

PL/2020/02792/PPFL

The Parish Council continues to have some concerns relating to various documents and data recently submitted following the deferral of the planning application by the Planning Committee and their request for more information. The Parish Council wishes to make the following comments:

Noise Impact Assessment

Para.2. 2.1 - the bund shown on the drawing in Figure 2-2, Proposed Site Layout Plan does not reflect the drawing/s prepared by Highways England and shared with Mr. Philip O'Reilly, HE, AECOM, representatives of Hampton Parish Council and the WGAA (copy attached) when the impact of this development was being discussed and the noise bund promoted in July 2019 - a copy of the minutes from that meeting is enclosed.

It was discussed and agreed that a bund would be built south of the pitches to mitigate against the potential noise and environmental impact created by the pitches moving closer to Four Winds. It should be noted that at the time the bund was being discussed no location for the new clubhouse had been agreed and any subsequent impact not assessed.

In fact, variations of bund position options were discussed at various times. Drawing HE551485-ACM-GEN-ZZ_SW_ZZ_ZZ-DR-ZH-0109 was received in March 2019-. Drawings AFL-00-00-DR-A-90101-P3 Site Plan Option A and AFL-00-00-DR-A-90102-P1 Site Plan Option B were received in December 2019 but had been tabled and discussed at a meeting with HE, AECOM and Skanska in November 2019 (also attended by Parish Councillors Cuthbert and Cook) and Drawings WGAA Revised Option A and WGAA Revised Option B were received as recently as July 2020.yet this application contains bund configuration totally at odds with previous discussions.

It was also stated in Para. 2.5.12 of the DCO Inspector's report that a bund would be constructed as follows:

- 2.5.12. It is the intention that the Legacy Scheme should not give rise to any environmental impacts on Four Winds or other neighbouring properties that are materially new or materially different from those set out in the Environmental Statement. Provision will be made for the owner of the fields to the north and south to drive cattle between those fields. And, even though the Legacy Scheme will bring 2 of the pitches, the car parking and the clubhouse, closer to Four Winds, an earth bund will be constructed along the new southern boundary which can be landscaped and planted to provide environmental screening. There is to be no floodlighting and no hurling wall.

Representative Noise Sensitive Receptors.

Table 4.1 shows the nearest noise receptors to the configuration of the WGAA as indicated in this application. There is some inconsistency in the information relating to the various receptors located at Four Winds. Table 4.1 and Figure 4.1 quote receptor RO2 and it is unclear where this is located but Para.4.3.3 refers to two other receptors ML7a (Front) and ML7b (Rear)

and Table 4.2 contains data relating to these. However, Table 4.3 shows data from RO2 receptor. It does not include any data for receptors 7a and 7b.

We are a little confused concerning the data relating to Oak Tree Lodge in Table 4.3. The site is directly under the flight path, will be approx. 115m from the new dual carriageway, closer to the south bound lane of Catherine de Barnes Lane, the new clubhouse and the new car park and only slightly further from the pitches than currently but according to the table it will see a reduction in noise levels. Is this correct?

Para.4.3.4 states that noise surveys taken in 2020 (during Covid-19 restrictions) are not representative and goes on to suggest that the survey data in 2018 is. We do question this judgement on the basis that the data is out of date.

Para 6.2.1. of the Noise Impact assessment states: - An environmental earth bund with relative height approximately 1.5m above existing grade level is proposed on the southern site boundary. A 1.8m high solid panel fence is also proposed to be located on the bund along the southern boundary. The earth bund and fence aim to provide visual and acoustic screening between pitches and the nearest property, Four Winds. The bund and fence location are shown in Figure 6-1. We believe this statement to be mis-leading and not supported by the diagram Figure 6.1. The bund only covers the area south of the club house and does not continue across the southern ends of the pitches as indicated in the HE drawing referred to earlier. It also does not provide visual screening to Four Winds and given the rural aspect, a solid panel fence will be a blot in the landscape.

Para 7.1 Sports Pitches: We are concerned over the data contained in the Table 7.1 particularly relating to Four Winds reproduced here –

Table 7.1 Predicted Free-field Noise Levels - Sports Pitches

Ref	Description	Predicted Noise Level, dB L _{Aeq,1hr}			Noise Level Difference, dB	
		Existing Site	DCO Site Layout	Proposed Site Layout	DCO – Existing	Proposed - Existing
R02	Four Winds, Catherine De Barnes Lane	45.2	48.9	46.5	3.7	1.3

Table 7.1 Predicted Free-field Noise Levels - Sports Pitches.

The table shows only slightly higher noise levels at the proposed site over the existing facilities – how can this be true when:-

- a) the pitches, larger clubhouse and larger car park are significantly closer to Four Winds
- b) a new practice area and a new outdoor patio are located between the new clubhouse and Four Winds.
- c) the Existing Site consists of grass pitches only whereas the Proposed Site includes an all-weather pitch
- d) a grass pitch absorbs more sound than an all-weather pitch, resulting in lower noise levels

If we also compare the Proposed Site to the DCO Site Layout, the table indicates that higher noise levels would result from the DCO Site Layout, despite the following:

- a) the pitches included in the DCO Site Layout are the same distance from Four Winds as the Proposed Site pitches
- b) the DCO Site Layout is limited to just two new grass pitches, whereas the Proposed Site includes an all-weather pitch, a clubhouse, a car park, a practice area and an outdoor patio area

Also note R02 is used as a baseline but the tables 7.2, 7.3, 7.4, 7.5 and 8.1, show higher noise levels of the proposed configuration than the current layout, thereby supporting our suspicions over the data included in Table 7.1.

None of the data included in the various tables referred to in Section 7 refer to receptors 7a and 7b mentioned earlier.

What is crucially important to bear in mind is that *“every increase of 3 dB represents a doubling of sound intensity, or acoustic power*”*

We note that the conditions placed on this application are not in line with conditions placed on the conditional approval of Planning Application PL/2020/00724/PPFL a development which included a new pitch.

Noise Management Plan

We refer to para 4.1.2 in the Plan. We feel it would be appropriate for a copy of any complaint should be sent to a contact within HE and or SMBC. This will enable these interested parties to the project to keep a watching brief of the overall complaint situation and intervene where they feel it might be necessary.

The Clubhouse

The Planning Committee also asked that the clubhouse be re-sited to a less prominent position on the site, which seems to have been ignored. We do recognise that the roof detail has been altered and believe this to be an improvement over the original design and appreciate that the applicant has re-orientated the position of the opening doors of the facility.

Community Use Agreement

On the basis that Designated Funding (monies from the public purse) is being used to finance this new facility, we do not understand the reasoning why the Community Use Agreement should be for a limited period, namely 11 years and not in perpetuity.