

## SUPPLEMENTARY REPORTS

AREA 3 PLANNING COMMITTEE

DATED 1 October 2020

---

**East Malling & Larkfield**                      **(A)TM/20/00311/FL**  
**Larkfield North**                              **(B)TM/20/01136/FL**

**(A)Installation of 16 x light fittings on 6 x 15 metre high masts to light football pitch to the required FA standard of 200 lux**

**(B)Creation of hardstanding area adjacent to pavilion, creation of tarmac pathway around football pitch, erection of 2no. spectator stands, 2 no. dugouts and a paybooth at 251A New Hythe Lane Larkfield Aylesford**

DPHEH: Since publication of the main report, a number of points of clarification have been sought, which are addressed as follows:

*Planning history and status of the sports ground:*

Paragraphs 6.9 and 6.11 of the main report references the lack of planning restrictions currently in operation in respect of the application site. To further clarify, the original planning permission was granted dated 10 November 1965 by Kent County Council under reference 65/10337/OLD (KCC ref MK/4/65/367) for the “*change of use of vacant land to playing fields in connection with Larkfield and New Hythe Wanderers Football Club*”. At that time, two conditions were imposed; one requiring details of the siting, design, and layout of any buildings and the means of access to them to be submitted and approved; the other requiring adequate land to be reserved for car parking and thereafter maintained. There is no record of these conditions having been formally discharged but in any event given the significant amount of time that has elapsed, there is no ability to enforce any breach.

Since that time, our records indicate a number of planning permissions have been granted concerning the pavilion building, which typically include conditions to control matters such as the permitted hours of use, noise emissions, and landscaping. The most recent is reference TM/06/01222/FL dated 20 October 2006 for extensions to the clubhouse which was granted subject to eight conditions, including: hours of use (0700 -2300 daily); noise controls (3 conditions); a requirement for resurfacing of the car park and provision of a screen on its western boundary; and landscaping. Again, whilst there is no record of these formally being discharged, there is now no ability to take enforcement action in this respect.

Paragraph 6.9 of the main report details the most recent planning permission for floodlighting, from January 1996, which also specified permitted hours of illumination.

Notwithstanding any specific planning control over the pavilion building and previous floodlighting, the permitted and unrestricted use of the overall site as playing fields remains as originally granted in 1965.

Turning to the parking arrangements, the current, somewhat informal, area on the west side of the pavilion dates essentially from planning permission reference TM/84/10271/FUL for *Single storey sports pavilion building*. One of the conditions imposed required the parking area shown on the 'proposed' site plan to be surfaced and thereafter retained for parking. The area on the drawing appears significantly smaller than the area currently in use. The parking area is also only roughly surfaced.

However, it is not considered that either of the two applications on the current agenda triggers a requirement for additional or improved car parking facilities. It is unlikely that the relevant conditions in either the 1984 or the 2006 planning permissions could now be enforced. Of course, in the event that the club continued to expand and require additional associated built development to facilitate that expansion which required planning permission it would be necessary at that point in time to assess whether any additional parking provision was required and, if so, could be provided in an acceptable manner.

#### Light spill

For the avoidance of doubt, Application (A) is accompanied by a light spill diagram, within the document prepared by the applicants' consultant headed FOOTBALL PITCH 200LUX dated 21-02-2020. In the event that planning permission is granted for the development, this would be expressly cited as an approved document.

Paragraph 6.19 of the main report indicates that light reaching neighbouring houses would be no greater than from a full moon, whereas the applicant's own Technical Report indicates that the lighting level from a full moon would be only 0.3 to 0.5 horizontal lux. The comment made at paragraph 6.19 is intended to give a general impression of the order of magnitude involved. The submitted lightspill diagram (as amended) provides specific data on designed emissions in the vicinity of the floodlights and demonstrates that in respect of dwellings in Fielding Close and for 249 and 251 New Hythe Lane, the installation will meet the limit specified for a Zone 2 location, which is characterised as *Sparsely inhabited rural areas, village or relatively dark outer suburban locations*. This is considered to be satisfactory for this location, particularly in view of the automatic switching-off time of 10.15pm and the likelihood of comparatively infrequent use, for short periods, and a planning condition has been recommended to secure both the timing and the light emissions.

Members should also note that the new fence which has been erected on the western side of the pitch has been included in the calculations in this respect. The retention of the fence can be required by planning condition.

Members may be aware of a KCC Planning Floodlighting Guidance Note of 2006 and the suggestion by a local resident that this specifies minimum recommended distances of

floodlights from the nearest houses. However, this appears to be based on a misreading of the document, which on page 14 provides guidance on the recommended minimum distance of a new MUGA from houses, with the added note 'especially floodlit ones'. This document provides general guidance on floodlighting installations and what information should be included in a planning application, particularly details of the proposed luminaires and the predicted light output, overlaid onto a map base. The current proposals are considered to provide adequate detail in these respects.

Application (A):

#### **AMENDED RECOMMENDATION**

##### **Additional Condition:**

**5. The existing close boarded fence along the western side of the football pitch shall be retained and maintained at its current height and location in perpetuity.**

**Reason: In the interests of residential amenity.**

Application (B):

**RECOMMENDATIONS REMAIN UNCHANGED**

---

This page is intentionally left blank