

REPORT SUMMARY

REFERENCE NO - 21/00068/FULL

APPLICATION PROPOSAL

Change of use of land to expand the existing recreational facilities through the provisional of additional sports pitches, together with associated additional car parking provision, 'ball stop' fencing and ground works

ADDRESS Recreation Ground Southwood Road Rusthall Tunbridge Wells Kent

RECOMMENDATION to GRANT planning permission subject to conditions (please refer to section 11.0 of the report for full recommendation)

SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION

- The proposal would result in the delivery of additional playing fields on land allocated for this purpose within the current Development Plan – the Site Allocations Local Plan (SALP) (July 2016).
- There is an extant planning permission on this site for the same development which expires on 1 May 2021 (ref:17/03403/FULL);
- The proposal would not cause a significantly harmful impact towards the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB).
- The development of changing facilities and engineering operations which would be undertaken as part of the proposal are considered to comply with Development Plan and NPPF Green Belt (GB) policy, and there are considered to be Very Special Circumstances which outweigh the very limited harm associated with the proposed development.
- The development would not cause significant harm to neighbouring residences or residential amenity spaces.
- The proposal would not have an adverse impact on the character and visual amenities of the street scene.
- Other issues raised have been assessed and there are not any which would warrant refusal of the application or which cannot be satisfactorily controlled by condition.

INFORMATION ABOUT FINANCIAL BENEFITS OF PROPOSAL

The following are considered to be material to the application:

Contributions (to be secured through Section 106 legal agreement/unilateral undertaking): N/A

Net increase in numbers of jobs: N/A

Estimated average annual workplace salary spend in Borough through net increase in numbers of jobs: N/A

The following are not considered to be material to the application:

Estimated annual council tax benefit for Borough: N/A

Estimated annual council tax benefit total: N/A

Estimated annual business rates benefits for Borough: N/A

REASON FOR REFERRAL TO COMMITTEE		
The applicant is Tunbridge Wells Borough Council		
WARD Speldhurst & Bidborough	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Speldhurst Parish Council and Rusthall Parish Council	APPLICANT Tunbridge Wells Borough Council AGENT N/A
DECISION DUE DATE 14/04/21	PUBLICITY EXPIRY DATE 19/02/21	OFFICER SITE VISIT DATE Various
RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY (including appeals and relevant history on adjoining sites): There is some planning history relating to Jockey Farm but this is not considered directly relevant to the proposal.		

History for recreation ground/playing fields

17/03403/FULL	Change of use of land to expand existing recreational facilities through provision of additional sports pitches, together with associated additional car parking provision, 'ball stop' fencing, and other works	Granted	20/12/17*
08/02627/FUL	Proposal: Change of use of area of allotment land to recreation and change of use of area of recreation land to allotments	Granted	03/10/08
08/02735/FUL	Proposal: Provision of new facilities to include juniors and toddlers play area, BMX dirt track. mini skate area, multi use games area, footpaths and landscaping scheme.	Granted	03/10/08
00/00445/FUL	Resurfacing of existing car park	Granted	26/06/00
97/00511/TWBRG3	Regulation 3 TWBC- demolition of existing pavilion: construction of new pavilion and enlargement of car park	Granted	30/06/97

**Planning permission 17/03403/FULL was due to expire on 20/12/2020. However the Business and Planning Act 2020 has temporarily modified the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 to enable certain planning permissions in England which lapsed during 2020 to be extended to 1/5/2021.*

MAIN REPORT

1.0 DESCRIPTION OF SITE

- 1.01 This application relates to an area lying to the NW of Southwood Road, Rusthall. The majority of the site is an open agricultural field lying adjacent to an existing Council-owned recreation ground and playing fields. The application site only includes the field, the access to the recreation ground, the car park and pavilion. The existing playing fields and wider recreation ground are excluded.

- 1.02 The existing facilities include a changing room building and a parking area for around 30 cars including 4 disabled spaces, through which access is provided to the site from Southwood Road (a primarily residential street), a fenced multi-use games area, a juniors/toddlers play area, BMX dirt track, mini-skate area and open grassed areas. The existing playing fields accommodate three full-sized football pitches.
- 1.03 The land to the SW (one field of which forms part of this application) is an agricultural holding called Jockey Farm, which includes Rusthall Football Club's stadium and training pitches to the south (none of which is in TWBC ownership).
- 1.04 To the south is an allotment site, also owned by TWBC, measuring approximately 1.2ha. Nos. 153 – 177 Southwood Road back on to the play area on the eastern side and the rest of the facility is bordered by open fields. The boundaries are strongly defined by mature hedgerow and trees.
- 1.05 This application relates to the area around the car park / pavilion and a 2.75ha field within Jockey Farm's ownership to the SW of the football pitches. The whole application site measures 3.32ha. The field is currently used for grazing cattle and is gently sloping, with the Council's internal mapping systems showing an approximate level change of 5m over the 230m distance between the northern and southern corners.
- 1.06 The whole site lies outside the Limits to Built Development (LBD) as defined within the 2006 Local Plan, although the field subject to the application is allocated for use as sports pitches through Site Allocations DPD 2016 policy AL/RTW30. The whole site also lies within the Metropolitan Green Belt and High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. It also falls across the boundary dividing the Rusthall and Speldhurst & Langton parishes.

2.0 PROPOSAL

- 2.01 The application proposes to change the use of the open field to sports pitches. The application is accompanied by a block plan showing that the land can accommodate one senior pitch (100m x 64m), two pitches for under-9/10s (55m x 36m) and three pitches for under-7/8s (36m x 28m). Both this element of the block plan and the cross-section are indicative only as the number/distribution of pitches is not fixed and if planning permission is granted the final layout would not require a further planning application, providing that no physical works to the land were required. There will be no hard engineering features needed such as retaining walls and it is anticipated the land level changes would be dealt with through minor re-grading works.
- 2.02 Access to this extended part of the site would be through a new gap in the hedge via the existing car park. There would be an extended parking area using open grassed areas to the immediate east of the pavilion (11 spaces) plus 37 spaces to the south and west of the multi-use games area. The overall increase would be from 30 to 78 spaces. There is currently a concrete open-air table-tennis table to the east of the pavilion which would need to be re-located. The plans also indicate a possible future extension of the pavilion/changing facilities, however this does not form part of the current application.
- 2.03 The agricultural fields are not in the ownership of the applicant. The planning application procedure requires an applicant to serve notice on any third-party landowner whose land falls within the red line of the application site, and for them to certify they have done so on the application form. This procedure has been followed

and does not relate to a Compulsory Purchase Order, which is an entirely separate process to the determination of a planning application. This issue is addressed further in para 10.01 – 10.04 below.

