

**17/00436/FUL**

**LAND NORTH OF SMITHERS CHASE, SUTTON ROAD,  
ROCHFORD**

**DEVELOPMENT OF FIRST TEAM TRAINING CENTRE WITH  
RELATED CAR PARKING, FOUR FOOTBALL PITCHES,  
STADIUM MATCH DAY PARKING, FLOOD ATTENUATION  
MEASURES, ACCESS, REFUSE STORAGE POINT AND  
LANDSCAPING**

**APPLICANT: SOUTHEND UNITED FOOTBALL CLUB**

**ZONING: METROPOLITAN GREEN BELT**

**PARISH: SUTTON PARISH COUNCIL**

**WARD: ROCHE SOUTH**

**1 RECOMMENDATION**

**1.1 It is proposed that the Committee RESOLVES**

That planning permission be approved, subject to the following conditions:-

**Timing**

- (1) The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

REASON: Required to be imposed pursuant to Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

- (2) The development hereby approved shall only be implemented concurrently with the construction of the stadium development or in accordance with a timetable to be submitted to and agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. Once agreed, such timetable shall be adhered to.

REASON: In the interests of the protection of the Green Belt as the development is approved under very special circumstances within the Green Belt linked to the wider stadium development.

**Plan list**

(3) The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out other than in accordance with the approved plans listed below:-

- 0901 – Perspective Views Training Centre
- 0900 - Perspective Views Training Centre
- 0302 – Detail Elevations Training Centre
- 0301 – Elevation East and West Training Centre
- 0300 – Elevation North and South Training Centre
- 0100 – L00 Plan Training Centre (ground floor plan)
- 0101 – L01 Plan Training Centre (first floor plan)
- 1230-1-012 Rev P2 – Landscape GA 12 of 14
- 1230-1-013 Rev P2 – Landscape GA 13 of 14
- 0000 – Site Plan Training Centre
- 0005 – Red Line Boundary
- 0102 – Roof Plan Training Centre
- 0200 – Section Gridline A and F Training Centre
- 0201 – Section Gridline J and K Training Centre
- 0202 – Section Gridline 2, 4 and 7 Training Centre
- 1230-1-001 Rev P2 – Landscape GA 1 of 14 – Landscape Masterplan

REASON: For the avoidance of doubt and to ensure that the development is completed in accordance with the details considered as part of the approved application.

**Materials/Design**

(4) No development shall commence to construct the training centre building hereby approved before details of all external facing (including windows and doors) and roofing materials to be used in the development, including samples, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Such materials as may be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority shall be those used in the development hereby permitted.

REASON: To enable the Local Planning Authority to retain adequate control over the appearance of the building, in the interests of amenity and in accordance with policy CP1 of the Core Strategy 2011 and policy DM1 of the Development Management Plan 2014.

(5) Prior to works commencing to construct the refuse store hereby approved, details and plans shall be submitted to and agreed in writing

with the Local Planning Authority of the design of the store, including materials to be used. Once agreed, the store shall be constructed on site in accordance with the plans and materials agreed.

REASON: To ensure that the store is to an acceptable design in the interests of visual amenity and in accordance with policy CP1 of the Core Strategy 2011 and policy DM1 of the Development Management Plan 2014.

### **Landscaping/Boundary Treatment**

- (6) No development shall commence to construct any boundary treatment before plans and particulars showing precise details of any gates, fences, walls or other means of screening or enclosure to be erected at the site have been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This shall also include security details to ensure that the car parking areas cannot be accessed without consent. Such details of screening or other means of enclosure as may be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority shall be erected prior to the first use of the site and thereafter maintained in the approved form.

REASON: To enable the Local Planning Authority to retain adequate control over such details of screening and/or means of enclosure, in the interests of visual amenity, the openness of the Green Belt and security and in accordance with policies CP1 and GB1 of the Core Strategy 2011 and policies DM1 and DM16 of the Development Management Plan 2014.

- (7) Before the development hereby permitted is commenced a scheme of soft landscaping shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme, as agreed, shall show the retention of the existing trees, shrubs and hedgerows that exist at the site and shall include details of a schedule of species, size, density and spacing of all trees/shrubs and hedgerows to be planted and in addition those areas to be turfed/grassed. It should also include details of any climbing and aquatic planting proposed.

The western, eastern and northern boundary of the site shall be formed by a native hedge and shall be planted in accordance with the approved details in the first planting season prior to the construction of the development hereby approved; the remainder of the soft landscaping shall be implemented in full in the first planting season following the completion of the development or in any such other phased arrangement as may be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Any tree, shrub or hedge plant (including replacement plants) removed, uprooted, destroyed, or be caused to die, or become seriously damaged or defective, within five years of planting, shall be

replaced by the developer(s) or their successors in title, with species of the same type, size and in the same location as those removed, in the first available planting season following removal.

REASON: In the interests of visual amenity, the openness of the Green Belt and the protection of existing hedgerows in accordance with policies CP1 and GB1 of the Core Strategy 2011 and policies DM1, DM16, DM25 and DM26 of the Development Management Plan 2014.

- (8) Before the development hereby permitted is commenced a scheme of hard landscaping shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This shall include permeable paving to the access road and first team parking area and reinforced grass to the match day parking area. Once agreed, the hard landscaping shall be installed on site in the agreed form and thereafter maintained in this form.

REASON: To ensure an acceptable hard standing scheme is provided in the interests of visual amenity, the openness of the Green Belt and ensuring sustainable drainage methods in accordance with policies CP1 and GB1 of the Core Strategy 2011, policies DM1 and DM16 of the Development Management Plan 2014 and paragraph 169 of the NPPF 2021.

#### **Use Restriction**

- (9) The match day car park hereby approved shall only be used on match days (and for a maximum of 3 other events per annum) and shall not be used for any other purpose unless previously agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

REASON: To control such usage in the interests of highway safety, residential amenity and the openness of the Green Belt in accordance with policies CP1 and GB1 of the Core Strategy 2011 and policies DM1, DM16 and DM31 of the Development Management Plan 2014.

- (10) Notwithstanding the provisions of Article 3, Schedule 2, Part 4, Classes A and B of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (as amended) the car parks and training pitches shall not be used for the siting of moveable structures, works, plant or machinery and shall not be used for fêtes, boot sales, BBQs or any festival function or fund raising event whether or not incidental to the approved use, including any such use for any temporary period (excluding for a maximum of 3 other events per annum), without the consent in writing from the Local Planning Authority.

REASON: In the interests of highway and safety and the openness of the Green Belt in accordance with policy GB1 of the Core Strategy 2011 and policies DM16 and DM31 of the Development Management Plan 2014.

- (11) The training centre building shall not be used for any purpose other than that identified within the approved drawings without the consent, in writing, of the Local Planning Authority.

REASON: To enable the Local Planning Authority to retain adequate control over such uses, in the interests of residential amenity and the openness of the Green Belt in accordance with policy GB1 of the Core Strategy 2011 and policies DM1 and DM16 of the Development Management Plan 2014.

### **Lighting**

- (12) Prior to first use of the development hereby approved a lighting impact assessment, including details of the lighting to the car parking areas and training centre building, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. These shall include the minimal quantum of lighting possible. The details as approved shall be implemented at the site prior to first use and shall be retained as such thereafter. No lighting shall be installed to the football pitches hereby approved.

REASON: In the interests of protecting ecology and neighbouring properties from unacceptable light spillage in accordance with policy DM5 of the Development Management Plan 2014.

### **Environmental**

- (13) No amplified speech/music or other form of public address system shall be broadcast or operated within any of the external areas of the site.

REASON: In the interests of protecting the residential amenity of neighbouring properties in accordance with policy DM1 of the Development Management Plan 2014.

- (14) Prior to works commencing a Construction Noise Management Plan shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. Once agreed, such Construction Noise Management Plan shall be implemented on site during the course of construction works.

REASON: In the interests of protecting the amenity of neighbouring properties in accordance with policy DM1 of the Development Management Plan 2014.

- (15) Prior to works commencing a dust mitigation plan shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. Once agreed, such dust mitigation shall be implemented on site during the course of construction works.

REASON: In the interests of protecting the amenity of neighbouring properties in accordance with policy DM1 of the Development Management Plan 2014.

### **Trees**

- (16) No development or any preliminary ground works shall take place until an updated arboricultural report and method statement have been submitted to and agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. This shall include the following:
- a. Details of all trees to be retained during the construction works and their protection by fencing of the 'HERAS' type or similar. The fencing shall be erected around the trees and positioned in accordance with British Standard 5837:2012 and the approved arboricultural report and;
  - b. Details of all weather notices prohibiting access to be erected on the fencing demarcating a construction exclusion zone.

Notwithstanding the above, no materials shall be stored or activity shall take place within the area enclosed by the fencing. No alteration, removal or repositioning of the fencing shall take place during the construction period without the prior written consent of the Local Planning Authority.

No works should be carried out within the Root Protection Area (RPA) unless provisions are made in a site specific arboricultural method statement and subsequently approved by the Local Planning Authority.

Unless otherwise approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, no retained tree shall be cut down, uprooted or destroyed, nor shall any retained tree's branches, stems or roots be pruned. The hedgerow to the eastern boundary shall be retained and protected during the course of the construction works.

REASON: In the interests of ensuring that existing trees and hedgerows are retained and protected at the site in accordance with policies DM25 and DM26 of the Development Management Plan 2014.

**Ecology**

- (17) Prior to works commencing a bat survey and further details regarding the lighting for the site to reduce impact on foraging bats, the removal of reptiles and details/recommendations for working in proximity to nesting birds shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. Once agreed, such details shall be implemented on site.

REASON: In the interests of protected species and ecology on and neighbouring the site in accordance with policy DM27 of the Development Management Plan 2014.

- (18) Prior to works commencing details of Green Infrastructure provision and landscape enhancements shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Once agreed, such Green Infrastructure provision and landscape enhancements shall be provided and be maintained thereafter in the agreed form.

REASON: In the interests of the development providing a positive contribution to local ecology.

**Sustainability**

- (19) The training centre building hereby approved shall meet the BREEAM rating of 'Very Good' unless this would make the development economically unviable. In which case details shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority demonstrating such lack of viability prior to works commencing to construct the building hereby approved.

REASON: To ensure the achievement of BREEAM standards in compliance with Core Strategy Policy ENV10.

- (20) Prior to first use of the training centre building hereby approved details shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority to demonstrate how at least 10 per cent of the energy from the building would be provided from a decentralised and renewable or low carbon source unless this is not feasible or viable or unless provision of such would be at the expense of provision of a higher specification energy efficient building fabric in which case a report demonstrating the case and the amount (decentralised/low carbon/renewable energy) that would be provided shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The measures, as agreed, shall be implemented prior to first use of the building.

REASON: To ensure an energy efficient building in accordance with Policy ENV8 of the Core Strategy 2011.

### Drainage

(21) No works, except demolition, shall take place until a detailed surface water drainage scheme for the site, based on sustainable drainage principles and an assessment of the hydrological and hydro geological context of the development, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme should include, but not be limited to:-

- Limiting discharge rates to the 14l/s for all storm events up to and including the 1 in 100 year rate plus 40% allowance for climate change.
- Provide sufficient storage to ensure no off site flooding as a result of the development during all storm events up to and including the 1 in 100 year plus 40% climate change event.
- Demonstrate that all storage features can half empty within 24 hours for the 1 in 30 plus 40% climate change critical storm event. In case the drain down time is more than 24 hours then demonstrate that SuDS features can accommodate a 1 in 10 year storm event within 24 hours of a 1 in 30 year event plus climate change.
- Final modelling and calculations for all areas of the drainage system.
- The appropriate level of treatment for all run off leaving the site, in line with the Simple Index Approach in chapter 26 of the CIRIA SuDS Manual C753.
- Detailed engineering drawings of each component of the drainage scheme.
- A final drainage plan which details exceedance and conveyance routes, FFL and ground levels, and location and sizing of any drainage features.
- A written report summarising the final strategy and highlighting any minor changes to the approved strategy.

The scheme shall subsequently be implemented prior to first use.

REASON:

- To prevent flooding by ensuring the satisfactory storage of/disposal of surface water from the site.
- To ensure the effective operation of SuDS features over the lifetime of the development.
- To provide mitigation of any environmental harm which may be caused to the local water environment



- Failure to provide the above required information before commencement of works may result in a system being installed that is not sufficient to deal with surface water occurring during rainfall events and may lead to increased flood risk and pollution hazard from the site.
  - In accordance with paragraph 169 of the NPPF 2021.
- (22) No works shall take place until a scheme to minimise the risk of off site flooding caused by surface water run off and ground water during construction works and prevent pollution has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall subsequently be implemented as approved.

REASON: The National Planning Policy Framework at paragraphs 152 to 173 state that local planning authorities should ensure development does not increase flood risk elsewhere and does not contribute to water pollution. Construction may lead to excess water being discharged from the site. If dewatering takes place to allow for construction to take place below ground water level, this will cause additional water to be discharged.

Furthermore, the removal of top soils during construction may limit the ability of the site to intercept rainfall and may lead to increased run off rates. To mitigate increased flood risk to the surrounding area during construction there needs to be satisfactory storage of/disposal of surface water and ground water which needs to be agreed before commencement of the development. Construction may also lead to polluted water being allowed to leave the site. Methods for preventing or mitigating this should be proposed.

- (23) Prior to first use, a maintenance plan detailing the maintenance arrangements including who is responsible for different elements of the surface water drainage system and the maintenance activities/frequencies shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Once agreed, such maintenance plan shall be implemented at the site. Should any part be maintainable by a maintenance company, details of long-term funding arrangements should be provided.

REASON: To ensure appropriate maintenance arrangements are put in place to enable the surface water drainage system to function as intended to ensure mitigation against flood risk in accordance with paragraph 169 of the NPPF 2021. Failure to provide the above required information before commencement of works may result in the installation of a system that is not properly maintained and may increase flood risk or pollution hazard from the site.

- (24) The applicant or any successor in title must maintain yearly logs of maintenance which should be carried out in accordance with any approved Maintenance Plan. These must be available for inspection upon request by the Local Planning Authority.

REASON: To ensure the SuDS are maintained for the lifetime of the development as outlined in any approved Maintenance Plan so that they continue to function as intended to ensure mitigation against flood risk in accordance with paragraph 169 of the NPPF 2021.

- (25) Prior to construction a scheme for on site foul water drainage works, including connection point and discharge rate, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Prior to the first use of any phase, the foul water drainage works relating to that phase must have been carried out in complete accordance with the approved scheme.

REASON: To prevent environmental and amenity problems arising from flooding.

### **Archaeology**

- (26) No development or preliminary ground works can commence until a programme of archaeological trial trenching has been secured and undertaken in accordance with a Written Scheme of Investigation, which has been submitted by the applicant, and approved by the Local Planning Authority.

Following the completion of this initial phase of archaeological work, a summary report will be prepared and a mitigation strategy detailing the approach to further archaeological excavation and/or preservation in situ through re-design of the development, shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority.

No development or preliminary ground work can commence on those areas of the development site containing archaeological deposits until the satisfactory completion of archaeological fieldwork, as detailed in the mitigation strategy, which has been signed off by the Local Planning Authority.

Following completion of the archaeological field work, the applicant will submit to the Local Planning Authority a post-excavation assessment (within six months of the completion date, unless otherwise agreed in advance with the planning authority), which will result in the completion of post-excavation analysis, preparation of a full site archive and report

ready for deposition at the local museum, and submission of a publication report.

REASON: In the interests of preserving any archaeological deposits present at the site.

### Highways

(27) Prior to works commencing to construct the parking areas hereby approved, a revised parking layout shall be submitted to and approved in writing with the Local Planning Authority for both the match day and training centre parking areas showing:

- a. Compliance with the 5.5m x 2.5m minimum parking bay sizes
- b. Details of disabled bays, powered two wheeler spaces and cycle parking to be provided to the match day parking area
- c. An additional disabled bay to the training centre car park

Once agreed, such spaces shall be hard surfaced, sealed and marked out in parking bays on site prior to first use of the development hereby approved, and be permanently retained thereafter. The vehicle parking area and associated turning area shall be retained in this form at all times. The vehicle parking shall not be used for any purpose other than the parking of vehicles that are related to the use of the development unless otherwise agreed with the Local Planning Authority.

REASON: To ensure that sufficient spaces are provided in accordance with the Parking Standards SPD 2010.

(28) The car parks, playing pitches and training building shall not be used until the new roundabout, pedestrian crossing and other highway works within Fossetts Way are completed.

REASON: To ensure that the necessary highway works are undertaken prior to any use of the car parks, playing pitches and training building.

(29) No unbound material shall be used in the surface treatment of the vehicular access within 6 metres of the highway boundary.

REASON: To avoid displacement of loose material onto the highway in the interests of highway safety.

(30) There shall be no discharge of surface water onto the highway.

REASON: To prevent hazards caused by water flowing onto the highway and to avoid the formation of ice on the highway in the interest of highway safety.

- (31) Prior to works commencing to construct the development hereby approved a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. The Statement shall include details for:
- i. the parking and manoeuvring of vehicles of site operatives and visitors
  - ii. loading and unloading of plant and materials
  - iii. storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development
  - iv. wheel and underbody washing facilities
  - v. routing of vehicles

Once agreed, the approved statement shall be adhered to throughout the construction period.

REASON: To ensure that on street parking of these vehicles in the adjoining streets does not occur and to ensure that loose materials and spoil are not brought out onto the highway in the interests of highway safety.

- (32) Any powered two-wheeler/cycle parking facilities shall be provided prior to the first use of the development and retained at all times for that use.

REASON: To ensure appropriate powered two-wheeler and bicycle parking is provided.

- (33) Prior to first use of the development hereby approved, a scheme for improvement of the Public Footpath (PROW 292\_16) to the north of the proposed training pitches between Sutton Road and the easternmost boundary of the site and for the 'Historic Green Lane' between this footpath and Clements Way (PROW 292\_1) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Once agreed, such improvement works shall be undertaken in accordance with the agreed details and prior to first use of the development hereby approved or within a timetable to be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

REASON: In the interests of reducing the need to travel by car and promoting sustainable development and transport.

- (34) Prior to first use of the development hereby approved, the developer shall submit a workplace travel plan to the Local Planning Authority for approval in consultation with Essex County Council. Such approved travel plan shall be actively implemented for a minimum period of 5 years. It shall be accompanied by a monitoring fee of £6,132 (plus the

relevant sustainable travel indexation) to be paid before first use to cover the 5-year period.

REASON: In the interests of reducing the need to travel by car and promoting sustainable development and transport.

