

Our Ref: LF/ms/23061v1

8 July 2025

Ms L Palmer
Planning Inspectorate
S62a Application Team
3rd Floor
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Temple Quay
Bristol
BS1 6PN



**Barker Parry Town
Planning Ltd**

33 Bancroft, Hitchin,
Herts SG5 1LA

W: www.barkerparry.co.uk

By Email Only: section62a@planninginspectorate.gov.uk

Dear Ms Palmer

Response to Consultation Comments

S62a Application

**S62A/2025/0107 Former Friends School Field, Mount Pleasant Road, Saffron
Walden, CB11 3EB**

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to the comments received on the 4 July 2025.

We have reviewed the comments received and respond as follows:

Sport England

It must be first stated that the Applicant is endeavouring to balance the delivery of sports pitches, along with a changing room building, along with finding a mechanism to fund that delivery. There are competing requirements from all the clubs in the area, as well as the Town Council. Even if the entire site were given over to sports provision, it is unlikely to satisfy all the clubs' demands.

Without some development to fund improvements to the pitches and improve the overall offer being presented, this site will remain closed and unavailable for any sports use going forward.

Sport England suggest that no attempts have been made to make the fields available to other bodies. The site has been vacant for some time and discussions have been ongoing with the clubs and Town Council, none of these parties have suggested a desire to take on the pitches in isolation and moreover, the pitches would not be able to operate successfully without changing rooms. The Applicant has been advised by local clubs, that clubs without changing facilities are fined for each game played on pitches without such facilities. So, the provision of pitches in isolation is not a viable proposition for matches. Some funding maybe available to local clubs to bring

Steven Barker
Director
MA (Cantab) MA MRTPI

Liz Fitzgerald
Director (Managing)
BA (Hons) Dip TP MRTPI

Registered
England & Wales No. 5314018.
Registered Office same as
office address



forward a changing facility, however, most funding streams need to be match funded. There is no evidence to suggest that this is even a prospect to local groups, or a realistic opportunity to deliver such facilities.

In terms of the community use of the school field, Sport England have asserted that we have made an error in our understanding of the provisions in the CUA. This has been reviewed, and we have not made an error.

The pitches were only available for use on a Saturday and Sunday. They were available for 4hrs per day, except between April-June where it was reduced to 3hrs on a Saturday and 4hrs on a Sunday and only in the afternoons. This equates to a total of 8hrs a week between September-March and 7hrs a week between April – June.

It is in fact Sport England that have mis-read the CUA. It is the balance for CUA that is the defined period available for use by the community. It draws a clear division between the need for the pitches for school and commercial use, over the time then available for the community to use it.

It is entirely possible that other ad hoc arrangement was possible upon discussion with the School, however, weekdays during the winter months were unlikely due to the pitches not being lit and there was likely to be use by the school immediately outside of school hours by school teams.

There is no evidence presented beyond the CUA that gives any contrary evidential basis for deviating from this document.

The position set out in the CUA is reinforced by comments from Sport England in response to planning application reference: UTT/0188/10/FUL which related to The Avenue development. I attach a copy of their comments which helpfully include details of the sports use of the pitches in 2009 (highlighted by ourselves). It is worth highlighting that the local football clubs only used the pitches on Sunday mornings between September – March and the cricket club on used the pitch on alternative Saturday afternoons.

The additional hours set out in the Planning Statement are therefore accurate and reflect the last now evidenced position on community use for this site.

Sport England acknowledge that the drainage and gradient evidence submitted in support of the application are accurate and demonstrate that they would not meet Sport England standards. They endeavour to cast shadow on the wider implications beyond the southern section of the site and suggest that it should not be taken that it is the same for the entire site.

Unless by some miracle the northern half of the field is of a completely different soil make up to the southern half of the field, the implications for drainage are exactly the same across the site. The submitted Drainage Strategy (Appendix B) shows the locations of percolation testing, which includes locations in the northern half of the

site. The worst results for percolation within the site were at locations SA02 and SA03 where the site is the most level, again reinforcing the Applicants submissions.

Some suggestions have been made that this would be worse now as the field has been left untouched for many years, however, it is a well-known concept that leaving a field without compaction or interference i.e. fallow for a period of time will improve soil quality, therefore drainage should be improved not degraded.