3.0 SUMMARY INFORMATION

	Existing	Proposed	Change (+/-)
Site Area	3.32ha	3.32ha	No change
Land use	Site of playing fields: agriculture Car park and pavilion: recreation ground (D2) including 3 x pitches: 1 x adult, 1 x youth and 1 x junior	Whole site: D2 playing fields and recreation ground. Includes provision of 1 x senior pitch, 5 x junior pitches <i>(indicative only)</i>	Total number of pitches: 2 x senior, 1 x youth and 6 x junior
Car parking spaces	30	78	+48

4.0 PLANNING CONSTRAINTS

- Agricultural Land Classification Grade 3 (*This information is taken from the MAFF 1998 national survey series at 1:250 000 scale derived from the Provisional 1" to one mile ALC maps and is intended for strategic uses. These maps are not sufficiently accurate for use in assessment of individual fields or sites and any enlargement could be misleading. The maps show Grades 1-5, but grade 3 is not subdivided*).
- Agricultural Occupancy Condition attached to farmhouse at Jockey Farm (Lesmes View)
- Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (*statutory protection in order to conserve and enhance the natural beauty of their landscapes - National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act of 1949 & Countryside and Rights of Way Act, 2000*)
- Biodiversity Opportunity Areas (*this is a broad indication from the Kent Wildlife Trust to inform potential biodiversity enhancement*)
- Metropolitan Green Belt
- Outside, but adjacent to the Limits to built development
- Public Access Land: Common Waste Of Manor Of Rusthall and Lower Green, Rusthall, Tunbridge Wells

5.0 POLICY AND OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2019 National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

Site Allocations Local Plan Adopted 2016

Policy AL/STR 1: Limits to Built Development

Policy AL/RTW 30: Land allocated for sports pitches and other outdoor recreation facilities

Tunbridge Wells Borough Core Strategy 2010

Core Policy 1: Delivery of Development

Core Policy 4: Environment

Core Policy 5: Sustainable Design and Construction

Core Policy 8: Retail, Leisure and Community provision
Core Policy 14: Development in Villages and Rural Areas

Tunbridge Wells Borough Local Plan 2006

Policy LBD1: Development outside the Limits to Built Development
Policy MGB1: Metropolitan Green Belt
Policy EN1: Development Control Criteria
Policy EN10: Archaeological sites
Policy EN13: Tree and Woodland Protection
Policy EN25: Development affecting the rural landscape
Policy TP1: Major development requiring Transport Assessments and a Travel Plan
Policy TP4: Access to Road Network
Policy TP5: Vehicle Parking Standards
Policy TP9: Cycle Parking
Policy R1: Retention of existing recreation open space

Supplementary Planning Documents:

Landscape Character Area Assessment 2017
Recreation and Open Space SPD

Other documents:

High Weald AONB Management Plan 2018
Kent County Council Supplementary Planning Guidance SPG4: Kent Vehicle Parking Standards (July 2006)
Draft Pre-Submission Local Plan (Version agreed by Full Council on 3rd February 2021)
TWBC Playing Pitch Strategy 2017 – 2033 (published November 2017)

6.0 LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

- 6.01 Five site notices were displayed around surrounding roads and within the recreation grounds on 26 January 2021. The application was also advertised in the local press.
- 6.02 116 representations have been received (including representations from the owner of Jockey Farm and from Rusthall FC) raising the following concerns;
- Loss of agricultural land and impact on financial viability of Jockey Farm, which is a long-standing local business;
 - Threat of possible future CPO to landowner is unfair who has contributed to the community in the past;
 - Impact on ecology from hedgerow loss and the Green Belt;
 - Light pollution;
 - The two fields included within this planning application are vital to the farm. They are constantly farmed and give vital access to other fields which surround the current recreation ground on a further two sides;
 - Insufficient consultation on the allocated use;
 - Noise and disturbance from sports pitches;
 - Overemphasis on football to the exclusion of other sports/facilities - limited potential for alternative use;
 - Traffic increases;
 - Insufficient parking - Rusthall FC has a car park for 100 cars and this is not large enough for some 1st team games, so 70 is insufficient for this scheme;
 - Parked vehicles outside the site would block the bus route;

- Sufficient playing field/recreation area provision within Rusthall already, including at Rusthall FC's ground (Jockey Farm);
- The requirement for this pitch provision is outdated as it originated in the 2006 Local Plan – there is no supporting evidence as to who will be using the pitches;
- Current facilities under used and there are alternatives elsewhere;
- Limited information as to team and pitch use;
- Local leagues are dwindling and no teams are registered at the Southwood Road site;
- Current Southwood Road pitches are unplayable for large parts of the year and suffer from poor drainage – application has no 3G pitch provision;
- No 3G/4G pitch included, which is what there is demand for – what is being proposed will be waterlogged during the football season;
- Drainage costs will be prohibitive and the scheme will end up flooding land at Jockey Farm.

6.03 Officers are also aware of an online petition against the application at Change.org, although this partly refers to a CPO which is not part of the planning application.

7.0 CONSULTATIONS

Speldhurst Parish Council

7.01 (16/02/21) - Please note the previous objection from 2017 which SPC have repeated underneath the following comments:

- SPC are of the understanding that the borough has sufficient existing pitches which could be used to address the current requirement across the borough with the appropriate maintenance and investment.
- The presumption should always be against development of greenbelt land.
- SPC emphasise the unacceptable impact on the viability of the small agricultural business and the council must be even more mindful of this in these difficult times.
- This development would threaten an existing old and established hedgerow and it would appear the application misrepresents the presence of a hedgerow.
- SPC note the unprecedented number of objections from the local community and would hope that the borough council sees sense in this application. It is very hard to see how this proposal can be justified with not one single local resident supporting this application including from the football community both local and further afield.