- (35) Prior to first use of the development hereby approved details shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority in consultation with Essex County Council for a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) on match days inclusive of necessary signs and markings on Sutton Road from the RDC boundary to the junction of Shopland Road. Once agreed, the CPZ shall be implemented on site as agreed and for every match day/event whereby the match day parking is in use.

REASON: In the interests of reducing indiscriminate parking.

- (36) Prior to works commencing to construct the car parks hereby approved details of electric charging points shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. Once agreed, such points shall be installed on site and thereafter retained in the agreed form.

REASON: To ensure that sufficient electric charging points are provided in accordance with paragraph 107 of the NPPF.

- (37) Prior to first use of the match day car park hereby approved details of a barrier to control and limit movement from Smithers Chase to the approved match day car parking area shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Any controlled means of access to the car park shall be kept closed on all days that are not match days (excluding for a maximum of 3 other events per annum).

REASON: To ensure sufficient control over the vehicular movements in the interests of highway safety and residential amenity.

### **Playing Pitches**

- (38) No development of the playing pitches shall commence until the following documents have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority after consultation with Sport England:
- A. A detailed assessment of ground conditions (including drainage and topography) of the land proposed for the playing pitches which identifies constraints which could affect playing pitch quality; and

- B. Based on the results of the assessment to be carried out pursuant to (i) above, a detailed scheme which ensures that the playing pitches will be provided to an acceptable quality. The scheme shall include a written specification of soil structure, proposed drainage, cultivation and other operations associated with grass and sports turf establishment and a programme of implementation.

The approved scheme shall be carried out in full and in accordance with a timeframe agreed with the Local Planning Authority. The land shall thereafter be maintained in accordance with the scheme and made available for playing pitch use in accordance with the scheme.

REASON: To ensure that the playing pitches are prepared to an adequate standard and are fit for purpose.

## **2 PLANNING APPLICATION DETAILS**

2.1 The application is for a new training pitch facility for Southend United Football Club (SUFC). The development proposed includes the following:-

- Four full sized (105m x 68m) grassed football pitches - for use as training pitches for the first team and academy and for match day games for the academy and youth teams. The pitches would be level with each pitch and located on a terrace in order to achieve flat pitches on sloping ground. The pitch levels increase in height from west (lowest) to east (highest);
- Erection of a two-storey building - to provide training centre, changing facilities and other ancillary uses and creation of 40 spaces for associated car parking. The building would incorporate a balcony along its eastern elevation and would use modern materials in its design, including a grassed roof which would slope downwards across its western elevation. Earth bunds would be formed to the west and north of the building. To the south of the building would be 40 parking spaces and a refuse storage point. Internally, the building would include:
  - Ground floor – 5 academy changing rooms, under 21s changing room, main changing room, 2 plant rooms, male and female staff changing rooms, 2 lifts (one service), bin store, pitch store, reception, 2 stores, academy gym, gym store, first team gym, medical/physio room, boots off room, warm up room and 3 referee changing rooms.
  - First floor – 3 plant rooms, 2 lifts (one service), 9 toilet cubicles, 2 academy offices, manager's office, manager's toilet cubicle, store, match analysis room, communal room, dining room and kitchen.

The building would measure 57m wide and 23m deep with a maximum height of 8.7m and it would have a plant area inset within its roof.

- Creation of a flood attenuation pond and;
- Provision of 832 parking spaces - for match day parking in connection with the proposed new football stadium (located within the Southend-on-Sea Borough).

2.2 This application is associated with a larger development to provide a new football stadium and further training facilities for SUFC alongside other development including soccer domes and residential accommodation (full description in planning history section below). This development falls within the Southend-on-Sea Borough and the planning application for this was considered at a Development Committee meeting on 25 October 2021. Members agreed with the recommendation to approve and the application has now been submitted to the Secretary of State for consideration.

### **3 MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

#### **Site and Context**

- 3.1 The application site is on the eastern side of Sutton Road and also lies to the north of Smithers Chase and a road known as Fossetts Way. The site consists of approximately 9 hectares of undeveloped agricultural land.
- 3.2 To the north is agricultural land and an agricultural building as well as the residential dwellings 1 – 11 Templegate Cottages, a row of 2 storey semi-detached and terraced houses. To the south are the residential dwellings 1 and 2 Smithers Cottages which are 2 storey semi-detached houses and Smithers Farm. To the east is further agricultural land and a pond.
- 3.3 Public footpath No.16 runs along the northern and eastern boundaries of the site. Smithers Chase forms the boundary between Rochford District Council (RDC) and Southend Borough Council (SBC).
- 3.4 There is a ditch located within flood zone 2 that is located within close proximity to the north-western most corner of the application site and runs in a north-easterly direction towards the River Roach.

#### **Relevant Planning History**

- 3.5 11/00224/TIME - Application to Extend Time Limit of Planning Permission 06/00943/FUL - Creation of Three Training Pitches, One All Weather Floodlit Training Pitch (8 x 12m Columns) A Flood Attenuation Pond and Surface Car Park of 454 Spaces 34 x 8m Columns. APPROVED.
- 3.6 06/00943/FUL - Creation of Three Training Pitches, One All Weather Floodlit Training Pitch (8 x 12m Columns) A Flood Attenuation Pond and Surface Car Park of 454 Spaces 34 x 8m Columns. ALLOWED ON APPEAL.

**Southend-on-Sea Borough Council Applications**

- 3.7 17/00733/FULM - Hybrid planning application for part full and part outline consent for phased development for relocation of Southend United Football Club comprising: Full Application for the erection of 21,000 seat football stadium comprising east, west, south and north stands basement excavation changing rooms; ticket office; club shop; food drink concessions; café/restaurant: temporary stadium works including: erect end stand cladding, press seats and workroom, directors' seating and box, scoreboard and floodlights: stadium parking, new vehicular access from Fossetts Way, pedestrian access from Sutton Road and related ancillary works: stadium north stand, to include 107 bed hotel, conference floor space and two residential corners to stadium of 4-6 additional storeys, 182 units: erect fan plaza residential building of 72 units with ground floor sporting and community floor space of 890sqms (sui generis), 5-7 storeys, ground floor, parking, landscaping, access and related ancillary works; erect two residential buildings Fossetts Way north 42 units and south 51 units of 6-7 storeys and 4-7 storeys, car parking, access, landscaping and ancillary works; erect two soccer domes, changing facilities, classrooms, players' hostel accommodation, parking and landscaping; Outline Application (with all matters reserved except means of access) for demolition of existing training centre and club house; erect buildings ranging in height from 1-9 storeys to provide a total of up to 118,000 sqms (GIA) of residential floor space (up to 1,114 units), other commercial floor space of up to 1,609 sqms (Use Class E) and up to 280 sqms community use (Use Classes F1/ F2); car parking; servicing; landscaping; new public realm; access from Eastern Avenue, related ancillary works. Considered at a Development Committee meeting on 25 October 2021. MEMBERS AGREED WITH THE RECOMMENDATION TO APPROVE AND THE APPLICATION HAS NOW BEEN SUBMITTED TO THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR CONSIDERATION.
- 3.8 16/00654/RSO - Relocation of Southend United Football Club, New Stadium, Phased Development of Hotel, Offices, Cinema, Residential, Training Grounds, Soccer Dome and Player Accommodation with Associated Parking and Landscaping on Land North of Eastern Avenue Southend-on-Sea (at Fossetts Farm and Southend United FC Training Ground) (Request for Scoping Opinion). SCOPING/SCREENING OPINION ISSUED
- 3.9 15/01603/RSO - Relocation of Southend United Football Club, hotel, offices, retail, cinema, residential, training ground, soccer dome and player accommodation with associated parking and landscaping (Request for Scoping Opinion). SCOPING/SCREENING OPINION ISSUED
- 3.10 15/00281/RSO - Relocation of Southend United Football Club, hotel, offices, retail, cinema, residential, training ground, soccer dome and player accommodation with associated parking and landscaping (Request for Scoping Opinion). SCOPING/SCREENING OPINION ISSUED



- 3.11 11/00965/FULM - Revised planning application for demolition of a nightclub and football training facilities; 67 residential units, 22,000 seater stadium, erect A1 retail units totalling 18,878sqm gross (including 1,400sqm gross of food); erect three A3 units of 909sqm floor space, erect D2 health club of 2,370sqm floor space, a casino of 2,098 sqm floor space, stadium hub café (A3) and bar (A4) of 1,307 sqm floor space; training academy of 3,732sqm of floor space, layout of parking and cycle spaces, associated landscaping and access works (Amended Proposal)
- 3.12 11/00538/EXTM - Demolish Nightclub And Training Facilities; Erect 22, 000 Seat Football Stadium Including 114 Bedroom Hotel, Conference Floor space, Players' Hostel, Food And Drink Concessions, Bars And Other Ancillary Facilities; erect 67 flats with basement parking, erect retail units (Class A1) totalling 16,400 sq metres of floor space of which at least 20% shall be restricted to bulky/DIY goods, erect restaurant (Class A3) comprising 279 sq metres of floor space, erect health club (Class D2) totalling 3205 sq metres of floor space, lay out parking and cycle spaces and associated landscaping and form vehicular accesses onto Eastern Avenue and Fossetts Farm Link Road (application to extend the time limit for implementation following planning permission 06/01300/FULM granted 30/06/2008) DECISION UNKNOWN.
- 3.13 11/00479/RSE - Demolish nightclub and football training facilities, erect 22,000 seater football stadium including 114 bedroom hotel, conference floor space, players' hostel, food and drink concessions, bars and other ancillary facilities, erect 67 flats with basement parking, erect retail units (Class A1) totalling 16,400 sq metres of floor space of which at least 20% shall be restricted to bulky/DIY goods, erect restaurant (Class A3) comprising 279 sq metres of floor space, erect health club (Class D2) totalling 3205 sq metres of floor space, lay out parking and cycle spaces and associated landscaping and form vehicular accesses onto Eastern Avenue and Fossetts Farm Link Road - Renewal of application 06/01300/FUL (Request for Screening Opinion). SCOPING/SCREENING OPINION ISSUED
- 3.14 10/02179/RSO - Relocation of Southend United Football Club/hotel and retail development: Revisions to phase 2 the retail and leisure element comprising: Replacement of some of the A1 non food floor space by approximately 1,400Sqm retail floor space within unit AA; increase in gross retail floor space of overall 14%, Three A3 units comprising 839 sqm floor space; Stadium A3/A hub of 1254 sqm with two units; A football academy of 3578sqm at first floor, casino 2139sqm at first floor, amendments to retail/leisure car park. SCOPING/SCREENING OPINION ISSUED
- 3.15 09/01783/RSE - Relocation of Southend United Football Club/Hotel and Retail Development: revisions to Phase 2 the retail and leisure element comprising: Reduced A1 non food content from 16,400 GIA to 12,432 sqm, replacement of the A1 non food floor space with a 5,766 sqm retail food store; One A3 unit (326sqm), Stadium hub (2,113sqm) with two A3 units, Football Academy (2,766sqm), first floor casino (2,139sqm), ancillary amendments to the

retail/leisure car park nos. (increase to 731 max) and layout (Request for Screening Opinion).

- 3.16 06/01300/FUL - Demolish nightclub and training facilities; erect 22, 000 seat football stadium including 114-bedroom hotel, conference floor space, players' hostel, food and drink concessions, bars and other ancillary facilities; erect part five / part six / part seven block comprising 127 flats with 192 basement parking spaces; erect 15 retail units totalling 22, 682 sq. metres of floor space; erect restaurant (279 sq. metres) , lay out 1110 car parking spaces and cycle parking spaces and associated landscaping and form vehicular accesses onto Eastern Avenue and Fossetts Farm Link Road | Part Of Fossetts Farm And SUFC Training Ground North Of Eastern Avenue Southend-on-Sea Essex. GRANT CONDITIONAL PERMISSION
- 3.17 06/01021/RSO - Relocation of Southend United Football Club / Hotel, Residential and Retail Development. SCOPING/SCREENING OPINION ISSUED
- 3.18 00/00700/OUT - Demolish nightclub and training facilities; erect 16,000 seat football stadium, 80-bed hotel and leisure complex (21400 sq.m) lay out car and coach parks, form vehicular accesses onto Sutton Road and Eastern Avenue and form lagoon (outline). APPLICATION WITHDRAWN.

### **Principle of Development**

- 3.19 The proposed development has to be assessed against relevant planning policy and with regard to any other material planning considerations. In determining this application regard must be had to section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires proposals to be determined in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.
- 3.20 The relevant parts of the adopted Development Plan are the Rochford District Core Strategy (2011), the Allocations Plan (2014) and the Development Management Plan (2014).
- 3.21 In considering the acceptability of the current proposal regard should be had to the fallback position which exists as a result of a material start having been made to the development approved under the 2011 planning consent. Planning permission exists for the development of 4 training pitches, a surface car park of 454 spaces and flood attenuation pond and this development can be implemented at the site.
- 3.22 The differences between the 2011 consent and the current proposal are:-
- An all weather floodlit training pitch has been removed and replaced with a standard football pitch (the planning statement advises that this is because the all weather pitch for the Club's academy will now be provided within the small soccer dome in the SBC site for exclusive use by SUFC). No

floodlighting is now proposed to the pitches.

- A two storey building to provide a training centre, changing facilities and other ancillary uses and creation of 40 spaces of associated car parking is now proposed.
- 832 parking spaces for occasional stadium parking are now proposed in comparison to the 454 spaces previously approved.

- 3.23 The training centre for Southend's first team is specifically designed for the professional needs of SUFC, associated with the combined use of the adjacent training pitches, match days at the stadium and future progression of the club through the football leagues. It is important in the consideration of the first team training centre to understand how a professional football club operates. The first team currently competes in the National Football League although in the last 5 years they have also competed in leagues one and two. The club also has a full under 23 squad. Competing for and retaining first team players is a highly competitive commercial arena. Players have a choice of many clubs and will assess not only the financial offer but the training, education and sport science facilities, all of which contribute to the dynamics of a football club and attractiveness of the offer. The new facilities support the club's quest for promotion from the National Football League to league two and beyond.
- 3.24 Due to the elite nature of the first team, they require a significant level of facilities in the training centre with football training pitches adjacent with a high level of privacy, due to active scouting/competition for new talent.
- 3.25 The training centre facilities are divided across two levels, with the players' facilities on the ground floor and the support accommodation on the first floor. The club also coaches players from the ages of 7 through to third year scholars aged 19. Due to the range of levels and ages of the teams, a variety of changing rooms are required. A gym is also required for warm up/training, which is predominantly for use by the first team.
- 3.26 The communal room, dining room and kitchen are integral to the operation of any sporting clubhouse and the location, next to the terrace, allows for spectators (most importantly to include parents of young academy players) and represents an important ingredient as the parents of Academy players can then witness first-hand the level of support and tuition available to their children and to view the match on the closest pitch from indoors.
- 3.27 SUFC also has an under 23s team and an academy for youth players. Each of these teams has different requirements for training facilities. The training centre is mainly proposed for the first team and the academy u23s will mainly use the soccer dome within SBC. On league matchdays, the pitches and facilities would be used by the youth and academy players.

- 3.28 The office and training accommodation on the first floor is required for the operation of an elite club and must be located in the training building, due to the use of the training centre throughout the week and weekends and the impracticality of locating these facilities on the stadium site due to the distance from the training facilities. This accommodation is for the running of the training centre, ancillary to the main office accommodation for the club in the stadium and similar accommodation in the academy soccer dome. The stadium is for matchdays only and would be inappropriate for training.
- 3.29 SUFC considers that all of the facilities within the training centre are essential to the operation of an elite level football club and the proposed size is commensurate with the level of professionalism of the club, and no larger than required.
- 3.30 The key material planning considerations for consideration in the determination of this application are:-
- Green Belt
  - Character and appearance
  - Residential amenity
  - Playing Pitches
  - Noise
  - Sustainability
  - Highways
  - Flood Risk and Sustainable Urban Drainage (SUD's)
  - Air Quality
  - Archaeology
  - Refuse
  - Trees
  - Ecology
  - Light pollution

**Green Belt**

- 3.31 The application site is located within the Metropolitan Green Belt as defined in Rochford District Council's adopted Allocations Proposals Map (2014), where national and local policies apply controlling development.

- 3.32 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) should be considered alongside the Council's Development Plan Policies. Policies GB1 and GB2 of the Core Strategy seek to direct development away from the Green Belt as far as practicable and prioritise the protection of the Green Belt based on how well the land helps achieve the purposes of the Green Belt, whilst allowing rural diversification in appropriate circumstances. Policy GB2 does allow for outdoor recreation and leisure activities, including changing rooms connected with a sports use. Both policies pre-date the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) but can still attract weight in proportion to their consistency with the NPPF. These policies reflect the aims of those parts of the NPPF which seek to protect the Green Belt from inappropriate development. However, they do not reflect the exceptions listed within the NPPF which would also be a material consideration.
- 3.33 The NPPF re-iterates the importance of protecting the openness of the Green Belt. Paragraph 145 of the NPPF states that a local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in the Green Belt subject to certain exceptions. A handful of exceptions apply and the only one applicable to this application is exception (b) that allows for the provision of appropriate facilities (in connection with the existing use of land or a change of use) for outdoor sport or outdoor recreation, as long as the facilities preserve the openness of the Green Belt and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it.
- 3.34 Certain other forms of development are also not inappropriate in the Green Belt provided they preserve its openness and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it; this would include material changes in the use of land such as changes of use for outdoor sport. The proposed change of use of the land for the development of training pitches and surface car parking would amount to material changes in the use of the land and would fall to be considered against paragraph 146, criteria (e) of the NPPF.
- 3.35 Green Belt policy has not changed since the determination of the 2006 application which proposed four training pitches, a flood attenuation pond and surface car park of 454 spaces. An Inspector reasoned, on appeal, that this development was not objectionable in Green Belt terms. Therefore consideration around Green Belt impact relates predominantly to the building and the increased quantity of parking spaces now proposed.
- 3.36 An assessment must be made as to whether the building proposed in this application can be considered an appropriate facility for outdoor sport and, if so, whether the building would preserve the openness of the Green Belt and not conflict with the purpose of including land within it. If the proposed building would not satisfy the above requirements, it would be regarded as inappropriate development in the Green Belt which would be harmful by definition and should not be approved unless very special circumstances exist that would clearly outweigh the harm to the Green Belt that would result by definition and any other harm.

- 3.37 The NPPF advises that local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt. Additionally, policy DM16 of the Development Management Plan seeks to ensure ancillary facilities associated with the provision of playing pitches are modest in size, bulk and height to minimise the impact on the Green Belt.