The Applicant has never tried to assert that the gradients don't differ across the site and have made this clear when considering the quality of each individual pitch on the site.

It is appreciated that in many older fields pitch provision does not meet the Sport England standards, but it is the case that any new sports pitch provision is required to and invariably, whether it be for local club use or in association with new schools conditions are imposed on permissions requiring them to meet the Sport England standards. It is therefore the case that any application requiring a change to the sports pitches on this site would be required to improve drainage, consider ball strike etc.

It is acknowledged that the local sports clubs suggest that the pitches were flat and well drained, however, the sites topography tells a different story, as does the supporting agronomy report and Drainage Strategy.

Moreover, section 2.4 of the Winter Pitch Assessment 2024 sets out that, *"The capacity for pitches to regularly provide for competitive play, training and other activity over a season is most often determined by quality. As a minimum, the quality and therefore the capacity of a pitch affects the playing experience and people's enjoyment. In extreme circumstances, it can result in the inability of a pitch to cater for all or certain types of play during peak and off-peak times."* Therefore, improved quality equates to improved capacity, which when added to the additional hours available for community use, without the school restrictions, must be seen as a benefit to the overall scheme, as opposed to being simply disregarded.

The ECB have suggested that the site may have accommodated an 11-wicket square, not a 5-wicket square, however this is not evidenced. The aerial imagery provided shows the provision on site of a 5-wicket square historically. This is a position that has not been disputed by the local club. The provision of a 12-pitch square was requested by the local club and has been accommodated, one of which would be a non-turf pitch. The sizes have been agreed with the club and no issues were raised at pre-application stage by the ECB or Sport England.

A request has been made to update the plan to show a potential future location for practice nets. This element does not form part of this application and would be for a future user to dictate, not the Applicant.

The ECB has requested modified windows in the changing rooms to provide a better view of the pitch. This is not considered to be appropriate given that they are

changing rooms, but the door from the lobby out to the pitch is proposed to be glazed to facilitate viewing and not prejudice people's right to privacy when changing.

There has also been a request to bring forward the playing fields and clubhouse earlier in the development programme. This request is understood, but there is also a need to consider how the development can physically be delivered without any area for a site compound. It has been carefully considered, and it is only prior to the 80% occupation that the compound can be sufficiently reduced to enable the pitches to be brought forward, without impact on delivery and thus potentially impacting on the highway network due to the need for more regular deliveries, contractors parking off site and other consequential knock-on effects of more constrained sites. The delivery timetable for these pitches is therefore a balance between conflicting elements of site delivery.

Uttlesford District Council

Many of the issues raised in the UDC submission were addressed in our earlier July response documents, where incorrect information has been presented to the Committee. Whilst the Applicant has endeavoured to advise Officers of the errors they have continued in the addendum document to the Committee where Officers advise that the affordable 1 and 2 bed provision is limited to flatted accommodation. This is not correct, and the correct housing mix is clearly set out at paragraph 4.3 of the Planning Statement.

In respect of coach parking for the sports facilities proposed, all the local clubs objected to the coach parking, advising that it wasn't required. It was removed at their request.

The Applicant welcomes the confirmation of a Hearing on the 8 August and will respond to any further queries the Inspector may have. We note the Council's proposed conditions and will endeavour to liaise with them to reach agreement on the conditions prior to the Hearing.

We trust the above assists in the determination of the application. If anything further is required, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours sincerely

A solid black rectangular box used to redact the signature of Liz Fitzgerald.

Liz Fitzgerald
Managing Director

Enc.

The Avenue

Saffron Walden

Appendix C
Sport England

Sarah Eastham

From: Tim Ronalds Architects [REDACTED]
Sent: 17 November 2009 15:32
To: Patrick Devlin
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Sport England - FW: Pre application advice - Friend's School Playing Fields

Patrick,

Please see below the confirmation of the Sport England correspondence that we received today.