7.02 SPC repeat previous objections from 2017:

"We object to the enforced loss of agricultural land which would affect the viability of this long-established rural farm. The development would affect the landowner's access to parts of the land... we believe this is the wrong location, for the following reasons: -

- *Parking - the impact of such a large facility in a residential area would have a detrimental effect on a large number of the surrounding residents in terms of traffic congestion and overflow parking on narrow roads. Rusthall is already recognised as a bottle neck. We consider the parking provision to be inadequate and poorly designed being narrow and having no provision for coaches.*
- *Drainage is poor which will severely limit winter use as the ground becomes waterlogged.*

- *It is not clear what provision would need to be made for drainage and the effect this would have on the surrounding farmland".*

Rusthall Parish Council

7.03 (04/02/21) - Rusthall Parish Council unanimously refuse the proposal on the following grounds:

- Ecological. Large badger set within existing Parish Council Allotment which adjoins land for development.
- Traffic - Survey did not take into account traffic movement in whole of village as this affects all users of the village and not just football. It also stated that Southwood Road is not a bus route, incorrect, the 281 travels down Southwood Road to Parsonage Road. Survey in around September 2020 during Covid epidemic - reduced traffic movement.
- Impact on Area of Natural Beauty- proposed removal of established hedge in the middle of the site. Area will be spoilt by erection of high football fences.
- Environmental Impact Assessment - Flooding in the area will be costly to manage and could result in the water being drained on to nearby land. There is a rubbish dump on the allotments adjoining the proposed field.
- Local Plan 2006 - Parish council was not formed until 2011 and was, therefore, unaware of the contents of the plan, therefore, could not comment at the time.
- Falling birth rate to be taken into consideration
- No teams are registered as having Southwood Road as their home ground and it is considered that the current stock of pitches available to TWBC is more than sufficient to cope with the diminishing demand, bearing in mind that this proposal was made fifteen years ago and is therefore woefully out of date.
- Parish Council previous objections from 2017 remain pertinent as follows
- Jockey Farm is, and has been, a working farm in the same family since 1925. It currently operates a free range egg enterprise and a pedigree Sussex Beef suckler herd.
- To lose the land would be catastrophic for the family as the farm's viability as a business would be seriously affected. Also the two fields in question give access to the further fields on the farm.
- The fields get very wet in winter and a significant drainage system would be required if acquired for football pitches, which would be very costly.
- There is great concern about the increase in the volume of traffic on Rusthall High Street and Southwood Road, causing more congestion and pollution. The proposed increase in car parking does not appear large enough to facilitate all the pitches, people using the playground and allotment holders and therefore would spill out into neighbouring streets.
- The present changing rooms would not be adequate for the number of proposed pitches and does not have separate facilities for all genders.

Sport England

7.04 (10/02/21) - The current application is a resubmission of a scheme previously approved under reference 17/03403/FULL but now expired to which Sport England raised no objection. The proposal is to provide several new playing fields in existing agricultural fields adjacent to an existing playing field site.

7.05 In assessing this application SE have reconsulted the FA and the Football Foundation who have confirmed that their previous comments remain relevant. These were;

- The FA and Football Foundation commented that they are supportive of the proposals; the expansion of the playing fields at Rusthall has been identified as a priority within the emerging Playing Pitch Strategy that Tunbridge Wells Borough Council is currently producing. This has identified a strategic need for the development of these pitches. While they note that changing facilities are not confirmed as part of these plans, they are confident that, in this case, the existing facilities on the adjacent playing fields will be sufficient. The fields proposed are mainly mini-pitches, meaning that, in reality, children will turn up for matches already changed.

7.06 In terms of their design, the following comments should be taken into account:

- Design - Natural Turf Pitches should be designed by a RIPTA registered agronomist to meet The FA Performance Quality Standard (PQS).
- Construction - The construction of Natural Turf Pitches should be project managed or signed off by the same RIPTA registered agronomist that produced the design.
- Quality - Pitches should pass a PQS test to a 'good' standard before the pitches are used. The testing should be arranged via the FA Pitch Improvement Programme.
- Maintenance - In order to keep the quality of the pitches, an appropriate maintenance programme is agreed in-line with the design agronomist recommendations
- Recommended sizes - All pitch sizes should comply with FA recommended sizes.

7.07 The site operator must undertake a risk assessment to ensure that the run off area is safe and does not pose a risk of injury to a player or spectator. This would include structures immediately outside this 3m area.

7.08 Conclusion: Sport England has no objection to this application.

Environment Agency

7.09 (25/01/21) – no comment as the proposal falls outside the Environment Agency (EA) remit for comments.

KCC Flood and Water Management

7.10 (12/02/21) - Kent County Council as Lead Local Flood Authority have reviewed the application and regard the development as low risk. This is because the pitches are remaining grassed and there is little increase in impermeable surfacing. KCC would expect a re-submitted application should the detailed design include any 3G pitches, paved parking areas and SuDS features for our approval.

KCC Highways

7.11 (10/02/21) - It is KCC's understanding that broadly speaking, this application matches application 17/03403.

- Please confirm that the masterplan document reflects the number of additional spaces proposed. The masterplan drawing supplied with application 21/00068 is revision B from 17/03403. It includes eight further additional parking spaces compared to revision A. These were proposed

following KCC comments on 17/03403. This additional uplift in spaces is not reflected in the other documents submitted.

- KCC's emerging parking standards will require a proportion of the new spaces to be equipped with electric vehicle charge-points and motorcycle spaces to be provided. Please contact KCC for the applicable standards when required.
- The Transport Statement does not explore any TRICS data (Paragraph 3.02). Our review identified some 5-a-side football sites which may have been added in recent years. These sites may offer additional insights into any impact on peak traffic flows.
- Assuming no further changes to application 17/03403, please refer to KCC's comments on 17/03403. If, however, there are any additional highway safety concerns that TWBC consider should be brought to the attention of the HA, then please get in touch.

- 7.12 (16/11/17) - Understand this is an allocated site for additional sports pitches and recreational facilities. The proposal will utilise the existing access from Southwood Road and includes an extension to the car park to provide 40 additional spaces. *(Officers' Note: this is now 48 in response to KCC Highways comments)*
- 7.13 No assessment of existing parking demand or trip patterns at the existing facilities has been made, and no details of likely end users has been given and hence no assessment from first principles of likely trips generation or parking demand is available. Clearly this information would assist in the assessment of the proposals and also place them in context of existing conditions.
- 7.14 The level of additional parking provision has been justified in the Traffic Statement (TS) by making assumptions about likely use of the pitches and likely numbers of players on each pitch but there is no evidence base to the assumptions made. Nor has the calculation allowed for any increased parking demand at times of changeover which will also increase two way movement and potential conflict on the approach roads. Access by coaches has also not been addressed.
- 7.15 Whilst it is acknowledged that some of these issues can be addressed through good management of the facilities, the highway authority would recommend that the proposals should also identify an area for additional overspill parking. *(Officers' Note: in response to these comments the layout was amended to increase parking from 40 to 48 spaces)*

KCC Heritage

- 7.16 (verbal comments on 2017 application) – request archaeology condition given the size of the site and the greenfield nature of the land.