### **Proposed Building**

- 3.38 Whilst the NPPF deems new buildings in the Green Belt as inappropriate development, the proposed building would be used to facilitate outdoor sports and recreation constituting an appropriate form of development in the Green Belt. However, such buildings must still preserve the openness of the Green Belt and should not conflict with the purposes of including land within it.
- 3.39 The NPPF identifies the fundamental aim of the Green Belt as “to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence”. The Green Belt has both a spatial and a visual dimension and the impact on openness has to take account of both. In a spatial sense, any building on land that was previously free of development will have some impact on the openness of the Green Belt. In assessing the harm to openness in a visual sense, the impact on openness may be greater if the site is particularly visible and open to boundaries. The character of the existing site and surroundings will influence the degree of harm to the Green Belt by way of visual intrusion.
- 3.40 Policy DM16 of the Development Management Plan specifically requires a small-scale facility to be provided with playing pitches and that it can be demonstrated that such facilities are essential for the functioning of the activity.
- 3.41 The proposed building would comprise training facilities used by SUFC. The scale of the proposed building is two storeys in nature and is considered to be significant. While comparative information has not been provided about the SUFC existing training centre building, it is considered the training facility has been designed specifically to meet the SUFC current and future needs. It would appear that the range and quality of facilities in the proposed building would either be equivalent or superior to the existing facilities that would be replaced.
- 3.42 The design and appearance of the proposed building has responded to its Green Belt location by sinking the building and earth mounding three sides of the building which would be grassed. Due to its sunken design and grassed sloping roof, the proposed building would not be overtly visible from public views around the site. Nevertheless, the provision of a building on this site, which is currently free from built form, would remove the open aspect of this area of land, and as such the proposal would have a significant impact on the openness of the Green Belt.

- 3.43 Considering the above, the proposed building is not small scale and would be regarded as inappropriate development as it fails to preserve the openness of the Green Belt due to its significant scale contrary to paragraph 145 (b) of the NPPF and policy DM16 of the Development Management Plan. Inappropriate development should not be approved except in very special circumstances that clearly outweigh the harm to the Green Belt and any other harm.
- 3.44 Whilst the proposed building would represent inappropriate development, it is necessary to consider whether any very special circumstances exist to outweigh the harm identified to the Green Belt. The very special circumstances in this case are:
- The need for a new stadium is clearly demonstrated and this cannot be met at the existing Roots Hall Stadium;
  - There are no other more suitable, available or viable stadium sites;
  - The new stadium will provide major socio-economic benefits enhancing the club's existing facilities and securing its presence in the Borough/District boosting its long term cultural and sporting association;
  - On its own the club is a commercial enterprise employing a significant number of people on a full and part time basis across a wide range of skilled, semi-skilled and unskilled jobs. By requiring goods and services locally it contributes to the local economy;
  - The club's charitable community and education programmes run by SUCET, tackle social problems, ill health, crime and academic under achievement in all sectors of the local community, regardless of race, sex or age. SUCET has been particularly successful in reaching out to the wards of the borough affected by high levels of deprivation and crosses over the district boundaries into Rochford and Castle Point. It is constrained in growing these programmes by the club's existing facilities, which are not fully accessible to all and are out dated;
  - The social, economic and regeneration benefits arising in line with the South Essex Partnership's joint working with the South East Local Enterprise Partnership (SELEP) to support regeneration and growth within the borough to unlock the growth potential of South Essex including the delivery of temporary jobs during construction; and
  - Community Fund – there are large public realm areas across the application site that the applicant has suggested would benefit from a local partnership initiative, represented by local key stakeholders and new residents of the scheme to promote collective aims around "placemaking", creating a "strong community" and promoting "wellbeing", "climate change objectives" and "maximising opportunities to engage with nature". The formation of a Community Fund would facilitate these objectives.
- 3.45 With reference to the above paragraph, it is considered that 'very special circumstances' have been demonstrated which clearly outweigh the harm caused by inappropriateness. It is also considered that the design of the proposed building mitigates the harm caused to the Green Belt. Acceptance of such very special circumstances is considered to be dependent upon the

acceptability of the main stadium development within the SBC area. A condition similar to that imposed on the appeal decision should be imposed here ensuring that the car park, training centre, pitches and ancillary facilities are only constructed concurrently with the wider stadium development.

### **Proposed Additional Surface Car Parking**

- 3.46 A Planning Inspector (PI) reasoned, on appeal, that *“the provision of a car park of 454 spaces would not in itself have an adverse effect on openness while vehicles would be parked on the land intermittently, for relatively limited periods of time and on a relatively small number of days (some 20) in the year”*. It was therefore not considered to be inappropriate development in the Green Belt.
- 3.47 Although it has previously been established by the PI that the car park was not an inappropriate form of development in the Green Belt, the proposed car park has to be considered in the context of the current application. The proposed stadium parking numbers are proposed to increase to 832 spaces. The same principles, however, have been applied to use materials such as grasscrete and landscape treatments that retain the rural countryside character and that on non-match days it would retain field like qualities. It is estimated that the car park would be used for approximately 20 days per year related to stadium activities. For the remainder of the time, it would remain as an open space. It is considered that the car park area has been sympathetically designed to ensure it has a limited impact upon the openness of the Green Belt and therefore is considered acceptable in the context of the NPPF. The PI previously imposed a condition to allow for parking of cars, coaches or buses only on match days. This condition is recommended to be re-imposed.

### **Character and Appearance**

- 3.48 The planning system promotes high quality development through good inclusive design and layout, and the creation of safe, sustainable, liveable and mixed communities. Good design should be indivisible from good planning. Recognised principles of good design seek to create a high quality built environment for all types of development. The importance is reflected in the NPPF which states at paragraph 124 that:

*“The creation of high quality buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, creates better places in which to live and work and helps make development acceptable to communities.”* And goes on to state at paragraph 130 that *“Permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions, taking into account local design standards, style guides in plans or supplementary planning documents.”*



- 3.49 Policy CP1 of the Core Strategy promotes good, high quality design that has regard to local flavour while policy DM1 of the Development Management Plan explains that the design of new developments should promote the character of the locality to ensure that the development positively contributes to the surrounding natural and built environment and residential amenity. Both these policies are applicable to the design consideration of this application.
- 3.50 The proposed layout would create areas of car parking for both match days and the training pitches, a balancing pond, a two storey building and four training pitches. A dedicated vehicular and pedestrian access would be provided from Fossetts Way.
- 3.51 The proposed area of car parking for match days would be reinforced grass; the surface material proposed would be acceptable as it is not considered to have a significant detrimental impact upon the existing verdant character of the site. The idea is that on non match days the area would retain the appearance of an empty field. Similarly, the proposed training pitches would be laid to grass and the proposed attenuation pond would be heavily landscaped as a wildlife meadow. The pond would also feature an island which would become a safe habitat for birds and wildlife.
- 3.52 The proposed area of car parking to be used in association with the training pitches would be laid to hardstanding. The proposed building would be two storeys in height. The ground floor contains all of the training facilities, changing rooms, gyms and players' facilities. The first floor contains all of the support facilities, classrooms, offices and administrative facilities for the players. The roof form would slope in the western direction blending the building into the landscape and minimising its visual impact.
- 3.53 A contemporary and simplistic aesthetic design approach has been applied to the proposed building with large amounts of glazing along the eastern and southern elevation and a balcony to the eastern façade, recessed into the form of the building. The external materials, other than glazing, would be dark grey metal clad sections, British Western Red Cedar louvred cladding and Timber mullion curtain walling, with the timber cladding intended to appear like fences within the landscape.
- 3.54 The building has been designed with regard to its Green Belt location using a roof form sympathetic to its environment. Views from the North and West would see a green roof, grass landscaped banks and climbing plants on stainless steel wires with red cedar cladding above. This would assist in limiting the harshness of built form from some of the most sensitive perspectives. The view from the south would also be relatively sympathetic using red cedar timber walling and glazing followed by the football club's advertising. The eastern perspective would have the most stark impact of the elevations with an elongated elevation using red cedar timber walling and timber mullion curtain walling. However, such walling is still considered to represent a sympathetic material to its setting within the Green Belt and would assist in softening the impact of this building.

- 3.55 The ECC Urban Design team does not object to the proposal but seeks further information regarding the soft landscaping to the pond area, material samples and details including material samples of the refuse store, all controlled by planning condition. They do raise concern with regard to the use of vehicular bitmac for the access road and first team parking. They suggest alternatives such as permeable bitmac and permeable block paving. A condition requiring details of the hard landscaping to be agreed should be attached to an approval to improve on the hard landscaping proposed.
- 3.56 There is a Scheduled Ancient Monument (SAM) 'Prittlewell Camp Hillfort' to the south-east, outside of the application site. ECC Historic Buildings adviser has raised no objection to the application. They do advise that Historic England be consulted; however, such consultation did occur by Southend Borough Council as part of the wider development scheme which is closer to, and would have a far greater impact on, the SAM. Therefore, it is not considered necessary to consult Historic England as part of the Rochford element of the scheme alone.
- 3.57 With regard to boundary treatment, the proposal seeks to include gentle mounding around the training pitches and training building of between 1m and 3m high planted with native shrub, coppice and woodland species. Further extensive perimeter planting comprising of a native field hedge is also proposed around the match day parking area. Timber rail fencing is proposed to the northern boundary with the training pitches. The suggested boundary treatments are likely to be considered acceptable; more detail should be required by planning condition.

### **Residential amenity**

- 3.58 The site adjoins the rear gardens of residential properties and, as such, it is necessary to consider the impact of the proposed development on the occupiers of those properties.
- 3.59 The nearest neighbouring properties are located to the south in Smithers Chase adjacent to the site's southern boundary with an approximate separation distance of 70m between the rear elevation of the cottages and the proposed training pitches and the approximate same distance between the rear of the cottages and the training centre building. Neighbouring properties located to the north in Sutton Road are approximately 175m between the proposed training centre and rear elevations. Such distances would ensure that the proposal would not generate unacceptable overlooking and would not be overbearing on neighbouring properties.
- 3.60 Smithers Chase cottages would inevitably receive some disturbance from the parking of vehicles on the neighbouring match day and training centre parking areas. However, the attenuation pond with wildflower meadow would finish close to the boundary with these properties and there would also be a soft landscaped buffer between the parking areas and the boundaries with these properties. In addition, the match day parking area would only be used on

around 20 days of the year. On this basis, it is not considered that the noise impact generated by these parking areas would be sufficiently detrimental to the occupiers of Smithers Chase to justify refusal of this application. The properties at Temple Gate cottages would be separated from the match day parking by an area of land along with native hedging to the boundary of the car park which would also assist in reducing impact on these properties. A more detailed noise assessment is undertaken within the noise section of the report.

### Playing Pitches

- 3.61 The application includes the proposal for four natural turf playing pitches. These are to replace those that would be lost within the Southend area, on the existing training ground site, as a result of residential development occurring within the wider scheme. Paragraphs 92 to 103 of the NPPF focus on promoting health and safe communities. At paragraph 98 it advises that *‘access to a network of high quality open spaces and opportunities for sport and physical activity is important for the health and well-being of communities, and can deliver wider benefits for nature and support efforts to address climate change’*. It then goes on at paragraph 99 to state that:
- 99. Existing open space, sports and recreational buildings and land, including playing fields, should not be built on unless:*
- (a) an assessment has been undertaken which has clearly shown the open space, buildings or land to be surplus to requirements; or*
  - (b) the loss resulting from the proposed development would be replaced by equivalent or better provision in terms of quantity and quality in a suitable location; or*
  - (c) the development is for alternative sports and recreational provision, the benefits of which clearly outweigh the loss of the current or former use.*
- 3.62 The proposal falls within part (b) as it would represent replacement pitches that would form equivalent to or better provision in terms of quantity and quality in a suitable location being in close proximity to the newly approved stadium development and with a training centre building alongside it.
- 3.63 Sport England has responded to the application. Whilst it did not raise a holding objection to the proposal it did ask for further information to be provided around whether a sports pitch feasibility study for the proposed football pitches had been prepared to assess the ground conditions of the new training ground site, along with a query about the phasing of the works.
- 3.64 Upon further consultation with both the agent and Sport England it has been considered that a condition to address the matters raised by Sport England should be attached to an approval. This will ensure that the pitches are provided to a good quality and within an agreed timeframe.

## Noise

- 3.65 Paragraph 180 of the NPPF refers to environmental noise and seeks to *“ensure that new development is appropriate for its location taking into account the likely effects (including cumulative effects) of pollution on health, living conditions and the natural environment, as well as the potential sensitivity of the site or the wider area to impacts that could arise from the development. In doing so they should:*
- a) mitigate and reduce to a minimum potential adverse impacts resulting from noise from new development – and avoid noise giving rise to significant adverse impacts on health and the quality of life;*
  - b) identify and protect tranquil areas which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their recreational and amenity value for this reason; and*
  - c) limit the impact of light pollution from artificial light on local amenity, intrinsically dark landscapes and nature conservation.”*
- 3.66 The training centre and pitches would generate a higher level of activity than the current use of the site. Consideration has been given to the impact of noise upon surrounding residential amenity as the proposal would result in the use of the site being intensified.
- 3.67 A Noise Impact Assessment (NIA) accompanies this application which measured noise levels at the following nearest receptors: -
- Smithers Cottages
  - Sutton Road Crematorium
  - 682 Sutton Road (Rear Garden)
  - 503 Sutton Road (Front Garden)
  - A1159
  - Wellesley Hospital (Car Park) and
  - 684 Sutton Road
- 3.68 The grass training pitches would be used during daytime hours only. The noise associated with these pitches would be mainly whistles and communications during training. The noise impact of these activities at the residential receptors would be negligible. Football matches and concerts would take place in the main football stadium, the noise emanating from these events has been considered by SBC as the stadium falls within its borough.
- 3.69 The area of car parking (40 spaces) is proposed to be allocated for the training centre. Traffic generated by the training facility would be minimal and therefore would have a negligible impact upon the nearest residential receptors. It is considered this proposed area of car parking and its use would not significantly contribute towards the overall impact of road traffic noise.
- 3.70 The stadium car parking would produce additional noise on match days; however, as this is for occasional parking rather than any form of regular

parking the impact is not considered to be significant overall. A planning condition should be imposed, as was imposed on the previous appeal decision, limiting the use of the car park to match days only (excluding a maximum of 3 additional days within the year for other events) to ensure such noise impact is limited to just these days.

- 3.71 There would be inevitable construction noise during the course of works to construct the development. The NIA explains that the predicted noise levels are considered to be significant when they increase the existing ambient noise levels by 5 dB and are above 65 dB (daytime threshold). This occurs at Smithers Farm during most of the construction activities when construction occurs at its closest point. The NIA identifies some mitigation measures to assist during construction and explains that a Construction Noise Management Plan would be produced. This could be controlled by planning condition.
- 3.72 The Council's Environmental Health adviser was consulted for their views on the proposal. They initially raised concern due to the lack of data relating to the impact upon the residential dwellings at Smithers Chase cottages and Temple Gate Cottages. However, further information was provided by the agent's noise consultant detailing an indicative schedule of activities for training and matches by location across the academy and senior teams. The Council's adviser now considers that, given the distance separations to receptors and the regular, limited durations of the training and match activities, noise disturbance from the training facilities have been suitably considered and no mitigation is required.
- 3.73 In light of the above, given the acceptable separation distance between the proposed training centre and pitches to the adjoining residential properties and the comments from the Council's Environmental Health adviser, the noise levels associated with the proposed training facility would have no material detrimental impact on residential amenity, and is in accordance with the NPPF and NPPG.

### **Sustainability**

- 3.74 To ensure the delivery of sustainable development, non-residential buildings are required to incorporate sustainable design features to reduce carbon emissions and the consumption of natural resources. Policy ENV10 of the Core Strategy requires all new non-residential buildings over 1000 square metres of floor area to meet the 'very good' standard of the Building Research Establishment Environmental Assessment Method (BREEAM) as a minimum.
- 3.75 Policy ENV8 of the Core Strategy also requires that developments of the scale proposed secure at least 10 per cent of their energy from decentralised and renewable or low-carbon sources.
- 3.76 A BREEAM pre-assessment has been submitted with the application which identifies credits that the proposed building would likely achieve in order that

the 'very good' standard would be met. The submitted supporting document identifies that the building would be assessed under the BREEAM UK New Construction (2018) scheme. A condition is recommended to require that the proposed building achieves the 'very good' BREEAM standard as a minimum and secures at least 10 per cent of its energy from a renewable/low-carbon source.

## Highways

### *Access and Infrastructure Improvements*

- 3.77 Policy T1 of the Council's Core Strategy requires that development be located and designed in such a way as to reduce reliance on the private car but accepts that some impact on the highway network is inevitable and identifies that the Council will work with developers and the Highway Authority to ensure that appropriate improvements are carried out. Policy T2 of the Core Strategy identifies the Council's intention to work with Essex County Council (ECC) Highway Authority to ensure that highway improvements are implemented.
- 3.78 The intended access arrangements include a 4-arm roundabout within Fossetts Way which would provide access to the north to the training pitches, stadium parking and training centre building. Smithers Chase would not be used for access to these facilities.
- 3.79 ECC Highways has responded to the application and advised that it recommends approval, subject to conditions. This includes the need for a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) on match days, a travel plan and upgrade to the public footpath to the north. Originally a £300,000 contribution was sought towards improvements associated with local bus service No. 60 (Southend/Rochford/Canewdon) in the vicinity of the proposed site to provide an extended evening and weekend service. However, upon further discussion with ECC Highways, it is not considered that the £300,000 sought is a reasonable form of mitigation that meets the necessary tests for section 106 contributions within the Planning Practice Guidance. This requires contributions to be 'fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development' and for it to be 'necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms'. The RDC application site is a smaller proposal linked to the larger stadium development within SBC's area whereby the impact on the highway network would be far greater. The financial contribution sought is not considered to be fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development or necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms. As a result, such a request is no longer sought by ECC Highways.
- 3.80 Whilst a Controlled Parking Zone is a requirement of the SBC application, it is also important to ensure that such control is also applied within the Rochford area between Shopland Road and Fossetts Way along Sutton Road to avoid any indiscriminate parking that would obstruct Sutton Road on match days.

On this basis it is considered reasonable for such a condition to be imposed on the current application.