Best Regards

Ben

Tim Ronalds Architects
4 Nile Street
London N1 7RF

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
www.timronalds.co.uk

Tim Ronalds Architects Ltd Registered in England 5741468

-----Original Message-----

From: Nicky Warnock [REDACTED]
Sent: 17 November 2009 12:18
To: Tim Ronalds Architects
Subject: Pre application advice - Friend's School Playing Fields

Dear Tim

Thank you for consulting Sport England on the above pre-application consultation.

I can confirm that the pre-application consultation is statutory and that the consultation was received on 10 November 2009. I can also confirm that sufficient information has been provided with the consultation to allow a substantive response to be made by Sport England. In accordance with the Town and Country Planning (General Development Procedure) (Amendment) (England) Order 2005, I can confirm that a response will be made to this consultation within 21 days from the date of receipt (by 1 December 2009), unless a longer period is agreed in writing.

Please contact me if you have any queries.

Kind regards,
Nicky Warnock on behalf of Roy Warren

Nicky Warnock
Business Support

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
10/12/2009

[REDACTED]



Creating sporting opportunities in every community

Sport England, Crescent House, 19 The Crescent, Bedford, MK40 2QP

Nicky Warnock
Business Support

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]



Creating sporting opportunities in every community

Sport England, Crescent House, 19 The Crescent, Bedford, MK40 2QP

The information contained in this e-mail may be subject to public disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act 2000.

Additionally, this email and any attachment are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual to whom they are addressed. If you are not the intended recipient, be advised that you have received this email and any attachment in error, and that any use, dissemination, forwarding, printing, or copying, is strictly prohibited.

Friends' School Saffron Walden

Sports Facilities Usage

Term Time	Current Users			Potential numbers on site	Possible site availability
Sept/March					
Pitches	School pupils	9am to 5pm	Weekdays	Up to 400 pupils, coaching staff, visiting teams and parents	Some flexibility for usage here
	WAMRC(6 teams)	9am to 1pm	Saturdays	75 children, 25 coaches and parents	
	Boarders	1pm to 5pm	Saturdays	Up to 70 boarders and staff	
	WAMRC(36 teams)	9am to 1pm	Sundaysx3	Triangular tournament for up to 252 players + parents	Some flexibility for usage here
	SWFC	9am to 1pm	Sundaysx3	Match in lower league for up to 30 people	
	Boarders	1pm to 5pm	Sundays	Up to 70 boarders and staff	
Sports Hall	School pupils	9am to 5pm	Weekdays	Up to 400 pupils, coaching staff, visiting teams and parents	Some flexibility for usage here
	Local clubs & Boarders	6pm to 9pm	Weekdays	Porch FC, Spartak FC, Radwinter FC & Boarders(up to 50 users)	
	Local clubs & Boarders	9am to 9pm	Saturdays	SW Triathetes Trampoline club & Boarders(up to 60 users)	
	Local clubs & Boarders	9am to 8pm	Sundays	Noakes FC & Boarders(up to 40 users)	
Pool	School pupils	9am to 5pm	Weekdays	Up to 400 pupils, coaching staff, visiting teams and parents	Some flexibility for usage here Some flexibility for usage here
	SWASC, Dolphins, Triathaletes	4pm to 9pm	Weekdays	Up to 320 users per week	
	Triathaletes, Boarders & Staff	9am to 9pm	Saturdays	Up to 50 users	
	Dolphins, staff & Boarders	9am to 9pm	Sundays	Up to 70 users	
April/July					
Pitches	School pupils	9am to 7pm	Weekdays	Up to 400 pupils, coaching staff, visiting teams and parents	Some flexibility for usage here
	SWCC	2pm to 7pm	Alt. Saturdays	Up to 60 players, staff and spectators	
Tennis courts	School pupils	9am to 9pm	Weekdays	Up to 400 pupils, coaching staff, visiting teams and parents	Some flexibility for usage here Some flexibility for usage here
	Staff & Boarders	9am to 9pm	Saturdays	Up to 70 users	
	Staff & Boarders	9am to 9pm	Saturdays	Up to 70 users	
Sports Hall	School pupils	9am to 5pm	Weekdays	Up to 400 pupils, coaching staff, visiting teams and parents	
	Local clubs & Boarders	6pm to 9pm	Weekdays	Porch FC, Spartak FC, Radwinter FC & Boarders(up to 50 users)	
	Local clubs & Boarders	9am to 9pm	Saturdays	SW Basketball Club, Triathetes & Boarders(up to 60 users)	
	Local clubs & Boarders	9am to 8pm	Sundays	Noakes FC & Boarders(up to 40 users)	
Pool	School pupils	9am to 5pm	Weekdays	Up to 400 pupils, coaching staff, visiting teams and parents	Some flexibility for usage here Some flexibility for usage here
	SWASC, Dolphins, Triathaletes	4pm to 9pm	Weekdays	Up to 320 users per week	
	Triathaletes, Boarders & Staff	9am to 9pm	Saturdays	Up to 50 users	
	Dolphins, staff & Boarders	9am to 9pm	Sundays	Up to 70 users	
Holidays	(Christmas - School closed)				
All facilities	Barracudas, American Footballers, Twin, Youth for Christ. Quakers	9am to 9pm	Full time	Up to 150 users per day	