Mid-Kent Environmental Protection

- 7.17 (20/11/17 - Informal discussion with EP and written comments) – The proposed use could cause disturbance to nearby residential premises. This is in the form of noise from users of the facility and from any floodlighting involved in the use. The nearest residential property is approximately 50m (garden) from the pitches.
- 7.18 Given the site is allocated and that a similar approach was recommended in the Hawkenbury recreation ground proposal, in this instance conditions can be used

requiring noise impact assessments, rather than it being required up front (as stated in written comments).

- 7.19 No floodlighting is detailed in the application. If this is included any light spill could be controlled by condition. *(Officers' Note: A reply on the current application is outstanding and any response received after publication of the Agenda will be verbally reported to Committee)*

TWBC Landscape & Biodiversity Officer

- 7.20 (verbal comments 16/02/21) – as before, no objection –and agree mitigation and enhancement conditions appropriate. Net gain and landscape enhancement can be achieved through tree planting, leaving grass longer on the periphery of the site etc. LBO recognises the loss of hedgerow however this is limited and has been previously consented. With regards to the remains of hedgerow near the SW boundary a decision can be made at the conditions stage as to whether this former hedgerow can be restored

TWBC Parking Services

- 7.21 (19/02/21) - Parking Services have no further comments for the new application, given that there have been no material changes from 2017.

8.0 APPLICANT'S SUPPORTING COMMENTS (partly taken from part 7 of Design & Access Statement)

- 8.01 The recreational use proposed is in full accordance with the site allocation for this purpose within the Site Allocations DPD 2016. It also accords with the principles set out in the NPPF, and the wider strategy of the Council to improve facilities in a number of locations and to encourage increased participation rates in team sports.
- 8.02 The detailed site considerations have been given careful thought. The layout proposed is illustrative only at this stage, and will be subject to further review following a grant of planning permission. However, the illustrative layout has been produced to work with the overall space available and in order to maintain the existing boundary planting structure.
- 8.03 The site has limited ecological value and the main interest is in the hedges and boundary trees, which will be retained. There is the opportunity to provide biodiversity enhancements.
- 8.04 There are existing parking facilities at the recreation ground. In addition to this, it is proposed to provide a significant amount of additional car parking. Cycle parking facilities will be provided.
- 8.05 There are significant benefits to the community arising from the additional sports provision, which weigh significantly in favour of the proposal.

9.0 BACKGROUND PAPERS AND PLANS

- 9.01 Application form
Supporting planning statement
Letter from drainage consultant 30th September 2020
Preliminary Ecological Appraisal 16th October 2020
Planning Statement January 2021
Planning Statement October 2017
Traffic Statement 30th September 2020

Drawing numbers 00/000/01B; 00/000/02; 00/000/03
Design and Access Statement 18 October 2017

10.0 APPRAISAL

Main issues; 3rd party ownership and references to a Compulsory Purchase Order

- 10.01 The main issues are considered to be the principle of the development at this site (including the impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the loss of agricultural land); the impact on the AONB/landscape, residential amenity, highways/parking, drainage, ecology and other relevant matters.
- 10.02 Objections have been raised on the basis the applicant does not own some of the site. This is not in itself a reason for refusal. Notice has been served on the freehold landowner of Jockey Farm. If the applicant does not have the right to access the land to undertake the development the permission simply cannot be implemented. Grants of planning permission only permit development of land under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and do not override civil law or other legislation. They do not enable the applicant to take ownership or control of the land subject to the application, nor enter the land to carry out the development.
- 10.03 There is no certainty that TWBC would become the freehold landowners in the future. Granting planning permission for this scheme would not in itself enable that. Furthermore, any planning permission would not be personal to the Council as applicant but would run with the land. Many objectors have raised the issue of a TWBC using a Compulsory Purchase Order (CPO) to acquire the land for the uses that this application seeks planning permission for. The Draft Local Plan states in the supporting text to AL/SP 2 that it may be necessary to serve a CPO to ensure the site can come forward as expected. CPOs are used to enable land to be acquired for the wider benefit of the community, usually to enable regeneration and development schemes that involve complex or multiple land ownership, without which development would be unlikely to be delivered.
- 10.04 This is not an application for a CPO. The granting of this permission does not in itself enable a CPO to take place. An extant planning permission (which there already is on the site) is only one of the considerations that would be necessary as part of a CPO Inquiry and the bar is rightly set very high for any such proceedings to be successful. Any such CPO proceedings stand outside the planning process and are subject to a separate body of legislation and procedures; they are not a material planning consideration.

Principle of Development

- 10.05 The site is outside the LBD and within both the GB and the AONB countryside to the north of Rusthall.
- 10.06 Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 1990 requires that the determination of a planning application must be made in accordance with the provisions of the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The NPPF does not change the statutory status of the development plan as the starting point for decision making. The Council's Site Allocations Local Plan (July 2016) (SALP) forms part of the adopted Development Plan.
- 10.07 In light of the above, the starting point of this appraisal of the principle of development will be Policy AL/RTW 30 of the SADPD, which specifically allocates the land proposed to form the extension of the playing fields/recreation grounds for sports pitches and other outdoor recreation facilities. This allocation supersedes

Policy R3 of the 2006 Local Plan, which allocated the site for the same use but no longer forms part of the adopted Development Plan.

- 10.08 The TWBC Playing Pitch Strategy 2017-2033 is referred to by both objectors and the new Local Plan. This is not a planning document - it identifies the corporate aim to provide sports hubs across the borough, which will include enhanced sports and recreation facilities serving a wider catchment area. The proposed provision at Rusthall will seek to meet the needs of those living in Rusthall, Speldhurst, Langton Green, and Bidborough and there would be other visitors to the site, including other sports clubs playing 'away'. The Draft Local Plan states that development contributions, where applicable, from residential schemes within the parishes of Rusthall, Speldhurst, and Bidborough will help fund delivery of this site allocation. The Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) states that Rusthall playing fields are identified as a priority for improvements of non-playing pitch facilities as the site has ageing ancillary facilities. Support to Rusthall Juniors FC and also the provision of a 3G pitch at Rusthall are also identified by the IDP along with the need to replace or improve ancillary facilities at the Southwood Road Recreation Ground. The intention is that the site allocation would cater for these improvements (although no 3G pitch is proposed as part of this planning application)

New Local Plan

- 10.09 The draft new Local Plan has progressed to the point that the pre Reg 19 version was agreed by Full Council on 3rd February for approval of Reg 19 submission and consultation. Within it Policy AL/SP 2 of the Pre-submission Local Plan states the site will continue to be allocated for recreation purposes. This states;

'This site, as defined on the Speldhurst Policies Map, is allocated for recreation and sports provision, including additional provision for a range of sports and recreation uses, including grass and 3G sports pitches, and new and or enhanced built facilities such as male and female changing rooms.