*Parking, Pedestrian and Cycle Links*

- 3.81 The adopted Parking Standards Design and Good Practice SPD requires a maximum of up to 20 spaces per sports pitch plus 1 space per 10 spectator seats. There are not any intended spectator seats shown on the plans, although a terrace to the training centre building is proposed for viewing this does not show intended seating. A maximum of 80 spaces in this instance are therefore required. It is proposed to provide 40 spaces for the use of the training facilities and pitches which is still considered to provide an acceptable quantum of parking for the training pitches and centre. In addition to this, the Parking SPD requires that there are 10 cycle spaces plus 1 space per 10 vehicle spaces, which would result in the need for 14 cycle spaces at the site. Provision is made for 14 cycle parking spaces as well as six electric vehicle charging points. With regard to powered two wheeler spaces there should be 1 space plus 1 per 20 car spaces totalling 3 minimum. There should also be 3 disabled bays minimum. 4 powered two wheeler spaces are shown and 2 disabled bays. The additional disabled bay could be required by condition as there is capacity for this within the design. The training facilities parking would be managed using barrier systems, to ensure restriction of the use of the parking spaces other than for their intended use.
- 3.82 The remaining parking spaces proposed on site are in conjunction with the stadium development on the neighbouring Fossetts Farm Site. It is proposed that these parking spaces would only be used on match days for SUFC following its relocation to the stadium upon its completion, or on days of other events (e.g. concerts) at the stadium (maximum 3 per year). These matchday spaces are not intended to provide parking for any other elements of the Fossetts Farm development (hotel or residential), nor are they intended to provide additional parking for the training facilities and pitches. SBC has not raised issue with the quantum of spaces proposed for the match day parking in association with the stadium. A condition is recommended preventing usage of the car parking outside of match days. No disabled bays, powered two wheeler or cycle parking is shown in the stadium parking area; however, there is capacity for this within the design controlled by planning condition.
- 3.83 The Parking Standards SPD requires that parking bays measure a preferred 5.5m x 2.9m with 6m reversing distances between spaces. The minimum bay sizes within the SPD are 5m x 2.5m. The plan provided appears to show parking bays that would not adhere to either of these measurements for both the match day and the first team parking areas, appearing to measure 4.8m in length and 2.4m in width with 5.5m reversing space. Looking at the proposed parking immediately to the south of Smithers Chase within the SBC area of the wider scheme, the parking spaces measure the same and this has been accepted by SBC. Notwithstanding this, RDC's Parking Standards SPD requires spaces to measure a minimum 5m x 2.5m and it is considered that this should be adhered to. Looking at other sites recently approved for

commercial development (for example, Airport Business Park application reference: 20/00454/REM) minimum bay sizing has been accepted and it is considered that this should also be the approach taken with the current site to ensure that a balance is struck between achieving usable bay sizes and sufficient parking for the scheme. ECC Highways recommends a condition requiring compliance with the SPD.

- 3.84 Imposing such a condition would inevitably result in the quantum of parking spaces reducing at the site. It is not clear by precisely how many; a revised parking layout required by condition would need to address this. The Parking Standards SPD advises that for Stadia development there should be a maximum of 1 parking space per 15 spectators (this needs to be applied flexibly as the stadium is within SBC's area and subject to its parking guidance). This would result in the requirement for a maximum of 1,400 spaces for the stadium development. 968 spaces are proposed for the stadium and hotel with 832 of those spaces within the Rochford area. It should be noted that the figure within the Parking Standards SPD is a maximum and therefore a slight reduction below the 832 spaces within the Rochford area, which would result in the imposition of the suggested condition, is not considered objectionable. The first team parking area may have more potential to be expanded slightly within the site area to accommodate the 40 spaces sought and to the correct bay sizing. However, a slight reduction here would also not be objectionable on the basis of this being a maximum figure.
- 3.85 The design and access statement advises that 20% of the car parking spaces would be fitted with Electric Vehicle Charging Points (EVCPs) at the outset; this would equate to 166 spaces. It goes on to explain that the remaining spaces would have passive provision for ducts etc, to enable further EVCPs to be fitted in response to observed demand. It is considered that a planning condition requiring electric charging points to be provided and requiring details of where these would be located should be attached to an approval. The Environmental Statement goes on to explain that the travel plan and car park management plan would be used to monitor the use of EVCPs and identify when further provision is required.
- 3.86 It is advised within the Environmental Statement that the entrance to the stadium parking, training centre building and first team parking would be staffed on match days and gated on non match days for SUFC access only. Full details around the security of these parking areas should be controlled by planning condition. Barriers and electronic passes are suggested to be the likely form of controls.

#### *Impact on the Local Highway Network*

- 3.87 To assess the impact of traffic from the proposed development on the local highway network, the TA compares traffic modelled to result from the proposed development (developed case) with a baseline scenario. The baseline traffic data was derived from a traffic count survey conducted in



2019. Both the baseline and developed case consider traffic resulting in the year 2027, i.e., accounting for general growth in background traffic in the next 8 years and the year that development at the site would be anticipated to be complete.

- 3.88 The TA presents the results of modelling of the predicted change in traffic flows on the local highway network taking account of likely distribution of vehicle movements on the local network. The likely distribution of vehicle movements on the local highway network was established based on matchday journeys using distribution survey data from the Supporters Travel Survey. The highway link flows assessed were: -
- Sutton Road
  - Fossetts Way and
  - Eastern Avenue
- 3.89 The results show a prediction to add significantly to traffic levels on Sutton Road during the matchday weekend peak hour (1700-1800), which is reflective of Sutton Road being used as the main vehicle access route for the stadium. Eastern Avenue West WB is also expected to experience a significant increase in traffic flows during the Matchday weekend peak hour. This is generally a matter for consideration as part of the wider stadium development. However, the Council has consulted ECC Highways authority for comment and they have not raised an objection to the additional traffic generation.
- 3.90 Public footpath number 16 runs along the eastern and northern boundaries of the site. The proposal does not include any works to the public footpath and therefore no detrimental impact is considered to occur. ECC Highways has suggested a planning condition relating to the need to make improvements to this footpath as mitigation. Considering the need to encourage sustainable modes of transport to lessen the impact of the scheme on the highway network, such a condition is considered reasonable here.

### **Flood Risk and Sustainable Urban Drainage (SUD's)**

- 3.91 The site falls within Flood Zone 1 as defined by Planning Practice Guidance and shown on the Environment Agency Flood Risk Map; this designation indicates the lowest risk of flooding and the proposed development, classed as 'less vulnerable,' is an acceptable form of development in principle in flood risk terms at this site. In addition to ensuring that the development itself is safe from flood risk, the development must not increase flood risk elsewhere and planning policy (national and local policy ENV7) requires the use of Sustainable Urban Drainage systems (SUDs) for development of this scale.
- 3.92 The applicant has submitted a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) and SUDs statement. There is also an addendum to the FRA. Essex County

Council Lead Local Flood Authority (ECC LLFA) has been consulted and whilst it initially raised a holding objection, it has since removed this, subject to the imposition of conditions which should be attached to an approval.

- 3.93 The existing predominant direction of overland flow is from south to north through a system of ditches and field drains. There is an existing land drain situated within the north-west boundary of the site which flows north and eventually discharges into the River Roach.
- 3.94 The proposed development would introduce a higher amount of impermeable hardstanding surface which has the potential to increase the surface water run off from the site and the probability of flooding from surface water at the site. To account for this, a new surface water drainage system is proposed which combines a below ground piped network and a storage system with some above ground attenuation. The system has been designed to hold surface water and then ultimately convey surface water at a restricted rate, using flow control devices, to the River Roach. The proposed drainage scheme:
- Accounts for 40 per cent climate change allowance
  - Restricts discharge rate to the 1 in 1 year green field run off rate (up to 1 in 30 year event + allowance for climate change)
  - Restricts discharge rate to the 1 in 30 year green field run off rate (up to 1 in 100 year event + allowance for climate change)
- 3.95 The whole of the proposed Southend United Football Club development, including the new stadium and associated development to the south which falls in the Southend-on-Sea borough, would drain northwards. Run off from the site to the south would be conveyed to the northern attenuation pond (within the Rochford district), through pipes beneath the access road for the proposed match day parking, and then flow from here to the River Roach. The final outlet for surface water from the development would be from the northern attenuation pond where there would be a flow control device to restrict the discharge rate for up to the 1 in 30 year events to the 1 in 1 year green field run off rate (28 l/s) and a high level weir to allow additional discharge for higher intensity rainfall events. Discharge rates would be restricted for the residential/commercial element of the scheme to the south, within the application site that falls within SBC, before flowing northwards to the site within RDC.
- 3.96 As well as the large attenuation pond proposed to the site within the Rochford district, a further attenuation pond is proposed within the Southend part of the wider development, to the north of the soccer domes, along with below ground attenuation and swales. The attenuation pond within Rochford's area would have a proposed volume of around 6500m<sup>3</sup>.

- 3.97 The proposed match day parking area is identified in the submitted flood risk assessment as being an area of the site that can accommodate controlled ponding on the surface in times of high intensity rainfall (events over 1 in 30 years). The flood depth would be a maximum of approximately 100mm and would result from gradual overtopping of the adjacent attenuation pond. The submitted report acknowledges that finished ground levels would need to be designed to direct overland flows to the proposed match day parking area and to contain the flooding here, at the detailed design stage. Surface water drainage conditions as suggested by the ECC LLFA would address this.
- 3.98 A foul water drainage statement has been provided with the application, along with a pre-planning assessment report from Anglian Water. It is proposed that the foul drainage would run, under gravity, to a pumping station to the north-eastern corner of the Fossetts Farm site. It would then be discharged via a pumped rising main into an Anglian Water public sewer located in Eastern Avenue. The site wide pumping station is located within Southend Borough Council's section of the wider development. Anglian Water has responded to the application and raised no objection, subject to a condition being imposed which should be attached if permission were to be granted.

#### **Air Quality**

- 3.99 Paragraph 181 of the NPPF states “planning policies and decisions should sustain and contribute towards compliance with relevant limit values or national objectives for pollutants, taking into account the presence of Air Quality Management Areas and Clean Air Zones, and the cumulative impacts from individual sites in local areas. Opportunities to improve air quality or mitigate impacts should be identified, such as through traffic and travel management, and green infrastructure provision and enhancement. So far as possible these opportunities should be considered at the plan-making stage, to ensure a strategic approach and limit the need for issues to be reconsidered when determining individual applications. Planning decisions should ensure that any new development in Air Quality Management Areas and Clean Air Zones is consistent with the local air quality action plan.”
- 3.100 The NPPF is supported by Planning Practice Guidance (PPG). The PPG relating to air quality states that “Defra carries out an annual national assessment of air quality using modelling and monitoring to determine compliance with EU Limit Values” and “It is important that the potential impact of new development on air quality is taken into account ... where the national assessment indicates that relevant limits have been exceeded or are near the limit”.
- 3.101 The PPG states that “whether or not air quality is relevant to a planning decision will depend on the proposed development and its location. Concerns could arise if the development is likely to generate air quality impact in an area where air quality is known to be poor. They could also arise where the development is likely to adversely impact upon the implementation of air

quality strategies and action plans and/or, in particular, lead to a breach of EU legislation (including that applicable to wildlife)".

- 3.102 Policy DM29 of the Development Management Plan states alongside the provision of transport assessments, major developments will be required to submit an air quality assessment with their planning application to determine the potential cumulative impact of additional transport movements on potentially significant road junctions.
- 3.103 The application site is situated off Smithers Chase which does not lie within or close to a designated Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) (the only AQMA is currently around Rayleigh Town Centre). However, in accordance with policies contained within the adopted Development Plan, an Air Quality Assessment (AQA) forms part of the Environmental Statement accompanying this application.
- 3.104 It is necessary, however, to consider whether the proposed development would result in a significant adverse impact on existing air quality such as could tip an area into such poor air quality as to fall below acceptable pollution threshold levels and this should take account of cumulative development in the locality.
- 3.105 The AQA discusses the operational phase of the development as a whole. An impact assessment has been undertaken for receptors along local highway links; these being Victoria Avenue, Eastern Avenue, Sutton Road and Prince Avenue (A127). It concludes that concentrations at all modelled human health receptors are expected to be well within the respective NO<sub>2</sub>, PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub> air quality objectives. It goes on to explain that the predicted effects from the construction and operation of the development on local air quality are therefore not considered to be significant and no mitigation measures are proposed.
- 3.106 The proposed development and cumulative traffic assessment have demonstrated that the impacts from vehicle emissions that would result from the development would be considered to be negligible and it is predicted that the air quality pollutant concentrations would decrease into the future remaining below their respective air quality objectives/targets. All the locations identified in the AQA fall within Southend's terrain.
- 3.107 The Council's Environmental Health adviser initially raised an objection to the proposal due to the lack of data regarding the impact upon Temple Gate Cottages. Such data has still not been provided; however, the applicant's consultant gave direct comparison to another modelled location which the consultant considers 'worst-case' in respect of the development as a whole. On this basis, the Council's adviser considers it likely that the Temple Gate Cottages would experience an equivalent 'negligible' (adverse) impact as a result of the development and no longer objects to the scheme.

- 3.108 Impacts on air quality can arise from construction activities associated with the proposed development, notably relating to dust generation. Mitigation measures, consistent with best practice guidance, have been recommended in line with the level of anticipated risk and are expected to reduce the impact to negligible. The Council's Environmental Health adviser confirms that they are content with dust impact being addressed through a Construction Management Plan. A condition to this effect should be attached to an approval.
- 3.109 It is considered that the proposed development would satisfy Policy DM29 of the Development Management Plan. There is no evidence that this application would have a demonstrable impact on the existing AQMA at Rayleigh Town Centre or result in significant adverse impact on existing air quality as a result of emissions from vehicle movements associated with the site.

### **Archaeology**

- 3.110 Planning policy at the national and local level requires consideration of the impacts of proposed development on heritage assets which includes underground heritage assets.
- 3.111 This application is accompanied by an Archaeology and Cultural Heritage Assessment that forms part of the Environmental Statement. Wessex Archaeology undertook field works of the site in 2018. The proposed development is part of the overall development for Southend United Football Club, which lies mostly in Southend Borough Council's area, and immediately adjacent to Prittlewell Camp, a Late Bronze Age/Early Iron Age hillfort, which is a Scheduled Monument. It is possible that associated features may survive within the development area which would be damaged or destroyed by the development. The new Environmental Assessment attached to this application shows that archaeological trial trenching has taken place on the development area in Southend, but the area in Rochford has had no assessment. The ECC Archaeology team has advised that it is essential that a similar programme of archaeological trial trenching is undertaken across the Rochford area. Conditions are suggested to mitigate any harm and it is considered reasonable that such conditions are imposed here.

### **Refuse**

- 3.112 A refuse storage point is proposed to the south-western corner of the training centre car park. This is considered to be located within an area accessible by a refuse vehicle. Whilst it would have been more preferable in design terms for the refuse store to be part of the main training centre building, the location of the store proposed is considered to be functional. There is a small bin store to the northern elevation within the building to provide a degree of bin storage within the building itself. There are no details of the design of the intended refuse store, such details should be controlled by planning condition to ensure

that the building has a modest impact in terms of visual amenity. The proposed location of the refuse store is considered acceptable.

### **Trees**

- 3.113 Policy DM25 of the Development Management Plan 2014 looks to ensure that trees and woodlands do not suffer detrimental impact as the result of a proposed scheme.
- 3.114 A tree survey dated 2017 has been submitted that identifies that tree groups G110 and G112 are within the Rochford District. The G110 group is identified as a C category tree and the G112 group as a B category. Both groups are mixed species. G110 is described as early mature mixed, including Leyland cypress, willow and ash and G112 is described as semi-mature mixed including ash, sycamore and field maple growing within sloe and hawthorn hedgerow. B category trees are trees of moderate quality with a life expectancy of 20+ years. They are usually maturing trees or younger trees with good form. Retention of these trees is desirable though less than Category A trees. C category trees are unremarkable trees of low quality and merit; individual specimens are not considered to be a material planning consideration. The tree constraints plan also shows that there is a row of young ash, hawthorn, lime, rowan, goat willow and elder to the southern boundary and a hedgerow of sloe and hawthorn to the eastern boundary.
- 3.115 One part of the G110 grouping is proposed for removal to facilitate the development. The rest would be protected within construction exclusion zones using tree protection barriers. Whilst one part would be removed, this is a relatively small section in comparison to the new planting that would be undertaken at the site. On this basis, its removal is not considered objectionable.
- 3.116 The Council's arboriculturalist has advised that a condition should be attached to an approval regarding tree protection and a method statement. Whilst the survey provided does give some detail around this, it is 5 years old and it is necessary for a more up to date survey to be undertaken to sufficiently identify tree protection methods. This should be controlled by planning condition.

### **Ecology**

- 3.117 The site is located within a SSSI Impact Risk Zone which is a GIS tool developed by Natural England to make a rapid initial assessment of the potential risks posed by development proposals to: Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs), Special Areas of Conservation (SACs), Special Protection Areas (SPAs) and Ramsar sites. The site currently under consideration represents a 'rural non-residential' scheme with an internal floor space exceeding 1000m<sup>2</sup> and therefore Natural England should be consulted on the proposal. Such consultation has taken place and Natural England advises that the proposal is unlikely to affect any statutorily protected sites.

- 3.118 Natural England does advise that the proposal could benefit from enhanced Green Infrastructure provision, along with landscape enhancements. It is considered that a planning condition could be attached looking to seek such infrastructure and enhancements.
- 3.119 Policy DM27 of the Development Management Plan 2014 looks to ensure that protected species do not suffer detrimental impact as the result of a proposed scheme.
- 3.120 With regard to protected species, a phase 1 survey has been provided. The site was initially visited in 2015 to undertake the survey but further visits have also taken place in 2016 and 2020. The survey has explained the following with regard to protected species:
- Bats - None of the buildings and structures within the site appeared to support features suitable for roosting bats, while the semi improved grassland and associated habitats provide foraging and commuting habitat only.
  - Badgers - Badgers and their setts have been recorded across the wider area. No evidence of setts or other activity definitive of badgers was recorded.
  - Common Reptiles - the majority of the site: amenity grassland, hardstanding and hedgerows and trees are not suitable for reptiles. The built development and training pitches of the site are of low suitability for reptiles. The remainder of the site is of moderate suitability for reptiles.
  - Nesting birds - The semi improved grassland has some potential for ground nesting birds, perhaps reduced by the use of the site by dog walkers. The trees, hedges and scrub all have the potential to support the breeding of common bird species.
  - No other protected species or evidence or suitable features for protected species was encountered during the surveys
- 3.121 The phase 1 survey went on to recommend that:
- Consideration should be given to the protection of habitats within the site, in particular the hedgerows and mature trees.
  - Lighting impacts during construction and operation of the facilities should be considered. Lighting, if used, should be directed away from vegetation, trees and wildlife corridors.
  - Reptiles - As reptiles were previously present within the site a reptile survey of suitable habitats using artificial refugia is currently being conducted.

- Nesting birds - Vegetation clearance should be avoided during the nesting season (March – August) as noted above. If vegetation, on inspection, is found to contain an active nest the plant and a buffer of 3m of surrounding vegetation should be retained and clearly marked (with tape) and be left undisturbed until the nest is no longer active before clearance can be completed.
- A pre-construction survey should be completed immediately prior to the start of development works to confirm that the situation on site is as reported here.