Your ref:

Our ref: REG/PLAN/ES/14

18 November 2009

Mr. Tim Ronalds
Tim Ronalds Architects
4 Nile Street
London
N1 7RF

Dear Mr. Ronalds

FRIENDS SCHOOL, SAFFRON WALDEN

Thank you for your letter dated 9 November 2009 regarding the request for pre-application advice in relation to the revised proposals for development at the Friends School site in Saffron Walden.

First, I would wish to confirm that Sport England would be a statutory consultee on the proposed development when consulted on a future planning application, as the proposal would affect the school's playing field. All proposals affecting playing fields are assessed in relation to Sport England's playing fields policy 'A Sporting Future for the Playing Fields of England' (1997) which can be downloaded from our website at www.sportengland.org/facilities_planning/putting_policy_into_practice/playing_fields.aspx. Sport England will normally oppose development that would lead to the loss of, or prejudice the use of, all or part of a playing field, without meeting at least one of the specific exception criteria identified in the above policy. I would provide the following advice on how I consider the proposals would relate to this policy:

The proposal is for a revised scheme which involves residential and school related development on land within the Friends School's existing grounds. The scheme has been scaled down since the original scheme that was submitted as a planning application in 2006 in terms of the extent of proposed new housing and school development. In terms of the impact on the playing field, the encroachment onto the western side of the playing field would be similar to the original scheme and the revised playing pitch layout that this would necessitate would also be similar. The existing tennis court that would be displaced would be replaced in a similar location to the original scheme although it has been noted that the additional (fourth) tennis court proposed in the original scheme has been omitted from this revised proposal.

On the basis that the impact on the playing field of the revised proposal is similar to that of the original scheme, I can advise that Sport England's position as a statutory consultee would be the same as that set out in our original response to the planning application dated 22 May 2006 which I append to this response i.e. no objection subject to the imposition of planning conditions relating to the completion of a community use agreement for the school's sports facilities and the conversion of the former tennis court site (to the east of the playing field) to playing field use. It is presumed that the school's offer to enter

into a formal community use agreement to make its sports facilities and remaining playing fields available to the community still applies.

As a non-statutory consultee, advice would be provided to Uttlesford District Council on the sports facility needs of the proposed residential development. When this matter was last discussed with the school in 2007, it was proposed that a community use agreement for the school's existing and proposed sports facilities would be secured as an alternative to a developer contribution. It would be helpful if the planning application could confirm whether this approach would still be taken and what, if any, new sports facilities would be provided as part of the development in view of the scaled down nature of the proposals.

I hope that this response is helpful to you in determining how to progress the development proposals. Please contact me if you wish to discuss this response further.

Yours sincerely

A large black rectangular redaction box covering the signature area.

Roy Warren
Senior Planning Manager

Two horizontal black rectangular redaction boxes covering contact information.

Your ref: UTT/0653/06/OP
Our ref: APP/27/2006/126

22 May 2006



Mr J Mitchell
Executive Manager (Development Services)
Uttlesford District Council
Council Offices
London Road
Saffron Walden
Essex
CB11 4ER

Dear Sir

OUTLINE APPLICATION FOR RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT, SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT ETC – FRIEND'S SCHOOL, MOUNT PLEASANT ROAD, SAFFRON WALDEN

Thank you for consulting Sport England on the above planning application. The proposal affects the playing field at the above site and the consultation is therefore statutory, under the terms of the General Permitted Development Procedure Order 1995 (as amended).