Development on the site shall accord with the following requirements:

- 1. Proposals for development at the site shall, where necessary, include the provision of a travel plan and details of the provision of overspill car parking;*
- 2. Any proposals to improve grass pitches shall include details to improve the drainage of the pitches to enable use over a longer period of the year;*
- 3. Proposals for the site shall have regard to existing hedgerows and mature trees on-site, with the layout and design of the development protecting those of most amenity value, as informed by an arboricultural survey and a landscape and visual impact assessment;*
- 4. The provision of details for proposals of external lighting;*
- 5. The provision of details for any proposed ground level changes throughout the site;*
- 6. The provision of a noise impact assessment of the proposed uses to inform design of, and management of, any noise mitigation measures that may be required to reduce noise to nearby residential areas;*
- 7. Contributions are to be provided to mitigate the impact of the development, in accordance with Policy PSTR/SP 1.'*

10.10 Given the early stage of the new Local Plan, plus the significant objections to AL/SP 2 it can only be given limited weight given it has not progressed through the formal Regulation 19 or examination process. More weight would be given to it once it is formally submitted for examination and as it progresses through the adoption process.

10.11 The proposal must therefore be assessed against current adopted policy AL/CRS30 of the 2016 SALP, which deems this use to be acceptable in principle on this land.

Extant planning permission

10.12 The same development also benefits from an extant planning permission, which carries significant weight in the determination of this matter. That permission remains extant until 01/05/2021.

Additional sports facilities

10.13 Para 91(a) of the NPPF states that planning decisions should aim to achieve places which promote opportunities for meetings between members of the community who might not otherwise come into contact with each other, along with high quality public space, and to encourage the active and continual use of public areas. Para 91 (c) states that planning policies and decisions should enable and support healthy lifestyles, for example through the provision of sports facilities.

10.14 Para 92(a) and (b) states that LPAs should plan positively for the provision and use of shared space, community facilities (such as sports venues) and to take into account and support the delivery of local strategies to improve health, social and cultural well-being for all sections of the community.

10.15 No objection is raised to the proposal by Sport England. Some of the matters they raise are very detailed and can be left to the site developer; others, such as the need for a 3m run-off area besides the pitch, can be left to the final layout which is proposed to be addressed by condition.

10.16 This site is allocated in the Development Plan for additional sports pitches. Many objectors have questioned the requirement for the additional pitches and consider the allocation is out of date, as need is alleged to be much reduced since the land was originally allocated for these purposes in 2006. However, the inclusion of this land as for recreation/playing fields use was not challenged at the examination of the SALP 2016; in both the 2013 consultation on the first draft document and the 2015 pre-submission consultation, one supportive comment was received each time. Ultimately the SALP is a Development Plan document which has been found sound by an independent inspector. The proposal is in accordance with Policy ALR/RTW30 although this only applies to the playing pitch itself, not the additional car parking.

Green Belt

10.17 The NPPF is more recent than the Green Belt development plan policies (LP policy MGB1 and Core Strategy Policy CP2) and is therefore the most relevant policy consideration for development affecting the GB. NPPF Para 133 sets out that the fundamental aim of GB policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of GBs are their openness and their permanence. Para 141 states that LPAs should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the GB, such as looking for opportunities to provide access and to provide opportunities for outdoor sport and recreation.

- 10.18 It is set out at Para 145 (b) of the NPPF that new buildings can be appropriate development in the GB if they comprise “*appropriate facilities for outdoor sport and outdoor recreation...as long as it preserves the openness of the GB and does not conflict with the purposes of including land within it*”. It is therefore necessary to consider whether the engineering operations to create the levelled areas for the pitches and car parking areas, and the material change in the use of the land itself, are appropriate development in the GB.
- 10.19 Para 146 (b) states that engineering operations are ‘not inappropriate’ development provided they preserve the openness of the GB and do not conflict with the purposes of including land in it. Engineering operations will be involved in the creation of the car park area and to level the land to make it suitable for sports pitch use. However there will not be retaining walls (rather the land will be re-graded between the pitches), and it is considered that this will not conflict with the purposes of including land in the GB.
- 10.20 NPPF Para 146 (e) states that material changes in the use of land (such as changes of use for outdoor sport or recreation are ‘not inappropriate’. The Green Belt designation would have been taken in to consideration in allocating the site under AL/RTW 30.
- 10.21 As the use of land is supported by Green Belt policy, the actual harm from the development then falls to be considered. The following would all appear visually lightweight and would not have the effect of visually or functionally subdividing the land:
- Goalposts, which are typically made from steel/timber and which remain in place between uses, with only the netting attached/detached each time they are used;
 - The proposed ‘Ball Stop’ fencing, being sited towards the edges of the land parcel;
 - The proposed connecting pathways.
- 10.22 All the above are considered to be small scale developments which do not create a significant quantum of structures or built form. The development would have a very limited impact on the openness of the Green Belt, owing to the proximity of the car park and changing rooms to built form on the western boundary. In terms of Very Special Circumstances: this site is already allocated for use as sports pitches/recreation; as stated earlier the location within the GB would have formed part of the considerations at the examination stage of both the SALP and the 2006 Local Plan; and there is clear support in the NPPF to improve sport and recreation facilities. These are considered to overcome the limited level of actual harm to openness which has been identified.
- 10.23 This is similar to the conclusion reached in 2017, however back then the NPPF did not explicitly support changes of use in the Green Belt (this was amended in the February 2018 edition). It now does, and consequently the identified level of Green Belt harm is far less.
- Loss of agricultural land and impact towards the viability of Jockey Farm***
- 10.24 The NPPF (Paragraph 170b) states that LPAs should take into account the economic and other benefits of the Best and Most Versatile (BMV) agricultural land. Where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, LPAs should seek to use areas of poorer quality land in preference to that of a higher quality. This does not preclude the loss of BMV agricultural land but does require that be justified.

- 10.25 In this instance the application relates to a relatively small area of land and whilst the owner of Jockey Farm states its loss to development would prejudice the agricultural use of the rest of the unit, this site has been specifically allocated for the uses for which planning permission is now sought (and has been since 2006). No representations were made in relation to this during the most recent allocation of the site (2016) and in allocating the site the Inspector would have been satisfied in this respect. Therefore, whilst regard has been had to the comments from the owner, as set out at the beginning of the appraisal section, the legislation is clear that proposals should be assessed in line with adopted development plan policy unless material considerations indicate otherwise: in this instance the adopted development plan allocates the site for this use, and there are not considered to be such material considerations that indicate a different assessment. It may be that rights of access can be addressed should the Council take possession of the land in the future, but that will be a matter to be considered outside the planning system.
- 10.26 Any greenfield development around this area is likely to result in the loss of agricultural land albeit in this case the loss would be potentially reversible should the playing fields ever become disused.
- 10.27 On this basis the proposed use of the land is considered acceptable in principle and this is the same conclusion reached in 2017.