3.122 A bat survey report was also produced in 2021. No bats were recorded during the survey; however, because of seasonal and weather-based limitations it was recommended that the survey be repeated during optimal conditions.

3.123 The Council's ecological adviser has stated that further detail should be required by condition regarding the necessary licence for the removal of a bat roost and subsequent lighting for the site to reduce impact on foraging bats, details for the removal of reptiles and details/recommendations for working in proximity to nesting birds. The adviser has also identified the hedgerow to the eastern boundary as having important ecological value; it should be retained and protected, controlled by planning condition. A planning condition also requiring an updated bat survey, details for the removal of reptiles and details/recommendations for working in proximity to nesting birds should be attached to an approval.

### **Light pollution**

3.124 Policy DM5 of the Development Management Plan 2014 seeks to ensure that proposals are designed and installed to minimise the impact of light pollution on residential and commercial areas, important areas of nature conservation interest, highway safety and/or the night sky through avoiding unnecessary light spillage and trespass.

3.125 There is no proposal for the pitches to use flood lighting (the previously approved all weather pitch has been removed from the current scheme) and this could be controlled by condition to ensure that no future detrimental impact would occur in terms of light pollution. Whilst the training building itself and car park is likely to have some form of external lighting, the design of such lighting could be controlled by condition to limit its impact.

## **4 CONSULTATIONS AND REPRESENTATIONS**

### **Sutton Parish Council**

#### **FIRST RESPONSE (12/07/21)**

4.1 The proposed First Team Training Centre is a 'New Build' in the green belt.



- 
- 4.2 The 'Four' proposed football pitches and the subsequent players' noise generated by their use, will not be acceptable.
- 4.3 Local residents already suffer from noise from the use of the training pitches on 'Boots and Laces', Southend.
- 4.4 The proposed stadium match day parking has doubled the parking area previously objected to and no security calculations or details of the gates and fencing security of the parking area, outside of match days, has been shown, leaving it open to invasion by undesirables.
- 4.5 The Flood attenuation measures indicate a reduction in the pond size and residents' first-hand knowledge of all local waterways, indicate a lack of proper water run off calculations, by the football club.
- 4.6 Detail of access management on match days is not covered to the satisfaction of local residents in the Planning documents.
- 4.7 No calculations on the management of traffic on match days and its effect on the Sutton Road and all other local feeder road, is shown or proven.
- 4.8 No calculations on the policing of traffic on match days.
- 4.9 The match day effect on the emergency services and the Southend Fire Station based on Sutton Road and their ability to use all local feeder roads to attend local emergencies is not calculated.
- 4.10 If this planning application is allowed then a 106 covering the following for the protection and comfort of all local residents is requested to Rochford District Council Planning Officers and Councillors:
- Landscaping to improve the visual outlook of all local cottages/houses blighted by this application
  - Landscaping to improve the soundproofing of all local cottages/houses blighted by this application
  - Landscaping to improve the air quality of all local cottages/houses blighted by this application
  - Full proper security measures for the car park outside match days.
  - Proper policing of all accesses/exits to all local properties on match days.
  - The proposed car parking area must only be available to match day visitors and not available for any other purpose at any other time
  - Any future lighting allowed to be switched off beyond locally agreed times
  - The club house building to be available for football training purposes only, with a total restriction on any social use, licensed use, disco's, dances, weddings, funerals, or any other purpose, etc.
  - The 106 to include all funding to improve the junctions at Sutton Road/Shopland Road, Sutton Road/Purdeys Industrial Estate and Southend Road/Sutton Road, Rochford.

**SECOND RESPONSE (28/01/22)**

- 4.11 Same as above.

**Rochford Parish Council (26/07/17)**

- 4.12 Unwelcome encroachment into RDC Metropolitan Green Belt.
- 4.13 Proximity of development to the crematorium and gardens of remembrance.
- 4.14 Significant noise pollution for neighbouring properties.
- 4.15 Concern with the traffic levels which are proposed to increase along Sutton Road, as well as Southend Road and the adjoining side road which are already congested.
- 4.16 The need for an overflow car park whilst public transport and other services are being promoted.
- 4.17 Alternative site for overflow parking.
- 4.18 Concern that the overflow car park has increased by 45%.
- 4.19 The access from the overflow park is limited for the number of persons using it, notwithstanding stewards will be available. What might ancillary uses be?
- 4.20 Impact of pedestrian safety adjacent to Temple Gate and Smithers Cottages with over 800 additional vehicles in the locality on match days as well as other events.
- 4.21 That the developer ensures the car park is not only grassed but allows for gutters or other permeable materials to minimise the run off to the flood attenuation pond and the cottages.

**RDC Environmental Health****FIRST RESPONSE (21/12/21)**

- 4.22 The Environmental Statements v1 and 2 (30/11/20) concentrate upon the stadium and environs. In my opinion, there is insufficient information provided in respect of noise, air quality and lighting impacts of the training facilities and associated car parking to provide direct comments.
- 4.23 **Lighting** – I recommend that a lighting impact assessment is required by condition and previous related conditions are also added.
- 4.24 **Noise** – There are no noise impacts from the training facilities discussed. It is therefore recommended that a dedicated noise impact assessment is

required. It would be my preference for this to be submitted and assessed prior to any decision being made by the Development Control Committee. In particular, impacts from raised voices should be assessed.

Anecdotally, I am aware that Colchester BC has some experience with this issue and it is therefore recommended that officers confer with their counterparts there to draw upon their experiences.

In any respect, it is recommended that a condition is imposed prohibiting any external p.a. system within the training or parking environments along with another requiring a Construction Noise Management Plan.

- 4.25 **Air quality** – The Environment Act 2021 has recently passed in to law. This will mean new standards being brought in for PM2.5 (which are likely to be stricter than the predicted PM2.5 levels indicated for 2027 in the air quality assessment). It is also highly likely that tighter standards will also be introduced for other pollutants, such as nitrogen dioxide.

Air pollution impacts upon Temple Gate Cottages and other nearby residential receptors are not discussed. Overall, the air quality assessment is therefore considered incomplete and requires revision prior to any decision being made by the Development Committee.

- 4.26 Proposed dust mitigation measures are considered suitable in principle. A formal plan should be required by condition.

## **SECOND RESPONSE (18/01/22)**

### **Noise**

- 4.27 Temple Gate Cottages are not referenced in the noise report and no relevant new data or commentary is included in the May 2021 ES revision. I consider that the potentially intrusive nature of whistles and raised voices from the training facilities has been dismissed in paragraphs 9.96 - 9.98. It is my experience that these sorts of sounds have a likelihood for complaint as they give rise to distinguishable, sporadic and tonal peak events. Reference to these in terms of LAeq levels masks these events because they are lost in the averaging applied. Provision of data will allow proper consideration of whether these events will be significant to occupants in Smithers Chase and/or Temple Gate Cottages and if mitigation or other control is required. From the wording of these paragraphs, the data is readily available and can be interpreted and supplied quickly. Previous comments regarding prohibition of external p.a. systems or similar, and a requirement of a construction noise management plan stand.

### **Air Quality**

- 4.28 It remains that there is no specific air quality data or modelling available regarding Temple Gate Cottages, although comment is made that there will

be no breach of the hourly mean level for nitrogen dioxide. It is understood that permission for the stadium has now been granted by Southend BC, and this will by far have the greatest contribution to levels of nitrogen dioxide and particulate matter along Sutton Road. I am therefore unable to directly comment upon the cumulative effects at this location.

- 4.29 Proposed dust control via a Construction Management Plan is noted.

**THIRD RESPONSE (30/01/22)**

**Noise**

- 4.30 The latest comments from the applicant were accompanied by a detailed indicative schedule of activities – training and matches – by location across the academy and senior teams.
- 4.31 Given the distance separations to receptors and the regular, limited durations of the training and match activities I am satisfied that noise disturbance from the training facilities have been suitably considered and no mitigation is required.

**Air Quality**

- 4.32 The latest comments from the applicant lack the data specifically requested; however, direct comparison is drawn to another modelled location which the consultants consider 'worst-case' in respect of the development as a whole. It is considered likely that the Temple Gate Cottages would experience an equivalent 'negligible' (adverse) impact as a result of the development.
- 4.33 I am satisfied that no further air quality assessment is required and no mitigation is required.

**RDC Engineer (14/08/17)**

- 4.34 No comments/observations.

**RDC Strategic Housing (13/01/22)**

- 4.35 We have no comment on this application as it does not involve any housing.

**RDC Arboriculture**

**FIRST RESPONSE (10/08/17)**

- 4.36 A tree impact assessment has been provided with the application detail.
- 4.37 Generally the majority of the tree stock is within Southend Borough. Trees G112 and G110 are within Rochford District; these trees are shown to be retained and suitably protected during the development.

- 4.38 I would recommend the following as condition of consent should planning be permitted:

*No development or any preliminary groundworks shall take place until:*

- a. All trees to be retained during the construction works have been protected by fencing of the 'HERAS' type or similar. The fencing shall be erected around the trees and positioned in accordance with British Standard 5837:2012 and the supplied arboricultural report and;*
- b. All weather notices prohibiting accesses have been erected on the fencing demarcating a construction exclusion zone as detailed in BS5837:2012 section 6.*

*Notwithstanding the above, no materials shall be stored or activity shall take place within the area enclosed by the fencing. No alteration, removal or repositioning of the fencing shall take place during the construction period without the prior written consent of the County Planning Authority.*

*No works should be carried out within the Root Protection Area (RPA) unless provisions are made in a site specific Arboricultural method statement and subsequently approved by the LPA.*

*Unless otherwise approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, no retained tree shall be cut down, uprooted or destroyed, nor shall any retained tree's branches, stems or roots be pruned.*

#### **SECOND RESPONSE (11/12/20)**

- 4.39 Is there an updated tree protection plan / method statement provided with this. I can't seem to find it in any of the supporting documents, etc. If they are using the previous version they will need to have this updated / approved by the previous arboricultural consultant.

#### **THIRD RESPONSE (10/01/22)**

- 4.40 I would be happy with a condition for tree protection and method statement.

#### **RDC Ecology (10/08/17)**

- 4.41 A phase 1 habitat survey has been provided with the submitted application detail. The survey used previous data and updated survey data from 2014 - 2017 (section 13.44). The survey was undertaken in accordance with standing advice provided by Natural England for determining planning applications with regard to protected species.
- 4.42 Impact to bats, birds and reptiles have been recorded; details are provided in sections 13.92, 13.96 and 13.99 respectively. Further detail will be required

as part of the conditions for the planning consent should it be permitted; this will include details for the licence for the removal of a bat roost and subsequent lighting for the site to reduce impact on foraging bats, details for the removal of reptiles and details/recommendations for working in proximity to nesting birds.

- 4.43 A hedgerow on the eastern boundary has been identified as important under the criteria of the hedgerow regulations 1997 (section 13.65) – its retention and protection should be dealt with in the supplied arboricultural report.

**RDC Waste & Recycling (30/08/17)**

- 4.44 Please refer them to page 89 of the attached for waste requirements and advise them of the developer charge for bins at £168.00 per household.

**Essex County Council – Lead Local Flood Authority**

**FIRST RESPONSE (11/08/17)**

- 4.45 Having reviewed the Flood Risk Assessment and the associated documents which accompanied the planning application, we wish to issue a holding objection to the granting of planning permission based on the following:

*Inadequate Surface Water Drainage Strategy*

- 4.46 The Drainage Strategy submitted with this application does not comply with the requirements set out in Essex County Council's Full Drainage Checklist.
- 4.47 Therefore the submitted drainage strategy does not provide a suitable basis for assessment to be made of the flood risks arising from the proposed development.
- 4.48 In particular, the submitted strategy fails to:
- Demonstrate run off rates have been sufficiently limited.
  - Post development run off rates and supporting drainage calculations should be provided in support of the drainage strategy.
  - Demonstrate sufficient storage has been considered.
- 4.49 As above, storage calculations should be provided in support of the proposed underground storage and attenuation for this development; this is to ensure there is no off site flooding as a result of the development during all storm events up to and including the 1 in 100 year plus 40% climate change event.
- 4.50 A drainage plan should be submitted in support of the application to show indicatively how drainage requirements will be met.
- 4.51 We also have the following advisory comments:

Evidence should be provided to satisfy why infiltration is not feasible at a later stage.

Compliance with CIRIA C753 guidance on water quality should also be demonstrated. The type of solution to be used will need to match up with the mitigation Index score, as well as the corresponding methods of managing pollution risk. This should be supplied during the detailed stage of the planning application process.

- 4.52 In the event that more information was supplied by the applicants then the County Council may be in a position to withdraw its objection to the proposal once it has considered the additional clarification/details that are required.

#### **SECOND RESPONSE (04/10/17)**

- 4.53 Additional information received on 5 September has been considered and having reviewed the Flood Risk Assessment and the associated documents which accompanied the planning application, the holding objection to the granting of planning permission for this application remains; this is based on the following:

##### *Inadequate Surface Water Drainage Strategy*

- 4.54 Additional information submitted in support of this application does not fully comply with the requirements set out within Essex County Council's Full Drainage Checklist. This letter sets out the existing holding objections and below these are comments raised as a result of the additional information submitted on 5 September; these comments should be addressed in order to remove the holding objections:
- Demonstrate run off rates have been sufficiently limited.
  - Post development run off rates and supporting drainage calculations should be provided in support of the drainage strategy.
  - Demonstrate sufficient storage has been considered.
- 4.55 As above, storage calculations should be provided in support of the proposed underground storage and attenuation for this development; this is to ensure there is no off site flooding as a result of the development during all storm events up to and including the 1 in 100 year plus 40% climate change event.
- 4.56 A drainage plan should be submitted in support of the application to show indicatively how drainage requirements will be met.

##### *Additional information required:*

- 4.57 To help us determine sufficient storage has been provided above ground, a plan should be supplied that includes pipe numbers so that we can determine

where the above ground flooding is; this should be considered alongside the additional holding objection to consider long term storage.

- 4.58 It should be demonstrated how the existing surface water flows onto the site are being managed.
- 4.59 A topography survey should be supplied so that we can understand the natural flow of surface water for the whole site.
- 4.60 Run off calculations do not appear to have been supplied; these should be submitted in response to this letter so that we can ensure run off rates have been sufficiently limited.
- 4.61 An additional holding objection has also been raised where the drainage strategy fails to consider long term storage. Where run off cannot be restricted to the green field 1 in 1 year event for all events up to the 1 in 100 plus 40% climate event, we would expect long term storage to be provided to achieve the same result. The following advisory comments remain: evidence should be provided to satisfy why infiltration is not feasible at a later stage.

### **THIRD RESPONSE (23/12/20)**

- 4.62 Having reviewed the Flood Risk Assessment and the associated documents which accompanied the planning application we do not object to the granting of planning permission for this application; this is based on the following:

#### **Condition 1**

No works shall take place until a detailed surface water drainage scheme for the site, based on sustainable drainage principles and an assessment of the hydrological and hydro geological context of the development, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme should include but not be limited to:

- Limiting discharge rates to the 14l/s for all storm events up to and including the 1 in 100 year rate plus 40% allowance for climate change.
- Provide sufficient storage to ensure no off site flooding as a result of the development during all storm events up to and including the 1 in 100 year plus 40% climate change event.
- Demonstrate that all storage features can half empty within 24 hours for the 1 in 30 plus 40% climate change critical storm event.
- Final modelling and calculations for all areas of the drainage system.
- The appropriate level of treatment for all run off leaving the site, in line with the simple index approach in the CIRIA SuDS Manual C753.
- Detailed engineering drawings of each component of the drainage scheme.
- A final drainage plan which details exceedance and conveyance routes, FFL and ground levels, and location and sizing of any drainage features.



- A written report summarising the final strategy and highlighting any minor changes to the approved strategy.

The scheme shall subsequently be implemented prior to occupation.

#### Reason

- To prevent flooding by ensuring the satisfactory storage of/disposal of surface water from the site.
- To ensure the effective operation of SuDS features over the lifetime of the development.
- To provide mitigation of any environmental harm which may be caused to the local water environment
- Failure to provide the above required information before commencement of works may result in a system being installed that is not sufficient to deal with surface water occurring during rainfall events and may lead to increased flood risk and pollution hazard from the site.

#### Condition 2

No works shall take place until a scheme to minimise the risk of off site flooding caused by surface water run off and groundwater during construction works and prevent pollution has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The scheme shall subsequently be implemented as approved.

#### Reason

The National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 103 and paragraph 109 state that local planning authorities should ensure development does not increase flood risk elsewhere and does not contribute to water pollution. Construction may lead to excess water being discharged from the site. If dewatering takes place to allow for construction to take place below groundwater level, this will cause additional water to be discharged. Furthermore, the removal of top soils during construction may limit the ability of the site to intercept rainfall and may lead to increased run off rates. To mitigate increased flood risk to the surrounding area during construction there needs to be satisfactory storage of/disposal of surface water and groundwater which needs to be agreed before commencement of the development. Construction may also lead to polluted water being allowed to leave the site. Methods for preventing or mitigating this should be proposed.

#### Condition 3

No works shall take place until a Maintenance Plan detailing the maintenance arrangements including who is responsible for different elements of the surface water drainage system and the maintenance activities/frequencies, has been submitted to and agreed, in writing, by the Local Planning Authority.

Should any part be maintainable by a maintenance company details of long term funding arrangements should be provided.

Reason

To ensure appropriate maintenance arrangements are put in place to enable the surface water drainage system to function as intended to ensure mitigation against flood risk.

Failure to provide the above required information before commencement of works may result in the installation of a system that is not properly maintained and may increase flood risk or pollution hazard from the site.

Condition 4

The applicant or any successor in title must maintain yearly logs of maintenance which should be carried out in accordance with any approved Maintenance Plan. These must be available for inspection upon request by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason

To ensure the SuDS are maintained for the lifetime of the development as outlined in any approved Maintenance Plan so that they continue to function as intended to ensure mitigation against flood risk.

**FOURTH RESPONSE (03/02/22)**

- 4.63 Same as above except conditions 1 and 3 have slightly altered wording as follows:

Condition 1

No works except demolition shall take place until a detailed surface water drainage scheme for the site, based on sustainable drainage principles and an assessment of the hydrological and hydro geological context of the development, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme should include but not be limited to:

- Limiting discharge rates to the 14l/s for all storm events up to and including the 1 in 100 year rate plus 40% allowance for climate change.
- Provide sufficient storage to ensure no off site flooding as a result of the development during all storm events up to and including the 1 in 100 year plus 40% climate change event.
- Demonstrate that all storage features can half empty within 24 hours for the 1 in 30 plus 40% climate change critical storm event. In case the drain down time is more than 24 hours then demonstrate that SUDS features

can accommodate a 1 in 10 year storm event within 24 hours of a 1 in 30 year event plus climate change.

