costs, funding opportunities, site constraints, operational and maintenance requirements, potential income generation, risks, and alternative options.

13.4 The business case will provide the evidence base necessary to determine whether the project represents value for money, is financially sustainable, and delivers sufficient community benefit to justify investment.

14. Local Government Reorganisation Implications

14.1 The Memorial Gardens MUGA proposal will not proceed. The decision sought in this report is to select one alternative potential location for consultation only and does not create a commitment to deliver a scheme before Local Government Reorganisation or Vesting Day.

14.2 If, following consultation, Members later wish to progress a MUGA at the selected site, further approvals will be required. Any future proposal would need to take account of transition arrangements, available resources, funding requirements, procurement principles, contract approval requirements and the priorities of the successor authority.

15. Timetable for implementation

15.1 The current Memorial Gardens MUGA proposal will not proceed following the Environment & Sustainability Committee's decision on 10 September 2026. No further delivery timetable applies to that scheme. Officers will instead present this options paper to the November Committee for Members to select one alternative potential location for consultation.

15.2 If Members select a site, officers will commence a consultation exercise on that single location. The consultation findings, any site-specific feasibility issues, funding requirements and proposed next steps will be reported back to Members before any commitment is made to design, planning, procurement or delivery.

15.3 The indicative timetable, subject to Committee decision and officer capacity, is set out below;

Milestone	**Indicative date**
Consultation commencement date	27 November 2026
Consultation closes	8 January 2027
Report consultation results back to Committee	18 March 2027

16. Contact

16.1 Jackie Taylor, Group Head Neighbourhood Services *j.taylor@spelthorne.gov.uk*

Background papers: There are none

Appendices: There are none