



**RESPONSE TO STATEMENT OF
ROCHFORD DISTRICT COUNCIL
AND THIRD PARTY
REPRESENTATIONS**

**LAND ADJACENT TO CHICHESTER
HALL, OLD LONDON ROAD,
RAWRETH, ROCHFORD**

LPA REF: 07/00297/OUT

PINS REF:

APP/B1550/W/15/3121582

Date: September 2015

Ref: 6346A

Dalton Warner Davis LLP

21 Garlick Hill

London

EC4V 2AU

Tel: 020 7489 0213

Fax: 020 7248 4743

www.dwdllp.com

Disclaimer

This report has been produced by Dalton Warner Davis LLP (DWD) and is intended for the sole and exclusive use of the instructing client. The report shall not be distributed or made available to any third party or published, reproduced or referred to in any way without the prior knowledge and written consent of DWD. The report does not constitute advice to any third party and should not be relied upon as such. DWD accepts no liability or responsibility for any loss or damage to any third party arising from that party having relied upon the contents of the report in whole or in part.

CONTENTS

1.0 RESPONSE TO THE ROCHFORD DISTRICT COUNCIL’S STATEMENT 1

 Introduction 1

 Reason 1: No justification for the operational need for the land raising leading the Council to consider the proposal to amount to unnecessary deposit of fill material on the land and concern at the likely harm arising from use of the site for the deposit of waste material 1

 Reason 2: Close proximity of dropped balls to neighbouring homes 1

 Reason 3: Lack of a Flood Risk Assessment fails to give sufficient information for the Council and the inspector, to properly consider the impact upon discharge of surface water upon the local draining network..... 2

 Reason 4: Inappropriate development in the Green Belt 2

 Reason 5: Unsuitable Access 2

2.0 THIRD PARTY REPRESENTATIONS 3

1.0 RESPONSE TO THE ROCHFORD DISTRICT COUNCIL'S STATEMENT

Introduction

- 1.1 This report responds to comments made in the Rochford District Council's (RDC) Statement in relation to the appeal at Land adjacent to Chichester Hall, Old London Road, Rawreth (ref. APP/B1550/W/15/3121582)
- 1.2 The report is structured so that it methodically responds to each issue raised by RDC.

Reason 1: No justification for the operational need for the land raising leading the Council to consider the proposal to amount to unnecessary deposit of fill material on the land and concern at the likely harm arising from use of the site for the deposit of waste material

- 1.3 The Council states in section 3.1 of its Statement that members at committee considered that the appeal proposal is driven by waste disposal rather than any demand for increased golfing provision, particularly given the location of a driving range immediately to the east of the site.
- 1.4 In response to this, the appellant acknowledges that one of the benefits of the appeal proposal is to provide a sustainable solution to the reuse of inert engineering clays and soils and the formation of a 9 hole pay and play golf course on the site. Another significant benefit is that the creation of the course will help to meet the general deficit in outdoor recreational facilities in this location [refer to sections 6.11 to 6.14 in the Appeal Statement]. It is also noted that the appeal proposal comprises a golf course and practice area which would provide a different type of golfing facility from the existing driving range to the east of the site.
- 1.5 The Essex and Southend Waste Local Plan acknowledges that there is a beneficial reuse component to using such material in golf course landscaping so long as the relevant policy considerations are considered. The appellant proposes a new Condition [see Condition 23, Section 6.34 of the Appeal Statement] which would ensure that the site will be developed as a golf course within 4 years following commencement of development.
- 1.6 Further Conditions are proposed in section 6.34 of the Appeal Statement which would ensure that the imported material would be inert and non-hazardous (Condition 21), and that appropriate safeguards would be put in place to prevent unreasonable harm to residential amenity (Conditions 11 and 20).

Reason 2: Close proximity of dropped balls to neighbouring homes

- 1.7 This issue is addressed in sections 6.21 to 6.25 of the Appeal Statement. Despite there being no previous amenity objection as part of the 1992 appeal, should this current appeal succeed, the location of holes 1 and 9 could easily be swapped as part of the detailed landscaping submission which would result in the green of hole 9 being moved away from gardens of Claremont and Raymonds.

Reason 3: Lack of a Flood Risk Assessment fails to give sufficient information for the Council and the inspector, to properly consider the impact upon discharge of surface water upon the local draining network

- 1.8 This issue is addressed in detail in sections 6.24 to 6.25 of the Appeal Statement.
- 1.9 A Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy (June 2015) was submitted with the appeal and appended to the Appeal Statement in Appendix 5. The FRA concludes in section 2.9 that there should be no objection to the appeal proposals on the grounds of flood risk and drainage.