- Final modelling and calculations for all areas of the drainage system.
- The appropriate level of treatment for all run off leaving the site, in line with the Simple Index Approach in chapter 26 of the CIRIA SuDS Manual C753.
- Detailed engineering drawings of each component of the drainage scheme.
- A final drainage plan which details exceedance and conveyance routes, FFL and ground levels, and location and sizing of any drainage features.
- A written report summarising the final strategy and highlighting any minor changes to the approved strategy.

The scheme shall subsequently be implemented prior to occupation.

### Condition 3

Prior to occupation a maintenance plan detailing the maintenance arrangements, including who is responsible for different elements of the surface water drainage system and the maintenance activities/frequencies, has been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Should any part be maintainable by a maintenance company, details of long term funding arrangements should be provided.

## Essex County Council Archaeology

### FIRST RESPONSE (18/07/17)

- 4.64 The proposed development is part of the overall development for Southend United Football Club, which lies mostly in Southend Borough Council's area, and immediately adjacent to Prittlewell Camp, a Late Bronze Age/Early Iron Age hillfort, which is a Scheduled Monument. It is possible that associated features may survive within the development area which would be damaged or destroyed by the development. The Environmental Assessment attached to this application proposes that archaeological trial trenching should take place across the whole of the development area. It is therefore important that Rochford District Council should liaise with both Southend Borough Council and Historic England, to ensure that the conditions below are applied across the whole of the development area.
- 4.65 In view of this the following recommendation is made in line with the National Planning Policy Framework.

Recommendation: Full condition – trial trenching and full excavation

1. No development or preliminary ground works can commence until a programme of archaeological trial trenching has been secured and

undertaken in accordance with a Written Scheme of Investigation, which has been submitted by the applicant, and approved by the planning authority.

2. Following the completion of this initial phase of archaeological work, a summary report will be prepared and a mitigation strategy detailing the approach to further archaeological excavation and/or preservation in situ through re-design of the development, shall be submitted to the local planning authority.
3. No development or preliminary groundwork can commence on those areas of the development site containing archaeological deposits until the satisfactory completion of archaeological fieldwork, as detailed in the mitigation strategy, which has been signed off by the local planning authority.
4. Following completion of the archaeological fieldwork, the applicant will submit to the local planning authority a post-excavation assessment (within six months of the completion date, unless otherwise agreed in advance with the planning authority), which will result in the completion of post-excavation analysis, preparation of a full site archive and report ready for deposition at the local museum, and submission of a publication report.

A professional archaeological contracting team should undertake any archaeological work. An archaeological brief outlining the methods of investigation can be issued from this office (on request) and there would be a cost implication for the developer.

#### **SECOND RESPONSE (29/12/20)**

- 4.66 The proposed development is part of the overall development for Southend United Football Club, which lies mostly in Southend Borough Council's area, and immediately adjacent to Prittlewell Camp, a Late Bronze Age/Early Iron Age hillfort, which is a Scheduled Monument. It is possible that associated features may survive within the development area which would be damaged or destroyed by the development. The new Environmental Assessment attached to this application shows that archaeological trial trenching has taken place on the development area in Southend, but the area in Rochford has had no assessment. It is essential that a similar programme of archaeological trial trenching is undertaken across the Rochford area. It is unclear why they have evaluated the Southend Area and not that in Rochford.
- 4.67 In view of this the following recommendation is made in line with the National Planning Policy Framework (same as per paragraph 4.65 above).

**THIRD RESPONSE (12/01/22)**

- 4.68 The proposed development is part of the overall development for Southend United Football Club, which lies mostly in Southend Borough Council's area, and immediately adjacent to Prittlewell Camp, a Late Bronze Age/Early Iron Age hill fort, which is a Scheduled Monument. It is possible that associated features may survive within the development area which would be damaged or destroyed by the development. The new Environmental Assessment attached to this application shows that archaeological trial trenching has taken place on the development area in Southend, and it indicates that the area in Rochford has had no assessment yet. It is essential that a similar programme of archaeological trial trenching is undertaken across the Rochford area.
- 4.69 In view of this the following recommendation is made in line with the new National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 205 (same as per paragraph 4.65 above).

**Essex County Council Highways (28/06/21)**

- 4.70 From a highway and transportation perspective the impact of the proposal is acceptable to the Highway Authority, subject to the following requirements:
1. Prior to development the areas within the site identified for the purpose of loading/unloading/reception and storage of materials and manoeuvring associated with the proposal shall be provided clear of the highway and retained at all times for that sole purpose.  
  
Reason: To ensure that appropriate loading / unloading facilities are available in the interest of highway safety in accordance with policy DM1 of the Development Management Policies as adopted as County Council Supplementary Guidance in February 2011.
  2. No unbound material shall be used in the surface treatment of the vehicular access within 6 metres of the highway boundary.  
  
Reason: To avoid displacement of loose material onto the highway in the interests of highway safety in accordance with policy DM1 of the Development Management Policies as adopted as County Council Supplementary Guidance in February 2011.
  3. There shall be no discharge of surface water onto the Highway.  
  
Reason: To prevent hazards caused by water flowing onto the highway and to avoid the formation of ice on the highway in the interest of highway safety to ensure accordance with policy DM1 of the Development Management Policies as adopted as County Council Supplementary Guidance in February 2011.

4. The development shall accord, including any ground works or demolition, with the approved CEMP. The approved Statement shall be adhered to throughout the construction period. The Statement shall provide for:
  - i. the parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors
  - ii. loading and unloading of plant and materials
  - iii. storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development
  - iv. wheel and underbody washing facilities
  - v. Routing of vehicles

Reason: To ensure that on street parking of these vehicles in the adjoining streets does not occur and to ensure that loose materials and spoil are not brought out onto the highway in the interests of highway safety and Policy DM 1 of the Highway Authority's Development Management Policies February 2011.

5. The parking shall be provided in accordance with the EPOA Parking Standards. The proposed development shall not be occupied until such time as the vehicle parking area indicated on the approved plans, including any parking spaces for the mobility impaired, has been hard surfaced, sealed and marked out in parking bays. The vehicle parking area and associated turning area shall be retained in this form at all times. The vehicle parking shall not be used for any purpose other than the parking of vehicles that are related to the use of the development unless otherwise agreed with the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that on street parking of vehicles in the adjoining streets does not occur in the interests of highway safety and that appropriate parking is provided in accordance with Policy DM8 of the Development Management Policies as adopted as County Council Supplementary Guidance in February 2011.

6. The powered two-wheeler/cycle parking facilities as shown on the approved plan are to be provided prior to the first occupation of the development and retained at all times.

Reason: To ensure appropriate powered two-wheeler and bicycle parking is provided in accordance with Policy DM8 of the Development Management Policies as adopted as County Council Supplementary Guidance in February 2011.

7. Prior to commencement of development a scheme for improvement of the Public Footpath (PROW 292\_16) to the north of the proposed training pitches between Sutton Road and the easternmost boundary of the site and for the 'Historic Green Lane' between this footpath and Clements Way (PROW 292\_1) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and such works to this footpath as involve land under the control of the applicant or the Highway

Authority shall be completed prior to the occupation of the development in accordance with the approved scheme.

Reason: In the interests of reducing the need to travel by car and promoting sustainable development and transport in accordance with policies DM9 and DM10 of the Highway Authority's Development Management Policies, adopted as County Council Supplementary Guidance in February 2011.

8. Prior to first occupation of the proposed development, the Developer shall submit a workplace travel plan to the Local Planning Authority for approval in consultation with Essex County Council. Such approved travel plan shall be actively implemented for a minimum period of 5 years. It shall be accompanied by a monitoring fee of £6,132 (plus the relevant sustainable travel indexation) to be paid before occupation to cover the 5 year period.

Reason: In the interests of reducing the need to travel by car and promoting sustainable development and transport in accordance with policies DM9 and DM10 of the Highway Authority's Development Management Policies, adopted as County Council Supplementary Guidance in February 2011.

9. Prior to first occupation of the proposed development, the developer shall implement a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) on match days inclusive of necessary signs and markings on Sutton Road from the District Boundary to the junction of Shopland Road. Details to be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval in consultation with Essex County Council.

Reason: In the interests of reducing the need to travel by car and promoting sustainable development and transport and reduce indiscriminate parking in accordance with policies DM9 and DM10 of the Highway Authority's Development Management Policies, adopted as County Council Supplementary Guidance in February 2011.

10. Prior to first occupation of the proposed development the provision of a financial contribution of £300,000 (three hundred thousand) towards improvements associated with local bus service No. 60 (Southend/Rochford/ Canewdon) in the vicinity of the proposed site to provide an extended evening and weekend service.

Reason: To make adequate provision within the highway for increased demand for sustainable transport generated as a result of the proposed development.

#### **Essex County Council Public Rights of Way**

**FIRST RESPONSE (12/10/17)**

- 4.71 Given that the site is bordered by Footpath 16 Sutton the developers will need to be 100% certain that they are not encroaching upon land with highway rights on it.
- 4.72 It will be for them to request a search via [highway.status@essexhighways.org](mailto:highway.status@essexhighways.org) (a chargeable service) to determine the width and extent of the PROW. Although they mention the PROW bordering the site it is disappointing that their plans do not show this and we ask planning authorities to try and ensure that applicants' plans do clearly indicate the PROW where it could be affected.
- 4.73 With regard to possible improvements to the PROW this will depend on everyone's interpretation as to how much the setting of the PROW will alter if this goes ahead and its usage and character.
- 4.74 Personally it is difficult to see this retaining its rural character and assuming that people might want to watch SUFC training (you never know) the amount of use it gets will probably increase, too.
- 4.75 Any works that they might want to make to the access drive will require ECC's permission prior to commencement and our agreement to surface type, etc. As there is already a surfaced section in practice I can't see this being withheld though an informative would need to make clear that ECC would only ever maintain to footpath standard (i.e. rural PROW not surfaced footway) and that if they are going to work on any part of the footpath they may need to obtain a TTRO from the TRO team first if a closure or temporary diversion is required. There is the possibility of it all being upgraded to a fully adopted footway and coming off the Definitive Map, which might better fit its future usage and enable it to be maintained and surveyed appropriately. They would need to ensure in any case that if working on the PROW they also obtained the landowner's consent where they didn't own the land. What we wouldn't accept is it becoming a de-facto footway – surfaced, lit, etc. but remaining a PROW as the PROW budget would not accommodate that.
- 4.76 I would reiterate the following, however. If the public footpath (which is still essentially rural in character), is to be sealed-surfaced, e.g., tarmac, we would not support this unless it becomes an adopted highway footway. If it is to be surfaced I would prefer a porous material that will naturalise. Change of use from arable field to football training pitches doesn't necessarily mean the area will become urbanised. The surface drainage of the path also needs to be thought through.



**SECOND RESPONSE (19/01/22)**

- 4.77 In so far as can be ascertained from the plans there should be no impact upon Footpath 16 Sutton (the nearest PROW) provided that the applicant has accurately recorded that PROW's alignment.
- 4.78 The footpath should remain clear and unobstructed during construction and thereafter and not used for any form of development access, subsequent access for this development and not used to store materials. Any screening proposed would need to be a minimum 2m from the extent of the PROW.

**Essex County Council Urban Design****FIRST RESPONSE (11/08/17)**

- 4.79 The submitted scheme is a carefully considered and articulated design which appears high quality and tailored very specifically to the site within which it is located. Much thought has been given to how the building will blend with the immediate and surrounding landscape to reduce its visual impact and sustainability has been given a high priority at all levels of the design.

A much greater level of detail has been provided as part of the full application, including elevations, sections, landscape plans and a Design and Access Statement (DAS). This letter sets out the points listed in the pre-application response which were recommended to be integrated into the design for the full application and acknowledges whether steps have been made to address them. It was requested that sections of the landscape bund (surrounding the site) were provided along with details of the proposed planting palette and details of any barrier / boundary treatments. The submitted plans provide this information across a number of plans and include a number of cross-section diagrams at various locations around the site edges. The proposed planting palette and boundary treatments are deemed acceptable for the site and the provision of a gauze screening in the interim period before planting has matured is positive. It is considered that the proposed native planting, which includes shrubs, specimen trees and herbaceous species, will help the site to blend into the surroundings, soften the edges and alongside the 1-3m high bunds, reduce any visual impact. It is, however, not entirely clear what the proposed palette for both the climbers and the aquatic landscape is.

We requested that full elevations of the proposed building, including material specification and details of fenestration and access points were provided. The plans, together with the DAS and a number of perspective views, provide sufficient information on the proposed design which is deemed to be of high architectural quality. The elevations provide details of proposed fenestration which is positive and will make a feature of the building's eastern aspect, whilst associated plans show how the building is proposed to operate for both pedestrians and vehicular access. The materials palette is of good quality and minimalist in style which is

appropriate for the architectural style of the building and its setting. The mounded / slope arrangement to the western aspect is exciting and a very positive feature of the building.

1. The pond is a very positive feature in the landscape and amendments have been made to the attenuation pond as recommended at pre-application such as the inclusion of a habitat island in the pond for wildlife. Helpful diagrams have been included which show typical sections across the pond; however, it is unclear at present what the proposed aquatic and marginal planting palette will be.

It was suggested that careful consideration be given to waste storage and collection as part of the scheme, which should be integrated as part of the proposed building to avoid additional standalone buildings. This does not appear to have been considered, as a stand alone refuse collection store is shown to be located on the edge of the first team car parking area. Whilst this may be to facilitate access by refuse collection vehicles and operatives, we would seek to obtain information of the proposed materials, treatment and elevations of the refuse store.

As outlined in pre-application correspondence, it is imperative that careful consideration is given to the appropriate placement of plant and extraction flues, and if necessary, screening to conceal their location to avoid any disturbance to the aesthetics of the building design. The various sections and roof plans show a high level of consideration for the location of plant within the scheme, and it is agreed that the inset approach within the grassed roof slope presents the best opportunity to conceal the infrastructure. Whilst it will have been considered as part of the design, what is not immediately clear in the plans and diagrams is how pedestrians on the roof will be prevented from accessing or falling into the plant area by accident, and this should be made clearer.

2. Whilst the match day parking has been shown to be reinforced grass, the access road and first team parking is still being shown as vehicular bitmac. It was outlined at pre-application that our preference would be for a permeable material in these areas, and the opportunity for using permeable bitmac should be considered should a tarmac approach be deemed necessary. Alternatively a permeable block paving surface would not only be more attractive aesthetically but also fulfil the sustainable drainage requirements for the first team parking area.
3. Archaeology, and in particular the presence of the Prittlewell Camp Ancient Monument located in close proximity to the site, has been considered and measures proposed to reduce the impact on this. Approval of this treatment would need to be taken by the District's conservation officer.

- 4.80 We do not see any grounds for objection to the scheme on urban design grounds and would support the development.

### **SECOND RESPONSE (28/01/22)**

- 4.81 Our original response to this application (09/08/2017) sets out our consultation response on urban design and landscape matters, following on from a series of pre-application meetings in 2015. Due to the nature of the re-consultation and the fact that the proposal has not altered our comments remain constant to those previously raised and are highlighted below.
- 1) Previous consultations suggested further details of specific landscape and boundary treatments to be provided. This included barrier and boundary treatments, climbing and aquatic/marginal planting specification. To address this, we would recommend a detailed planting plan and schedule to be conditioned as part of this application, if approved.
  - 2) Previous consultation responses were supportive of the proposed elevation treatment. The proposed material palette is of good quality and minimalist in style which is appropriate for the architectural style of the building and its setting. However, if approved, we would recommend a condition to determine the materials palette based on samples submitted to the local authority.
  - 3) Previous consultation responses sought further clarification regarding the proposed materials, treatment and elevations of the refuse store. We would recommend (if approved) a planning condition to determine the materials palette based on samples submitted to the local authority.
  - 4) Whilst the match day parking has been shown to be reinforced grass, the access road and first team parking is still being shown as vehicular bitmac. It was outlined at pre-application that our preference would be for a permeable material in these areas, and the opportunity for using permeable bitmac should be considered should a tarmac approach be deemed necessary. Alternatively, a permeable block paving surface would not only be more attractive aesthetically but also fulfil the sustainable drainage requirements for the first team parking area.
  - 5) Archaeology, and in particular the presence of the Prittlewell Camp Ancient Monument located in close proximity to the site, has been considered and measures proposed to reduce the impact on this. Approval of this treatment would need to be taken by the District's conservation officer.

**ECC Minerals & Waste****FIRST RESPONSE (18/12/20)**

- 4.82 The application site is located within land which is designated as a Mineral Safeguarding Area (MSA) for sand and gravel. At 6.5ha, the application meets the 5ha threshold at which Policy S8 of the Essex Minerals Local Plan 2014, and therefore mineral safeguarding provisions, are engaged.
- 4.83 However, upon the application of a 100m buffer around all existing residential development, the resulting area of mineral bearing land that would be sterilised falls below this 5ha threshold set for applications in an MSA associated with sand and gravel.
- 4.84 The proposed application site is also not within 250m of safeguarded minerals and/or waste infrastructure or 400m of a Water Recycling Facility. Essex County Council in its capacity as the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority therefore has no comment to make with regard to this application.

**SECOND RESPONSE (13/01/22)**

- 4.85 Same as above.

**Environment Agency (11/08/17)**

- 4.86 No comment as this application falls outside our consultation checklist.

**Natural England****FIRST RESPONSE (18/07/17)**

- 4.87 Statutory nature conservation sites – no objection.
- 4.88 Based upon the information provided, Natural England advises the Council that the proposal is unlikely to affect any statutorily protected sites.
- 4.89 We have not assessed this application and associated documents for impacts on protected species. Natural England has published Standing Advice on protected species. You should apply our Standing Advice to this application as it is a material consideration in the determination of applications in the same way as any individual response received from Natural England following consultation.
- 4.90 Green Infrastructure: The proposed development is within an area that Natural England considers could benefit from enhanced green infrastructure (GI) provision. Multi-functional green infrastructure can perform a range of functions including improved flood risk management, provision of accessible green space, climate change adaptation and biodiversity enhancement. Natural England would encourage the incorporation of GI into this

development. Evidence and advice on green infrastructure, including the economic benefits of GI, can be found on the Natural England Green Infrastructure web pages.