Impact towards the AONB

- 10.28 Adopted Development Plan Policy (including Core Policies 4 and 14) requires the conservation and enhancement of the AONB and rural landscape. The NPPF within paragraph 172 states that *“great weight should be given to conserving landscape and scenic beauty of AONB”*. Paragraph 172 of the NPPF relates to major development in the AONB and states that *“planning permission should be refused for major developments in these designated areas except in exceptional circumstances and where it can be demonstrated they are in the public interest”*.
- 10.29 NPPF Footnote 55 states that for the purposes of paragraphs 172 and 173, whether a proposal is ‘major development’ is a matter for the decision maker, taking into account its nature, scale and setting, and whether it could have a significant adverse impact on the purposes for which the area has been designated or defined. In this case, given the limited amount of new built development within the AONB, it is considered that this should not be considered as a major development. This proposal was not considered ‘major development’ in 2017 either.
- 10.30 The existing character is that of an open, undeveloped field with natural levels. An impact on the AONB will be created through the levelling of the land where necessary, regular grass cutting, the loss of the site’s agricultural appearance/function and the presence of ancillary sports equipment, along with the car park extensions.
- 10.31 However the site would retain its open, rural character – the perimeter trees and hedgerow will remain (aside from the removal of a small section to facilitate access from the car park) and there will be very little need for hardstanding. The scheme does not include floodlighting: the impacts of any floodlighting in this location will need to be carefully assessed. Given the scope of Local Authority PD rights, conditions restricting lighting on/around the new pitches will be imposed.
- 10.32 The proposal would result in land levelling within the site to accommodate the pitches, along with the works required to extend the parking area. The Council, as the applicant has been unable to access the land to undertake a topographical survey

however these matters, along with details of the surfacing material, parking bay layout, ball-stop fencing, extent of the hedge removal and the provision of connecting pathways between the car park and the pitches can all be addressed by condition. The impact on the wider landscape from the levelling, fences, car parking, access roads, lighting would be minimal and localised; such features would have been anticipated to be present on the site when it was allocated. They are not considered significant nor harmful to the wider landscape.

Residential amenity

- 10.33 The proposal would not result in any structures or physical development which would impact nearby dwellings through the loss of light/outlook or overlooking.
- 10.34 Last time, the Mid-Kent Environmental Protection team agreed that whilst it would have preferred a noise impact assessment to be submitted at this stage it can be required by condition. This is considered to be the most appropriate/pragmatic approach given the land is already allocated for recreation purposes and the dwelling in question at Jockey Farm is already adjacent to Rusthall FC's stadium.
- 10.35 Security lighting for the changing room building can already be installed without planning permission. Given the rural location it is considered that any other lighting (i.e. floodlighting for the 3G pitch) should require a full planning application.

Highways/parking

- 10.36 The existing recreation ground has a single vehicular and pedestrian access off Southwood Road. The latter runs between Rusthall High Street to the south, ultimately terminating in a cul-de-sac to the north of the access. There is a crossroads 120m south of the access to the recreation ground where Parsonage Road, Southwood Road and Tuxford Road meet. Between the High Street and this junction there is terraced housing with no off street parking, which instead takes place on both sides including pavement parking, as there are no parking restrictions.
- 10.37 Between Tuxford Road and the cul-de-sac there are residential properties fronting the road, with off street parking, as well as allotments and the recreation ground on the western side. There are no parking restrictions and on-street parking does take place (particularly in a layby located opposite the allotments). Objectors have referred to parked cars leaving insufficient room for buses (the 281 service) to pass however this does not pass by the recreation ground; it turns off Southwood Road at the aforementioned crossroads.
- 10.38 No changes are proposed to the access point. The submitted traffic statement does not consider there is a potential highway safety issue from the proposal and KCC Highways raise no issues with the safety of the access, nor its suitability for an intensified use. KCC Highways have directed TWBC to their 2017 comments on the extant planning permission and have suggested further reference to the TRICS database, which contains data on comparable uses elsewhere in the UK. However they do not suggest refusal through lack of reference to the latest TRICS data.
- 10.39 In terms of parking provision, the scheme includes provision to enlarge the car park from 30 to 78 spaces. These would be formed around the changing room building and the multi-use games area. New provision for cycle parking is also proposed. The applicants advise that, following reference to KCC Highways guidance within SPG4 (Kent Vehicle Parking Standards), a level of 1 car per 2 participants should be used for the assessment.

- 10.40 The TS reasons that the parking standards for outdoor sports facilities relate to participants and supporters however it is difficult to assess the number of each that can be expected on a regular basis. It also sets out that it is unlikely that all the pitches will be in use at the same time and that the existing pitches have operated successfully with a modest parking provision for some years.
- 10.41 KCC Highways raise concern that no assessment of parking demand or trip patterns at the existing facility has been made, and is over-reliant on assumptions about likely use of the pitches and player numbers. Changeover times will also increase two way movement and potential conflict on the approach roads. Access by coaches has also not been addressed either.
- 10.42 Last time KCC Highways (and TWBC Parking Services during discussions back in 2017) advised they would prefer a larger more informal overspill area that could be employed during periods of high use. This is not however possible to provide. It is acknowledged TWBC would need to carefully manage the facilities to avoid significant overspill at times of high use. Nevertheless some of the identified issues can be addressed through good management. It is also recognised that, south of the crossroads, Southwood Road is a residential cul-de-sac with no parking restrictions – the width and nature of the road at this point is not considered unsuitable for on-street parking.
- 10.43 It is recognised that elsewhere Southwood Road is prone to parking saturation, particularly between the High Street and Tuxford Road, although (from Officer observations) there is normally availability for parking south of this junction at all times of the day. There is the potential that the proposal will result in some additional on-street parking pressure as ultimately the LPA cannot force people to use the car park.
- 10.44 It would be difficult to attribute a significant parking-related safety issue directly to this development, given the number of other dwellings that already use the road, the slow speed that vehicles are likely to travel at in the area around the access point and the fact that there is parking availability in nearby streets. Therefore, in this instance, it is not considered that the proposal would cause harm to highway safety.
- 10.45 This is a constrained site and further parking provision carries the risk of negatively impacting on the functional space and attractiveness of the recreation ground. The layout of the site and position of the games area, changing rooms etc restricts the ability to provide the overspill parking that KCC Highways have asked for.
- 10.46 If necessary, use levels and times (to ensure kick off times are staggered) can be managed by TWBC who control the bookings. The applicants consider an absolute maximum of around 99 spaces for both the proposed and existing pitches would be necessary. Assuming a typical maximum usage of 6 out of the 8 pitches in use at any time, this would reduce the car parking spaces required by participant numbers down to 81-83. Taking into account a small number of cyclists and walkers to the site, this would balance with the proposed parking provision of 78 spaces allowing for a little on street parking as currently occurs. These figures are the same used in 2017 and were accepted back then.
- 10.47 It is considered a further way of addressing parking issues is to require the submission of a management plan for the site which will seek to spread bookings out and to prevent an over intensive use of the site. This is recommended as a condition. At this juncture however it must be noted that there is a difference between the inconvenience of high parking pressure to local residents and parking-related