Reason 4: Inappropriate development in the Green Belt

- 1.10 This issue is fully addressed in sections 6.2 to 6.10 of the Appeal Statement.
- 1.11 It is noted that the case of the 2009 dismissed appeal at the former Lords Golf Cub (referred to in section 6.2 of RDC's Statement), the inspector concluded that the extent of mound raising for the driving range at issue in that appeal, was considered not to be essential as with the provision of catch fencing, the driving range had operated from 2003 on a relatively flat surface without needing the mounding proposed at that time. The previous policy stance (in PPG2) allowed only for essential facilities for outdoor participatory sport. The NPPF now allows for a less strict approach in that the development must be considered appropriate, rather than essential.
- 1.12 Section 6.3 of RDC's Statement refers to the appeal proposal resulting in land raising across the site between 4m to 9m in height above ground level, which is incorrect. The correct height would range between 2.5m to 5.3m and as explained in detail in Sections 4.5 and 6.8 of the Appeal Statement and indicated on the indicative drawing in Appendix 4, the openness of the Green Belt will be maintained.

Reason 5: Unsuitable Access

- 1.13 As referred to in sections 6.26 to 6.29 of the Appeal Statement, a Construction Traffic Impact Assessment (June 2015) was produced and accompanies the appeal submission. It concludes that the proposed access is suitable for the type of vehicles that would be used for the earthworks and that with the proposed highway planning conditions, the local road network would be able to safely accommodate construction vehicles.

2.0 THIRD PARTY REPRESENTATIONS

- 2.1 Relevant planning issues raised by Ms C Paine, Mrs Murton and Councillor Black are addressed in the appellant's Statement.
- 2.2 We note that Cllr Black's calculations are incorrect and refer you to the correct calculations in the appellant's Statement section 4.6.
- 2.3 With regard to Ms Paine's comments in relation to the adjacent existing golf driving range business, we attach an e-mail dated 22 December 2011 from the proprietor of that business, David Bugg, which was submitted in support of the planning application. It explains the lack of facilities for beginners and casual golfers locally and that the proposals will be complementary to the existing business. No safety issues are raised.

Nick Bowen

From: Nick Fennell
Sent: 07 September 2015 14:59
To: Nick Bowen
Subject: FW: Project abutting Rayleigh Golf Driving Range

Nick Fennell BSc MRICS
Partner



Dalton Warner Davis LLPDDI: 020 7332 2104
21 Garlick Hill S'board: 020 7489 0213
London Fax: 020 7248 4743
EC4V 2AU Mobile: 07876 654 099

email: nf@dwdllp.com | www.dwdllp.com

Chartered Surveyors | Property Advisors | Planning and Development Consultants

This e-mail (and enclosures) may be privileged and confidential and exempt from disclosure under law. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender. Any unauthorised disclosure, copying or dissemination is strictly prohibited. Thank you.

From: Jeremy Suttling [<mailto:jeremy@jksgroup.co.uk>]
Sent: 02 September 2015 12:01
To: Nick Fennell
Subject: FW: Project abutting Rayleigh Golf Driving Range

From: David Bugg [<mailto:golfwiseltd@btinternet.com>]
Sent: 22 December 2011 11:32
To: Jeremy Suttling
Subject: Project abutting Rayleigh Golf Driving Range

To whom it may concern:

I have operated the Rayleigh Golf Driving Range adjacent to the Carpenters' Arms Public House for the past 14 years. The range is extremely busy with people using the range to hit balls and take advantage of the golf tuition packages which we offer. It has been very frustrating that many people trying to play golf have suffered from a lack of facilities that cater for beginners and casual golfers at an affordable price in the area. This is the reason we are very supportive of the planning application which abutts the golf range and feel it would attract many people into a healthy 'sport for life'. The design of the course would meet the needs of the people and help us establish our academy for junior golfers, as this would allow them to pursue the sport they want to participate in.

I have been a qualified PGA member for over 30 years and have worked in all aspects of the game, predominantly pitch & putt and starter academies. I believe I am one of the best authorities in this field to gauge the need and viability for the course abutting the range. The two facilities would be mutually beneficial and compliment each other, however, my motive for emailing is to promote access to the sport, which has in the past suffered from elitism.

Should you require any additional information or wish to look at the figures we are projecting for this course please feel free to contact me.

Regards,
David Bugg PGA

David Bugg
Director
Golfwise Ltd
Tel 01245 257682 (07714 296095)

This email has been scanned on behalf of Dalton Warner Davis by the MessageLabs Email Security System.
For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>