- 4.91 Local sites: If the proposal site is on or adjacent to a local site, e.g., Local Wildlife Site, Regionally Important Geological/Geomorphological Site (RIGS) or Local Nature Reserve (LNR) the authority should ensure it has sufficient information to fully understand the impact of the proposal on the local site before it determines the application.
- 4.92 Landscape enhancements: This application may provide opportunities to enhance the character and local distinctiveness of the surrounding natural and built environment; use natural resources more sustainably; and bring benefits for the local community, for example through green space provision and access to and contact with nature. Landscape characterisation and townscape assessments, and associated sensitivity and capacity assessments provide tools for planners and developers to consider new development and ensure that it makes a positive contribution in terms of design, form and location, to the character and functions of the landscape and avoids any unacceptable impacts.
- 4.93 Sites of Special Scientific Interest Impact Risk Zones: The Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 requires local planning authorities to consult Natural England on “Development in or likely to affect a Site of Special Scientific Interest” (Schedule 4, w). Our SSSI Impact Risk Zones are a GIS dataset designed to be used during the planning application validation process to help local planning authorities decide when to consult Natural England on developments likely to affect a SSSI. The dataset and user guidance can be accessed from the [data.gov.uk](https://data.gov.uk) website.

## **SECOND RESPONSE (23/12/20)**

- 4.94 Natural England has previously commented on this proposal and made comments to the authority in our letter dated 18 July 2017 Reference 219863.
- 4.95 The advice provided in our previous response applies equally to this amendment although we made no objection to the original proposal.
- 4.96 The proposed amendments to the original application are unlikely to have significantly different impacts on the natural environment than the original proposal.

## **THIRD RESPONSE (26/01/22)**

- 4.97 No objection based on the plans submitted. Natural England considers that the proposed development will not have significant adverse impacts on statutorily protected nature conservation sites or landscapes. Natural

England's generic advice on other natural environment issues is set out at Annex A.

**Essex & Suffolk Water (12/07/17)**

- 4.98 Our records show that we do not have any apparatus located in the proposed development. We have no objection to this development, subject to compliance with our requirements. Consent is given to the development on the condition that a water connection is made onto our company network for the new dwelling for revenue purposes.

**Sport England**

**FIRST RESPONSE (19/07/17)**

- 4.99 Summary: It is expected that Sport England would make no objection to this planning application when assessed in the context of its acceptability for replacing Southend United FC's existing training centre. However, there are a few queries that are requested to be addressed in relation to playing pitch construction and development phasing as set out in the response to allow our position to be confirmed. If responses to these queries could be provided, our response could be reviewed and our position confirmed on the planning application.
- 4.100 This response is made without prejudice to our position as a statutory consultee on the related planning application (17/00733/FULM) being determined by Southend-on-Sea Borough Council for re-development of Southend United FC's existing training ground.

**Sport England - Non Statutory Role and Policy**

- 4.101 The Government, within its Planning Practice Guidance (Open Space, Sports and Recreation Facilities Section) advises Local Planning Authorities to consult Sport England on a wide range of applications.  
<https://www.gov.uk/guidance/open-space-sports-and-recreation-facilities-public-rights-of-way-and-local-green-space#open-space-sports-and-recreation-facilities>.
- 4.102 This application falls within the scope of the above guidance as it relates to the creation of new playing fields.
- 4.103 Sport England assesses this type of application in line with its planning objectives and with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). Sport England's planning objectives are to protect existing facilities, enhance the quality, accessibility and management of existing facilities, and to provide new facilities to meet demand. Further information on Sport England's planning objectives can be found here: <http://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/planning-for-sport/aims-and-objectives/>

The Proposal and Assessment against Sport England's Objectives and the NPPF.

- 4.104 The proposal principally involves a new first team training centre for Southend United Football Club (SUFC) that would consist of a training centre building and associated car parking and four full size natural turf football pitches. This would represent a replacement training ground facility for SUFC to allow a retail park to be developed on the club's existing training ground (which is the subject of a separate but related planning application (17/00733/FULM)) that is being determined by Southend-on-Sea Borough Council on the related Fossetts Farm site that adjoins the application site to the south). As well as the retail park, the related planning application also includes a proposal for a new stadium for SUFC and indoor soccer domes that would be used by SUFC and the community. While the sites of the two applications are in different local authority areas, they physically adjoin each other and the developments are integrated in the masterplan that covers both sites. The development of the retail park on SUFC's existing training ground is contingent on this planning application being approved and implemented as the new training ground will need to be permitted and delivered to allow the club's training centre to relocate. As this application for the new training centre would not affect playing fields, the consultation with Sport England is not statutory. However, as the proposed development includes playing field provision which has been proposed to directly replace playing fields that would be lost to development at Southend United FC's training ground in the related planning application (which is a statutory consultation), I would expect the comments on the replacement training ground to be given an appropriate level of weight when the application is determined. I would also expect the two local planning authorities to co-ordinate the determination of the planning applications to avoid a potential scenario where the application for the loss of the existing training ground is approved but the application for the replacement training ground is refused given the inter-relationship and dependencies between the two applications in planning policy and practical terms.
- 4.105 As set out in the planning application, an extant planning permission (06/00943/FUL) exists for developing a new training ground on part of the application site. The main difference between the permitted scheme and the current scheme in relation to the training ground facilities is that the current scheme proposes a training centre building for use by the club's first team and academy. The permitted scheme did not include a building because it was intended that the training pitches would be served by the adjoining stadium facilities that were approved as part of an expired planning permission for a new stadium. In addition, the current scheme involves four natural turf pitches while the previous scheme involved three natural turf pitches and an artificial grass pitch. An artificial grass pitch is not proposed in the current scheme because it is proposed that the club would use the artificial pitch proposed in one of the soccer domes in the related Southend planning application.

- 4.106 In this context, I would comment on each of the key elements of the proposal as follows:

#### Playing Pitches

- 4.107 In quantitative terms, the number and type of football pitches proposed would be similar to those provided on the existing SUFC training ground which also provides four full size natural turf pitches. In qualitative terms, it would be expected that the quality of the new pitches would be equivalent or better to those on the club's existing training ground due to the high standard required to support SUFC's use. However, no sports pitch feasibility study has been submitted providing details of the playing pitch construction proposals. A feasibility study would assess the ground conditions of the site and set out detailed proposals for constructing the pitches to demonstrate that suitable quality pitches would be provided in practice. This is pertinent in view of the need to address the topography across the site to create pitches with suitable gradients plus the expected need to install a primary drainage system to drain the pitches. While it is acknowledged that it would be in the club's interests to ensure that suitable pitch construction proposals are implemented, the submission and approval of such a study would be required to demonstrate that the quality of the replacement pitches would be equivalent or better in practice and thereby accord with the criteria in Government policy in paragraph 74 of the NPPF and exception E4 of Sport England's playing fields policy <https://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/planning-for-sport/planning-applications/playing-field-land/> that is used for assessing replacement playing field proposals as a statutory consultee. In Sport England's initial response to the related Southend planning application, confirmation has been requested of whether a feasibility study (prepared by an agronomist/sports turf consultant) has been prepared to help inform our position as a statutory consultee on this application. It is requested that the applicant provides a response to this query before Sport England's position is confirmed on this matter in relation to the Rochford application. In the event that such a study has not been prepared before the application is determined, it would be necessary to secure the submission and approval of such a feasibility study through a planning condition as a pre-commencement requirement of any planning permission for the new training ground pitches. A model planning condition can be provided, if necessary. However, it would be preferable for such a study to be prepared and considered during the determination stage if it has not been already so that a fully informed assessment can be made at the outset of whether the replacement playing pitches would be of equivalent or better quality in practice.

#### Training Centre Building

- 4.108 The training centre has been designed to meet the requirements of SUFC's first team, youth teams and its academy. As well as providing essential ancillary facilities for supporting the use of the adjoining training pitches such



as changing rooms, it will provide the facilities that are necessary to support the training requirements of a modern professional football club such as gyms, rehabilitation facilities, dining areas and offices. The facilities proposed are considered to be comparable with those now provided at many professional football club training grounds. While comparative information has not been provided about the club's existing training centre building, as the facility has been designed specifically to meet the club's current and future needs, it would appear that the range and quality of facilities proposed in the proposed building would either be equivalent or superior to the existing facilities that would be replaced.

#### Phasing

- 4.109 Table 3.1 of the Environmental Statement submitted in support of the Southend planning application sets out an indicative phasing programme for the overall SUFC development which indicates that the new training ground if permitted would be built over a period between autumn 2017 and summer 2018 while development on the existing training ground would start in spring 2018. While such an indicative timetable could potentially allow the new training ground to be completed before any development starts on the club's existing facility, based on experience of similar schemes it is considered challenging to complete a training centre for a professional sports club of this scale in less than a year. In particular, the construction of suitable quality natural turf playing pitches typically takes 18 months from construction commencing to the pitches being ready to play on. In Sport England's initial response to the related Southend planning application, confirmation has been requested of how long it is actually expected to take in practice for the new training ground to be completed from commencement of construction to the pitches being operational in view of this potential concern. Clarity has also been requested about whether construction on the club's existing ground will not commence until the new training ground is operational or whether there are proposals for using alternative facilities for an interim period. This information has been requested as a statutory consultee to assess whether there would be continuity of training facility provision for SUFC in accordance with exception E4 of our playing fields policy. It is requested that the applicant provides a response to this query before Sport England's position is confirmed on this matter in relation to the Rochford application as well. The phasing and delivery of the replacement training ground will need to be addressed through any planning permission for the Southend application in order to ensure that continuity of facility provision is secured.
- 4.110 Without prejudice to our position on the related planning application that is being determined by Southend-on-Sea Borough Council, it is considered that the proposals would in broad terms offer potential to deliver a replacement training ground facility for SUFC that would accord with Sport England's playing fields policy and the NPPF as well as meeting the above objective relating to the protection of facilities. Based on the information provided to date it would appear that the new facility would be likely to be equivalent or

better in terms of quantity and quality to the existing facilities that they would replace. It is therefore expected that Sport England would make no objection to this planning application when assessed in the context of its acceptability for replacing SUFC's existing training centre. However, as set out above, there are some matters that we would request clarity on before confirming our position:

- Confirmation of whether a sports pitch feasibility study (prepared by an agronomist/sports turf consultant) for the proposed football pitches has been prepared (or will be prepared before the application is determined) to assess the ground conditions of the new training ground site. A planning condition is likely to be required to address this matter but the nature of it will depend on the response to the query.
- Confirmation of how long it is actually expected to take in practice for the new training ground to be completed from commencement of construction to the pitches being operational and whether construction on the club's existing ground will not commence until the new training ground is operational or whether there are proposals for using alternative facilities for an interim period.

4.111 If responses to the above queries could be provided by the applicant, I would be willing to review this response and confirm our position on the planning application.

4.112 It should be emphasised that this response to the training ground planning application is made without prejudice to our position on the related Southend planning application (17/00733/FULM) which involves the re-development of SUFC's existing training ground and other playing fields as we are awaiting further information to be provided on this application to allow a substantive response to be made to the consultation as a statutory consultee and our current position on this application is a holding objection, as set out in our initial response to this application dated 14 June 2017. Our assessment of whether the proposals for re-developing SUFC's existing training ground and replacing them on the site that is the subject of this application (17/00436/FUL) accords with our playing fields policy and the NPPF will be provided in our response to application 17/00733/FULM as this is the application that involves the loss of playing fields and is the one which Sport England has been consulted on as a statutory consultee. As set out above, there is a need to co-ordinate the determination of the two planning applications in view of the dependencies between the proposals in each application in both planning policy and practical terms.

## **SECOND RESPONSE (09/12/20)**

4.113 As you will be aware, Sport England made a formal response to the original consultation in 2017 as a non-statutory consultee and I attach our response dated 19 July 2017 for convenience.

- 4.114 It would appear that the amended scheme principally relates to amendments replacing the outline retail/leisure proposals with an outline residential led proposal in the related planning application 17/00733/FULM that is being determined by Southend-on-Sea Borough Council. There would not appear to be any amendments to the proposals for the replacement Southend United FC Training Centre that falls within the scope of application 17/00436/FUL. On the basis that it would appear that there are no substantive amendments to the scheme that would justify a review of our assessment of the scheme as a non-statutory consultee I can advise that our position on the application would remain as set out in our formal response dated 19 July 2017 i.e., it is expected that no objection would be made, subject to a few queries being addressed in relation to playing pitch construction and development phasing.
- 4.115 This response is made without prejudice to our position as a statutory consultee on the related planning application (17/00733/FULM) being determined by Southend-on-Sea Borough Council for re-development of Southend United FC's existing training ground. For information, I also attach our response to the amended plans consultation for the Southend-on-Sea application.

### **THIRD RESPONSE (10/01/22)**

- 4.116 Thank you for sending me the agent's comments that respond to the queries that I made on this planning application when originally consulted in 2017. I have reviewed the agent's comments and can advise that I am satisfied in principle with the response as the agent has confirmed that they will accept a pre-commencement condition being imposed that would address the need for a sports pitch feasibility study to be submitted and approved in order to demonstrate that an equivalent or better quality playing field will be provided at the proposed training centre. If such a condition also made provision for the details of the implementation programme then this would address the query about the timescales for delivering the new training pitches. The draft section 106 agreement for the related Southend-on-Sea planning application (17/00733/FULM) makes provision for the new training centre pitches to be provided before any development commences on the existing training centre site but the submission of the construction programme would help demonstrate that a suitable programme is proposed which allows the necessary time for the pitches to be constructed and maintained in advance of their first use.
- 4.117 I can therefore advise that no objection is made to the planning application as a non-statutory consultee, subject to a condition along the following lines being imposed on any planning permission which is based on model condition 10a of our model conditions schedule [https://www.sportengland.org/how-we-can-help/facilities-and-planning/planning-for-sport?section=playing\\_fields\\_policy](https://www.sportengland.org/how-we-can-help/facilities-and-planning/planning-for-sport?section=playing_fields_policy)) :

*No development of the playing pitches shall commence until the following documents have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority after consultation with Sport England:*

*A. A detailed assessment of ground conditions (including drainage and topography) of the land proposed for the playing field which identifies constraints which could affect playing field quality; and*

*B. Based on the results of the assessment to be carried out pursuant to (i) above, a detailed scheme which ensures that the playing field will be provided to an acceptable quality. The scheme shall include a written specification of soils structure, proposed drainage, cultivation and other operations associated with grass and sports turf establishment and a programme of implementation.*

*The approved scheme shall be carried out in full and in accordance with a timeframe agreed with the Local Planning Authority. The land shall thereafter be maintained in accordance with the scheme and made available for playing field use in accordance with the scheme.*

*Reason: To ensure that the playing field is prepared to an adequate standard and is fit for purpose and to accord with Development Plan Policy \*\*.*

- 4.118 Informative: The applicant is advised that the scheme should comply with the relevant industry Technical Guidance, including guidance published by Sport England, National Governing Bodies for Sport. Particular attention is drawn to the Natural Turf for Sport guidance note.
- 4.119 Further advice on sports pitch feasibility studies and examples can be provided to the applicant upon request.
- 4.120 If the above condition was not imposed then our position on the application would be an objection as there would not be a mechanism in place in advance of the development commencing for assessing whether the replacement training pitches were of equivalent or better quality compared to the pitches that they will replace.

#### **ECC Historic Buildings & Conservation (26/01/22)**

- 4.121 The application site is an area of open, part agricultural land and southeast of the site is the Scheduled Monument of Prittlewell Camp Hillfort (list entry number: 10175515). The open and rural landscape positively contributes to the rural character, setting and significance of the Scheduled Monument. To the west of the site is the Grade II listed Sutton Road Cemetery War Memorial (list entry number: 1444573).
- 4.122 It is understood that only the northern portion of the site, to include training pitches, training facility, parking and associated landscaping is located within Rochford District, and is for comment. Therefore, upon review of the submitted documents I raise no objection to this application. However, there is

a concern upon the cumulative impacts of the proposals and I advise that Historic England is consulted, who may wish to comment upon the potential cumulative impacts of the scheme against the designated heritage assets and their significance.

### **Anglian Water**

#### **FIRST RESPONSE (08/08/17)**

- 4.123 There are assets owned by Anglian Water or those subject to an adoption agreement within or close to the development boundary that may affect the layout of the site. Anglian Water would ask that the following text be included within your Notice should permission be granted:

*“Anglian Water has assets close to or crossing this site or there are assets subject to an adoption agreement. Therefore the site layout should take this into account and accommodate those assets within either prospectively adoptable highways or public open space. If this is not practicable then the sewers will need to be diverted at the developer’s cost under Section 185 of the Water Industry Act 1991 or, in the case of apparatus under an adoption agreement, liaise with the owners of the apparatus. It should be noted that the diversion works should normally be completed before development can commence.”*

- 4.124 The foul drainage from this development is in the catchment of Southend Water Recycling Centre that will have available capacity for these flows.
- 4.125 Development will lead to an unacceptable risk of flooding downstream. A drainage strategy will need to be prepared in consultation with Anglian Water to determine mitigation measures.
- 4.126 We request a condition requiring the drainage strategy covering the issue(s) to be agreed.
- 4.127 From the details submitted to support the planning application the proposed method of surface water management does not relate to Anglian Water operated assets. As such, we are unable to provide comments on the suitability of the surface water management. The Local Planning Authority should seek the advice of the Lead Local Flood Authority or the Internal Drainage Board. The Environment Agency should be consulted if the drainage system directly or indirectly involves the discharge of water into a water course.
- 4.128 Should the proposed method of surface water management change to include interaction with Anglian Water operated assets, we would wish to be re-consulted to ensure that an effective surface water drainage strategy is prepared and implemented.

- 4.129 The planning application includes employment/commercial use. To discharge trade effluent from trade premises to a public sewer vested in Anglian Water requires our consent. It is an offence under section 118 of the Water Industry Act 1991 to discharge trade effluent to sewer without consent. Anglian Water would ask that the following text be included within your Notice should permission be granted.

*“An application to discharge trade effluent must be made to Anglian Water and must have been obtained before any discharge of trade effluent can be made to the public sewer.”*

- 4.130 Anglian Water recommends that petrol / oil interceptors be fitted in all car parking/washing/repair facilities. Failure to enforce the effective use of such facilities could result in pollution of the local water course and may constitute an offence.
- 4.131 Anglian Water also recommends the installation of properly maintained fat traps on all catering establishments. Failure to do so may result in this and other properties suffering blocked drains, sewage flooding and consequential environmental and amenity impact and may also constitute an offence under section 111 of the Water Industry Act 1991.”
- 4.132 Anglian Water would therefore recommend the following planning condition if the Local Planning Authority is mindful to grant planning approval:

**CONDITION:**

*No development shall commence until a foul water strategy has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. No dwellings shall be occupied until the works have been carried out in accordance with the foul water strategy so approved unless otherwise approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.*

*REASON: To prevent environmental and amenity problems arising from flooding.*

**SECOND RESPONSE (07/01/19)**

- 4.133 There are assets owned by Anglian Water or those subject to an adoption agreement within or close to the development boundary that may affect the layout of the site. Anglian Water would ask that the following text be included within your Notice should permission be granted:

*Anglian Water has assets close to or crossing this site or there are assets subject to an adoption agreement. Therefore the site layout should take this into account and accommodate those assets within either prospectively adoptable highways or public open space. If this is not practicable then the sewers will need to be diverted at the developer's cost under Section 185 of*

*the Water Industry Act 1991. or, in the case of apparatus under an adoption agreement, liaise with the owners of the apparatus. It should be noted that the diversion works should normally be completed before development can commence.*

- 4.134 The development site is within 15 metres of a sewage pumping station. This asset requires access for maintenance and will have sewerage infrastructure leading to it. For practical reasons therefore it cannot be easily relocated. Anglian Water considers that dwellings located within 15 metres of the pumping station would place them at risk of nuisance in the form of noise, odour or the general disruption from maintenance work caused by the normal operation of the pumping station. The site layout should take this into account and accommodate this infrastructure type through a necessary cordon sanitaire, through public space or highway infrastructure to ensure that no development within 15 metres from the boundary of a sewage pumping station if the development is potentially sensitive to noise or other disturbance or to ensure future amenity issues are not created.