highway safety. Inspectors have traditionally only given weight to concerns regarding highway safety and any impact on convenience of residents is not considered to be a matter that would warrant refusal of this application. In general terms (and unless there is a concern regarding highway safety), the provision of residents' parking schemes fall outside of the planning system.

- 10.48 On this basis it is considered the impacts upon highway safety and parking arrangements are appropriate and can be addressed through conditions, as it is in the extant planning permission.

Drainage

- 10.49 The EA has no comments to make on this application. The site does not lie within the higher risk EA Flood Zones 2 or 3. KCC Flood and Water Management raise no objections.

- 10.50 The outline drainage strategy sets out that although permeable, all the playing surfaces will be constructed with active drainage to benefit the playing surfaces. This drainage system will be in accordance with the Sustainable Urban Drainage Scheme (SUDS) hierarchy, with the sub-surface drainage of the pitches envisaged to also act as attenuation prior to the run-off soaking into the ground as it does at present. The applicant's position on this matter is the same that was accepted by TWBC and KCC in 2017.

- 10.51 The use of ponds or swales as alternative attenuation means were considered by the drainage consultant however this is likely to be inappropriate given the safety aspect of using ponds where large numbers of children may be playing. It is considered that drainage details can be addressed by condition, which KCC as the Lead Local Flood Authority have not objected to.

Ecology

- 10.52 The application is accompanied by an Extended Phase 1 Habitat Survey. This concludes that;

- The site was considered to provide suitable commuting and foraging habitat for bats - primarily the hedgerows and treelines along the northern, eastern, and western boundaries of the site. However, these features are not considered by the ecologist to function as an important corridor for bats given the large network of connected woodland immediately adjacent the site and within the wider landscape that also provides plentiful foraging and commuting opportunities for bats. On this basis, the proposed development is considered unlikely by the ecologist to result in the loss or degradation of bat foraging and commuting habitat. Nor is it considered to sever important commuting routes and obstruct access between potential bat roosts and important foraging habitats, providing the mitigation measures in relation to lighting described below are implemented during the construction and operational phase of the proposed development.
- If any trees are to be removed as part of the proposed development, these should be subject to a preliminary bat roost assessment. If the tree(s) are identified as having potential to support roosting bats, then subsequent investigatory/survey work will also be required.
- The site supports some suitable semi-natural habitat for dormice comprising a mature treeline, and hedgerows. These habitats were deemed by the ecologist to be some suitable connective semi-natural habitat to the west and

to the south. However, no suitable connective habitat is connected to the east of the site, therefore the hedgerows are not considered to act as a key commuting route. Overall, the site provided some foraging, nest building and hibernating opportunities for dormice. These habitats include dense scrub, scattered scrub, and hedgerows along the site boundaries.

- The proposals seek to retain the majority of hedgerows with only minor hedgerow removal required to facilitate pedestrian access to the site from Rusthall recreation ground. The ecologist considers the pedestrian access can be created whilst maintaining arboreal connectivity. Therefore, the loss of the hedgerow is not considered to fragment any key dormouse habitat.
- No waterbodies are present within the site. On this basis it is not considered to provide negligible breeding opportunities for breeding GCN given the absence of suitable aquatic habitat within the Site. The site supported grassland and hedgerows and features including a rubble pile, which provided some foraging and commuting opportunities for GCN during their terrestrial lifecycle phase. GCN are not considered an ecological constraint and are not considered further in the report.
- Habitats recorded within the site (particularly the maintained grassland) were considered to provide very limited foraging, commuting, basking and sheltering opportunities for reptiles given the lack of species diversity and short sward length. Habitats including tall ruderal vegetation, scattered scrub, dense scrub and an earth/rubble mound did provide some foraging, commuting, basking and sheltering opportunities for reptiles, however, these habitat types were not present in sufficient quantities to support a notable population of reptiles.
- The site supports trees, hedgerows, and scrub, which were considered to provide good nesting and foraging opportunities to a wide range of common bird species. Although unlikely, a number of bird species listed on Schedule 1 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act could potentially use the Site for nesting.
- Habitats throughout the site were considered to provide some suitable sett building and foraging and commuting opportunities for badgers given the sloped topography along the south-eastern aspect of the site, and the proximity to mature woodland.
- In addition, evidence of a mammal path was recorded running along the site's eastern aspect.

10.53 Recommendations for mitigation and enhancement are given, which can be addressed by condition. The findings and recommendations of this Preliminary Ecological Appraisal are consistent with those supporting the previous application.

10.54 The loss of the former field boundary within the red-lined area (which bi-sects two of the pitches) is noted. The ecologist only refers to 'dense scrub' here and does not object to its removal. Given the extant permission and the 2016 allocation for sports pitch use of the land, this matter can be addressed by condition seeking final layout of the pitches as what is shown on the block plan is illustrative.

10.55 A detailed Biodiversity Net Gain assessment is not included as part of the PEA report, however given the limited impacts set out above indicate the recommended

>10% net gain can be sought by condition. The Landscape & Biodiversity Officer considers that the necessary net gain can be achieved through planting and other mitigation.

Archaeology

- 10.56 As the application proposes works to a large area of greenfield land there is some potential for archaeological finds. A condition requiring a watching brief was requested by KCC Heritage last time and again this forms part of the recommendation.