Sport England would also wish to make separate comments as a non-statutory consultee on the sports facility requirements of the proposed residential development.

Impact on Playing Fields

I have considered the proposal with regard to Sport England's policy 'A Sporting Future for the Playing Fields of England' (1997), a copy of which you have. The aim of this policy is to ensure that there is no further reduction in the supply of conveniently located, quality playing fields to satisfy the current and likely future demand.

Sport England will normally oppose development that would lead to the loss of, or prejudice the use of, all or part of a playing field, without meeting at least one of the specific exception criteria identified in the above policy.

I have visited the site and can confirm that I have had extensive pre-application discussions with the applicant about the impact of the proposed development on the playing fields. Some of the pre-application correspondence is included in Appendix 8 of the supporting statement submitted with the planning application.

The proposal is a major development which principally involves new school buildings and enabling residential development as well as associated infrastructure such as new roads and car parking. In terms of the impact on the playing field, as set out in section 4 of the supporting statement, the development would result in a small (0.2 ha) net loss in the size of the playing field in relation to the area which is considered to be useable for sport. The development would affect the existing playing field as follows:

- An extended car park adjoining the sports hall would encroach onto part of the playing field adjoining the existing rugby pitch;
- Two new tennis courts would encroach onto part of the playing field that is currently used for a hockey pitch (winter) or a running track (summer);
- The proposed junior school would encroach onto the playing field in the area in the vicinity of the existing cricket pavilion;
- A new access road to serve the residential development proposed to the south east of the site which encroach into the southern part of the playing field;
- A disused area to the east of the playing fields formerly used as tennis courts would be converted to form part of the playing field.

Crescent House, 19 The Crescent, Bedford, MK40 2QP

www.sportengland.org

Chair: Lord Carter of Coles Chief Executive: Stephen Baddeley (Interim) Regional Sports Board Chair: Mr Stephen Castle Regional Director: Chris Perks



Although the development would clearly have an impact on the playing field and its overall size would be reduced the following considerations are material to my assessment:

- The applicant has offered (paragraph 4.10.2 of the supporting statement) to enter into a formal community use agreement to make its sports facilities and remaining playing fields available to the community;
- Despite the net loss in the size of the playing field, all existing summer and winter pitches would be retained through reorganising the playing pitch layouts without any reductions in their size. The existing cricket pavilion would also be relocated to another part of the playing field;
- The development would not prejudice the potential for additional pitches to be laid out on the playing field to meet future needs because the capacity of the playing field for both winter and summer sports is already fully utilised and insufficient space would exist for accommodating additional pitches if the development was not implemented.
- The conversion of a disused area to the east of the site to form a useable (for formal sport) part of the playing field would help compensate for the loss of other parts of the playing field;
- The two new tennis courts would provide new tennis facilities for the school and potentially the community. Whilst the courts would be sited in an area used for existing pitches, the pitches affected would be satisfactorily relocated by reorganising the playing pitch layouts. Consequently, I consider that the sports development benefits offered by the proposed tennis courts would outweigh the detriment caused by the loss of part of the playing field affected.
- The part of the playing field that would be encroached onto by the proposed junior school would not in my view be capable of forming a playing pitch or part of one due to the existence of mature trees, hedgerows and the siting of the existing cricket pavilion;
- The extended car park adjoining the sports hall would help facilitate community use of the school's sports facilities

In view of the above considerations, I am of the view that the proposals, when considered as a package, would accord with Sport England's playing fields policy. Exception E5 of the policy which relates to developments which offer benefits to the development of sport that outweigh the detriment caused by the loss of the playing field or playing fields would apply to the proposed community use agreement and tennis court proposals. Exception E4 which relates to equivalent replacement playing field provision being made would apply to the disused area to the east of the site which is proposed for conversion to playing field use. Exception E3 which relates to areas that are incapable of forming playing pitches (or parts of) would apply to areas affected by the proposed junior school. Exception E2 which relates to developments that are ancillary to the principal use of the site as a playing field would apply to the proposals for relocating the cricket pavilion and the extended car park.