#### Section 2 - Wastewater Treatment

- 4.135 The foul drainage from this development is in the catchment of Rochford Water Recycling Centre that will have available capacity for these flows.

#### Section 3 - Used Water Network

- 4.136 Development will lead to an unacceptable risk of flooding down stream. Anglian Water will need to plan effectively for the proposed development, if permission is granted. We will need to work with the applicant to ensure any infrastructure improvements are delivered in line with the development. The developer is proposing to promote a pumped solution to Eastern Avenue as per FRA 5.3; however, we will require a connecting manhole and pump rate in order to conduct an accurate impact assessment. We therefore request a condition requiring phasing plan and/or on-site drainage strategy.

#### Section 4 - Surface Water Disposal

- 4.137 The preferred method of surface water disposal would be to a sustainable drainage system (SuDS) with connection to sewer seen as the last option. Building Regulations (part H) on Drainage and Waste Disposal for England includes a surface water drainage hierarchy, with infiltration on site as the preferred disposal option, followed by discharge to water course and then connection to a sewer.
- 4.138 From the details submitted to support the planning application the proposed method of surface water management does not relate to Anglian Water operated assets and the developer is proposing discharge via a ditch system as per FRA drawing 348762. As such, we are unable to provide comments in the suitability of the surface water management. The Local Planning Authority

should seek the advice of the Lead Local Flood Authority or the Internal Drainage Board. The Environment Agency should be consulted if the drainage system directly or indirectly involves the discharge of water into a water course. Should the proposed method of surface water management change to include interaction with Anglian Water operated assets, we would wish to be re-consulted to ensure that an effective surface water drainage strategy is prepared and implemented.

#### Section 5 - Suggested Planning Conditions

- 4.139 Anglian Water would therefore recommend the following planning condition if the Local Planning Authority is mindful to grant planning approval:

##### Used Water Sewerage Network (Section 3)

*Prior to the construction above, details of a damp proof course, a scheme for on-site foul water drainage works, including connection point and discharge rate, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Prior to the occupation of any phase, the foul water drainage works relating to that phase must have been carried out in complete accordance with the approved scheme.*

Reason: To prevent environmental and amenity problems arising from flooding

#### THIRD RESPONSE (17/12/20)

- 4.140 There are assets owned by Anglian Water or those subject to an adoption agreement within or close to the development boundary that may affect the layout of the site. Anglian Water would ask that the following text be included within your Notice should permission be granted.

*Anglian Water has assets close to or crossing this site or there are assets subject to an adoption agreement. Therefore the site layout should take this into account and accommodate those assets within either prospectively adoptable highways or public open space. If this is not practicable then the sewers will need to be diverted at the developer's cost under Section 185 of the Water Industry Act 1991. or, in the case of apparatus under an adoption agreement, liaise with the owners of the apparatus. It should be noted that the diversion works should normally be completed before development can commence.*

#### Section 2 - Wastewater Treatment

- 4.141 The foul drainage from this development is in the catchment of Rochford Water Recycling Centre that will have available capacity for these flows

#### Section 3 - Used Water Network



- 4.142 This response has been based on the following submitted documents:  
Addendum to Flood Risk Assessment. Development may lead to an unacceptable risk of flooding downstream. Whilst the strategy to pump foul flows to the 675mm foul sewer in Eastern Avenue is acceptable in principle, the proposed pumped rate of 88l/s is higher than Anglian Water would calculate for a development of this size. The rate calculated for the entire development is 16.9 L/S and a peak discharge of 31.8 L/S. We ask that the developer reconfirms their proposed pump rate for the entire development. Anglian Water will need to plan effectively for the proposed development, if permission is granted. We will need to work with the applicant to ensure any infrastructure improvements are delivered in line with the development. We therefore request a condition requiring an on site drainage strategy

#### Section 4 - Surface Water Disposal

- 4.143 The preferred method of surface water disposal would be to a sustainable drainage system (SuDS) with connection to sewer seen as the last option. Building Regulations (part H) on Drainage and Waste Disposal for England includes a surface water drainage hierarchy, with infiltration on site as the preferred disposal option, followed by discharge to water course and then connection to a sewer. From the details submitted to support the planning application the proposed method of surface water management does not relate to Anglian Water operated assets. As such, we are unable to provide comments on the suitability of the surface water management. The Local Planning Authority should seek the advice of the Lead Local Flood Authority or the Internal Drainage Board. The Environment Agency should be consulted if the drainage system directly or indirectly involves the discharge of water into a water course. Should the proposed method of surface water management change to include interaction with Anglian Water operated assets, we would wish to be reconsulted to ensure that an effective surface water drainage strategy is prepared and implemented.

#### Section 5 - Suggested Planning Conditions

- 4.144 Anglian Water would therefore recommend the following planning condition if the Local Planning Authority is mindful to grant planning approval.

Used Water Sewerage Network (Section 3) We have no objection, subject to the following condition:

*Prior to the construction above, details of a damp proof course, a scheme for on site foul water drainage works, including connection point and discharge rate, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Prior to the occupation of any phase, the foul water drainage works relating to that phase must have been carried out in complete accordance with the approved scheme.*

*Reason To prevent environmental and amenity problems arising from flooding*

**4.145 Response to Neighbour Notification****FIRST CONSULTATION****In objection: (21)**

Derbydale, Rochford: 21 (20/07/17)

Lee Lotts: 48 (05/07/17)

Rochefort Drive : 2 (10/01/18)

Shopland Road: Winters (24/07/17), Butlers Gate (26/07/17), Butlers Farm Bungalows (31/07/17)

Sutton Road: Rectory Lodge (17/07/17), 682 (31/07/17)

Templegate Cottages, Southend: 1 (31/07/17), 4 (03/08/17), 5 (17/07/17 & 20/07/17 x 2, 24/07/17), 6 (05/07/17), 9 (10/07/17)

Wentworth Road, Southend: 120 (24/07/17)

Woodpond Avenue, Hockley: 33 (25/07/17)

Unknown addresses: Oliver, Charles & Gill Tabor (31/07/17), Postcode: SS2 5QR – Sue du Preez (24/07/17), SS3 0LZ - P Splett (24/07/17)

Comments can be summarised as follows:

- Public right of way:
  - Footpath to remain unobstructed during and after construction by condition.
- Layout:
  - Boundaries not sufficient to stop travellers/joy riders.
  - How secure will the training ground be? No security measures or gates or fencing on the parking area has been stated.
- Amenity :
  - noise pollution
  - traffic vibration
  - air quality
  - Inappropriately close to crematorium
  - Facility will be used more than previous permission
  - Smithers Farm will be marooned when car park is used.
  - Air quality concerns from vehicles
  - Noise of vehicles parking and waiting to exit parking area and from stadium, especially if concerts are allowed

- Concerns regarding potential use of training pitches and/or car park being used to host other functions such as charity events, boot sales, etc
- Concern over litter everywhere
- Construction traffic noise
- Restricted use of the proposed Club House to times and the non hiring out of the premises and private use of the car park are musts or it will get out of control
- Ecology:
  - Harm to wildlife – great crested newts, badgers, badger set, bats, birds, foxes, deer
  - The pond on the edge of the site - the effect on nature from disturbance and pollution.
- Sustainability:
  - Area badly served by public transport
- Parking:
  - 92% increase in parking from previous scheme
  - Where do coaches park? Sutton Road does not have capacity for coaches
  - Not enough parking spaces proposed so people will park down adjacent streets
- Lighting:
  - No mention of lighting
- Principle of development
  - Does not accord with development plan in force
  - Loss of prime farm land
  - Over-development
- Concern around vandalism of local homes
- Green Belt:
  - Large building is clearly not a necessity for the training pitches
  - Visual impact of openness of green belt
  - Destroying character of the countryside
  - Where is RDC's pledge to keep green barrier between RDC and Southend?
- Design:
  - Height of the proposed development is offensive
- Attenuation:
  - Flats and car park are lower than attenuation pond; how can water run uphill? When balancing pond is full where will water discharge? Ditches won't be able to cope unless maintained. Effluent spills?
  - Show a reduction in size of the pond which will prove problems for drainage of the site.
  - No way water or water run off recalculations have been submitted
  - Always had a problem with removal of surface water along this stretch of road. Area is larger now and slopes away from pond, reinforced grass traditionally has to be laid on a hard base that after a couple of years will not allow much water through leaving it to drain downhill to the road and cottages

- Who will accept responsibility for drainage issues
  - Concern over drainage measures
- Knock on effect would be detrimental to businesses on Temple Farm and Purdeys Way industrial estates
- Those who profit from these developments should be forced to contribute to the update of the local infrastructure to support them
- They should restrict expansion plans to the Southend land
- Noise:
  - Football pitches will generate noise which is unacceptable for local residents
  - Other events would generate noise
- Insufficient landscape buffer zone to screen impact of the large car park
- Lighting:
  - The proposed 8m high lighting is unnecessary and will create light pollution and should be replaced with lower bollard lighting
- Section 106/condition suggestions:
  - Landscaping to improve visual outlook of all local houses
  - Soundproofing of houses
  - Security measures for match days
  - Car parking area only available on match days to match day visitors
  - Lighting restrictions
  - Clubhouse building for football training use only
  - Funding needs to be made available to improve the junctions of Sutton Road/Shopland Road, Sutton Road and Purdeys industrial estate and Southend Road/Sutton Road Rochford
  - Funding must be made available to improve the water course ditches from the site northwards towards the River Roach.
  - Sutton Road not wide enough. To be made wider by condition.
  - Suggested conditions – car parking area not for other purposes, car park only used for 1<sup>st</sup> team matches, training pitches 3 days per week usage and hour restrictions, lighting off by 2200 hours, buffer zone between car park and dwellings, no amplified speech/music, no floodlighting except in accordance with details.
  - Suggested mitigation To Temple Gate Cottage properties: protection to rear of properties in Temple Gate Cottages to include bunding and fencing, private road to the rear for sole use by residents, external sound insulation to properties and double glazing.
- Traffic:
  - No calculation on traffic management and its effect on Sutton Road and other local feeder roads is shown
  - More traffic – gridlocked
  - Query around emergency contingency plans with extra traffic on the roads blocking access to homes nearby
  - Development will attract coaches and buses on match days.
  - Concern around fires on match days and access through to Rochford and Hockley
  - Sutton Road can't cope with extra traffic
- Access:

- Details of access management on match days is not satisfactorily covered
- Only one access/egress point onto roundabout on Fossetts Way would take long time to clear traffic on match days

**In support (22):**

Barnstaple Road: 200 (26/07/17)

Broome Road: 26 (26/07/17)

Crouch Meadow, Hullbridge: 12 (26/07/17)

Doggetts Close, Rochford: 13 (27/07/17)

Downhall Park Way, Rayleigh: 20 (26/07/17)

Egbert Gardens, Wickford: 37 (04/08/17)

Glebe Crescent, Broomfield: 79 (26/07/17)

Grasmere Avenue, Hullbridge: 34 (26/07/17)

Gravel Road, Eastwood: 44c (03/08/17)

Hampstead Gardens: 21 (16/08/17)

Hedge Lane, Benfleet: 2 (15/08/17)

Kursaal Way, Southend: 30 Mirror Steps (26/07/17)

Larks Lane, Great Waltham, Chelmsford: Red House (03/08/17)

Lesney Gardens, Rochford: 14 (26/07/17)

Lundy Close: 37 (26/07/17)

Martock Avenue: 57 (26/07/17)

Olive Avenue: 99 (29/08/17)

Parklands: 82 (24/07/17)

Stansfield Road, Benfleet: 105 (26/07/17)

St Lawrence Gardens: 39 (28/03/18)

Trinity Road, Southend: 124 (26/07/17)

Uplands Road, Hawkwell: 28 (26/07/17)

Comments as follows:

- New location good for supporters travelling from Rochford
- Exciting new development within Rochford and Southend
- Green land will largely be preserved
- Creation of jobs within the community
- Football clubs often unite communities
- Club has been recognised by the league as a family friendly organisation and does a great deal with the youth of the area via its schools programmes
- Training facilities that the club would like to introduce will benefit the local schools
- Club's proposals have gone to great lengths to mitigate any impact on surrounding land and amenities
- Southend United are desperately in need of a new stadium and surrounding facilities to enable the club to grow
- Ground that they can be proud of and also facilities for the amateur Cubs in the area to use
- Will support local youths to develop their skills and maybe follow a career in professional sport
- Will bring jobs and visitors who will spend in our community – pubs and restaurants
- Will ensure a greater portion of Rochford and Southend's leisure expenditure is retained in the local area as opposed to Basildon/ Lakeside/ London
- Increased access to sport for Rochford's youths will benefit their wellbeing, both physically and mentally
- Will provide conference facilities and meeting rooms the like of which are thin currently
- Help reduce crime
- The football club's success will enhance public awareness of our home area throughout the country and thereby improve the economy in the Rochford region
- Will bring many economic and social benefits to the area
- These leisure facilities are urgently needed in the south east
- Will raise the profile of Southend as a town, both culturally and economically
- The town of Southend really needs to move forward, and take more advantage of the prosperous commuter towns of Thorpe Bay and Leigh and this development must surely be a step in the right direction
- Provide up to date and advanced facilities

**SECOND CONSULTATION****In Objection (4):**

Templegate Cottages: 5 (23/12/20) (x 2), 6 (08/12/21)

Sutton Road: Rectory Lodge (18/12/20)

Comments can be summarised as follows below. Many points are already highlighted in the first consultation stage above.

- Transport assessment contains many inaccuracies. In reality during the p.m. peak the queue for the Anne Boleyn Junction routinely stretches back to junction of Sutton Road/ Fossets Way. Any vehicle count is of little value, because of the slow progress of this queue. Morning queue for Cuckoo Corner stretches back to Eastern Avenue/ Bournemouth Park Road Junction, morning and evening peak queue for Hamstel Road/Eastern Avenue stretches back to Fossets Way/Eastern Avenue.
- Sutton Road classed as a B road. Have to pull over to let lorries past.
- Increase in car parking so that the appicate can increase the area for housing on the SBC site.

**In Support (4):**

Ashingdon Road: 94 (06/12/21)

Crouch Meadow: 12 (18/12/20)

Fremantle: 26 (08/12/20)

Grasmere Avenue: 34 (08/12/20)

These can be summarised as follows:

- The match day car park facility will also help on match days, which are only on 25 days per year and for just a few hours, therefore causing very little effect on the general public.
- I do imagine for a few hours every 2 weeks traffic will be higher but this is not uncommon for football grounds.
- The landscaping work will make this an attractive area and unlike many other similar projects not a blot on the landscape.
- Match day car parking is provided to offset potential street parking.
- There will be a build up of traffic an hour either side of the match but that is the case now along Victoria Avenue.
- Querying the building of a temporary training centre; if permission were granted for the permanent one would this be built and not the temporary? What safeguard is there that prevents the temporary facility becoming the permanent facility. Want to make sure they don't end up with a poor training centre when a state of the art one was promised.

### THIRD CONSULTATION

#### In objection: (2)

Templegate Cottages: 5 (24/01/22), 1 (28/01/22)

- When original application was submitted and approved by RDC and the Government Inspector there was no mention of any buildings on Green Belt land so why does the applicant consider that the training centre is required?
- Already sought permission for a temporary building within SBC and has permission for training domes, why not adapt them for all his needs.
- Could permission for car parking be reconsidered due to air pollution impacts
- Will the training pitches/car park be used for other purposes as Boots & Laces and Roots Hall currently are
- Infrastructure will not be able to cope
- Cannot see any benefits to residents of Rochford
- Object to car park design in its present form. Originally, the north boundary included an earth bund with tree planting, to minimise impact on neighbouring properties – this seems to have now been removed and needs to be replaced.
- Vast semi-permeable area could cause flooding in the valley
- Noise, fumes and light pollution will impact greatly on neighbouring properties on match days
- Concerned that the car park would be used at other times which will impact on neighbouring properties

#### In Support: (4)

37 (full address unknown)

Ashingdon Road: 94 (17/01/22)

The Glen: 12 (14/01/22)

Swanage Road: 60 (14/01/22)

Comments are as above in earlier responses.

## 5 EQUALITY AND DIVERSITY IMPLICATIONS

- 5.1 An Equality Impact Assessment has been completed and found there to be no impacts (either positive or negative) on protected groups as defined under the Equality Act 2010.



**6 CONCLUSION**

- 6.1 In determining this application regard must be had to section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires that proposals be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The proposal is not considered to have a detrimental impact upon the development plan or any of the material planning considerations assessed subject to conditions being attached to any permission granted.



Marcus Hotten

Assistant Director, Place & Environment

---

**Relevant Development Plan Policies and Proposals**

Core Strategy (2011) – policies CP1, GB1, GB2, ENV1, ENV5, ENV8, ENV10, CLT5, CLT10, T1, T3, T5, T6, T8

Development Management Document (2014) – policies DM1, DM5, DM12, DM16, DM25, DM26, DM27, DM29, DM30, DM31

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2021

Parking Standards Design and Good Practice Supplementary Planning Document (2010)

National Planning Practice Guidance

**Background Papers:-**

None.

For further information please contact Claire Buckley on:-

Phone: 01702 318127

Email: [Claire.buckley@rochford.gov.uk](mailto:Claire.buckley@rochford.gov.uk)

If you would like this report in large print, Braille or another language please contact 01702 318111.

17/00436/FUL



Reproduced from the Ordnance Survey mapping with the permission of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office Crown Copyright. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings. This copy is believed to be correct.

Nevertheless Rochford District Council can accept no responsibility for any errors or omissions, changes in the details given or for any expense or loss thereby caused.

Rochford District Council, licence No.LA079138