Conclusion

- 10.57 In conclusion, the development is proposed for a site which has been allocated for playing field/recreation ground use within the 2016 SALP and benefits from an extant planning permission for the same development.
- 10.58 The proposal complies with NPPF Green Belt policy and is considered to cause limited harm to the landscape and AONB. The development would not cause significant harm to neighbouring amenity, ecology or highway safety, with sufficient parking provision within the application site. Other impacts can be satisfactorily controlled by condition. Overall, the proposed development is considered to be acceptable in the balance of issues discussed within this report and there are not considered to be any other material considerations which would indicate a refusal of planning permission is appropriate.
- 10.59 Pre-commencement conditions 6, 7 and 10 listed below have been agreed by the applicant in accordance with section 100ZA (8) of the Town and Country Planning Act.
- 10.60 The applicant seeks a five year planning permission rather than the standard three years (p.4 of the supplementary supporting planning document). The PPG states at Paragraph: 027 Reference ID: 21a-027-20140306 (under heading: 'Conditions relating to time limits') that '*A longer time period may be justified for very complex projects where there is evidence that 3 years is not long enough to allow all the necessary preparations to be completed before development can start.*'
- 10.61 The supporting statement cites the complexity of delivering the development. The risk of non-implementation of the extant permission after 3 years is stated to be due to competing corporate priorities, negotiating land acquisition and the development of a business plan which is still ongoing. The applicant states that the next stages of working up a detailed scheme would then involve Sport England, several NGAs as well as the local community. In addition, delivery of the sports field is related to the bringing forward of proposed housing sites which potentially would cross fund.
- 10.62 However the standard three-year period to implement a planning permission is rarely extended by this LPA, even for large housing schemes. The fact that the site has been allocated for these purposes for nearly 15 years but has not been developed also counts against granting a longer permission. In addition, part of the development could reasonably be implemented (as it relates to TWBC land) within three years provided all the necessary conditions were discharged first, by undertaking operations that are deemed to constitute a material start within S.56 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended). On this basis it is not considered reasonable to recommend a longer period than the standard three years.

- 11.0 RECOMMENDATION – GRANT** Subject to the following conditions;

- (1) The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of 3 years from the date of this decision.

Reason: To comply with the requirements of 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 permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

Drawing number 00/000/01B

Reason: To clarify which plans are approved

- (3) No external lighting shall be installed anywhere on the extended playing fields without the prior written planning permission of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of amenity of adjoining residents and to prevent light pollution in this rural area.

- (4) Notwithstanding the submitted details or approved plans, prior to the commencement of development on the individual areas below, the following details shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and the development thereafter shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details;

- a) Details of all changes to existing ground levels throughout the site, to be illustrated by way of cross-sections and reference to spot heights;
- b) Details of all ball-stop fencing (including any increase in height to the fencing around the multi-use games area), including height, location and alignment;
- c) Details showing the extent of the hedge and tree removal required to facilitate access from the existing Recreation Ground and to facilitate the final pitch layout;
- d) Details of connecting pathways between the car park and the pitches including surfacing materials;
- e) Details of the re-location of the existing concrete open-air table tennis table to the east of the pavilion.
- f) Details of the proposed pitch layout

Reasons: To preserve the visual amenities of the locality and to secure a satisfactory standard of development.

- (5) Notwithstanding the submitted details or approved plans, the area shown on the approved drawings as vehicle parking space and turning shall be provided, surfaced and drained in accordance with details submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before the use is commenced and shall be retained for the use of the occupiers of, and visitors to, the development. The submission shall include details of electric vehicle charging points, the number and distribution of which shall have regards to KCC standards at the time of submission.

No permanent development, whether or not permitted by the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order), shall be carried out on that area of land so shown or in such a position as to preclude vehicular access to this reserved parking space.

Reason: Development without provision of adequate accommodation for the parking of

vehicles is likely to lead to parking inconvenient to other road users

- (6) Notwithstanding the submitted details or approved plans, prior to the commencement of development details of drainage works, designed in accordance with the principles of sustainable urban drainage, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To mitigate the impact of standing water within the site. This is a pre-commencement condition as drainage matters will need to be addressed from the beginning of the construction phase.

- (7) Notwithstanding the submitted details or approved plans, no development shall take place until a scheme for the mitigation and enhancement of biodiversity has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved scheme shall take account of any protected species that have been identified on the site, and in addition shall have regard to the enhancement of biodiversity generally. It shall include a scheme to restore where possible the former field boundary on the SW side of the site.

The approved scheme shall be implemented in accordance with the approved proposals within it and shall be carried out in perpetuity unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To protect the existing populations of protected species and to improve their habitat on the site. This is a pre-commencement condition as biodiversity matters will need to be addressed from the beginning of the construction phase.

- (8) Prior to the first use of the site, details showing a covered and secure space for bicycle storage shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved bicycle storage shall be completed prior to first use of the development and shall thereafter be retained.

Reason: To ensure the provision and retention of adequate off-street parking facilities for bicycles in the interests of highway safety

- (9) Prior to the first use of the development hereby approved, details of a management plan for the use of the playing pitches in order to limit pressure on the car parking facilities shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

The management plan shall include details of available time slots, measures taken at the point of booking to control the amount of pitches in use at any one time, measures to mitigate the impacts from two way movement through the access at changeover times, and measures to enable access by (and parking for) coaches. The development shall then be operated in accordance with the approved details thereafter.

Reason: Development without provision of adequate accommodation for the parking of vehicles is likely to lead to parking inconvenient to other road users

- (10) No development shall take place until the applicant, or their agents or successors in title, has secured the implementation of a watching brief to be undertaken by an archaeologist approved by the Local Planning Authority so that the excavation is observed and items of interest and finds are recorded. The watching brief shall be in accordance with a written programme and specification which has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: This is a pre-commencement condition to ensure that features of archaeological interest are properly examined and recorded.

- (11) All existing hedges or hedgerows shall be retained, unless shown on the approved drawings (including details approved pursuant to conditions 4 and 7) as being removed. All hedges and hedgerows on and immediately adjoining the site shall be protected from damage for the duration of works on the site. Any parts of hedges or hedgerows removed without the Local Planning Authority's prior written consent or which die or become, in the opinion of the Local Planning Authority, seriously diseased or otherwise damaged following contractual practical completion of the approved development shall be replaced as soon as is reasonably practicable and, in any case, by not later than the end of the first available planting season, with plants of such size and species and in such positions as may be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure the continuity of amenity afforded by existing hedges or hedgerows.

- (12) Prior to the commencement of development (excluding the creation of the new parking area), a noise impact assessment of the proposed use shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The assessment shall be completed by a suitably qualified person. If necessary, this shall then be used to design a scheme of mitigation to include both physical and management measures to reduce noise to nearby receptors. The scheme shall then be implemented and retained thereafter as approved.

Reason: In the interests of residential amenity.

INFORMATIVES

N/A

Case Officer: Richard Hazelgrove

NB For full details of all papers submitted with this application please refer to the relevant Public Access pages on the council's website.

The conditions set out in the report may be subject to such reasonable change as is necessary to ensure accuracy and enforceability.