In conclusion, I therefore consider that the proposed development in relation to its impact on playing fields would accord with Sport England's playing fields policy because it has been satisfactorily demonstrated that exceptions E2, E3, E4 or E5 would be met for the various proposals which have implications for the playing field. I can therefore confirm that no objection is made by Sport England to this planning application as a statutory consultee, subject to the following planning conditions being imposed if planning permission is granted:

- A condition requiring a community use agreement to be completed before the commencement of any development on the playing field. This condition is required to ensure that the potential community benefits of the proposed development are actually secured in practice and is necessary to ensure that the proposed sports development benefits identified above (which would outweigh the detriment caused by the loss of some parts of the playing field) are secured to allow exception E5 of the playing fields policy to be met in practice. A model condition which has been used elsewhere can be provided by Sport England upon request. On this occasion, Sport England would not wish to be a party to the community use agreement. The agreement should therefore be between Friend's School and Uttlesford District Council although Sport England would wish to be consulted when an agreement is submitted for discharging such a condition. For information, model community use agreement templates have been prepared by Sport England for schools and local authorities to use. I would encourage consideration to be given to the completion of a community use agreement based upon one of these templates, although I would have no objection to the principle of a community use

agreement in another format being used. These agreements can be downloaded from Sport England's website at www.sportengland.org/index/get_resources/resource_ps/kitbag_front_page

- A condition requiring the disused area (formerly used for tennis courts) to the east of the site to be converted to playing field use (and operational) before any development commences on the playing field. This is required because the proposed reorganisation of the playing pitch layouts (which ensures that the size and number of existing playing pitches is maintained) is dependent on this area being available. Such a condition is also required to ensure that the requirements of exception E4 of the above policy are fully met.

Sports Facility Requirements of the Residential Development

As a non-statutory consultee, I would also wish to make comments on the sports facility requirements generated by the proposed residential development. The residential development will generate its own needs for sports facilities, which if not met by the development, will place additional pressures on existing facilities. Policy GEN6 of the adopted local plan requires developments to make provision for community facilities and other infrastructure where this is made necessary by the proposed development. As such, I would expect the development to make adequate provision for meeting the sports facility needs that it will generate.

With respect to outdoor sports facilities, I understand that Saffron Walden has a deficiency in playing pitches. As the needs generated by the proposed residential development would exacerbate this deficiency, the principle of the development making an appropriate level of outdoor sports facility provision would be justified.

As it is considered unlikely to be viable or justifiable for a development of 164 dwellings to provide on-site outdoor sports facilities, I would expect provision to be made offsite. This could be made in the form of an appropriate financial contribution in lieu of on-site provision being made to Uttlesford District Council which would be used towards the provision of new or improved outdoor sports facilities in Saffron Walden. The level of such a contribution should be based on the financial cost of providing the outdoor sports facilities that the development would generate and would be informed by local standards for outdoor sports facilities. Sport England would be willing to provide advice on how to calculate an appropriate financial contribution if necessary.

Alternatively, as the overall development on the Friend's School site is expected to facilitate new or increased community use of the school's outdoor sports facilities (playing pitches and tennis courts), on this occasion I would be prepared to support the principle of community use (outside of school hours) of these facilities being formally secured as another way of providing for the outdoor sports facility needs generated by the residential development. Whilst the majority of the outdoor sports facilities on the school site would not be new facilities, if they were opened up for community use for the first time or if community use was substantially increased this would have a similar affect to providing new or improved community sports facilities elsewhere. The close proximity between the proposed residential development and the playing fields is also an attraction of this option because the facilities would be easily accessible for new residents. The acceptability of this approach would only be acceptable if an appropriate long term community use agreement between Friends School and Uttlesford District Council was completed as a condition of any planning permission. This would be necessary to ensure that community use is secured in practice for a long term period. The acceptability of this approach would also depend on the extent of outdoor sports facilities that would be made available for community use and the extent that community use would be increased above current levels e.g securing one football pitch for community use that is already in regular use by the community would not represent "new" provision.

In relation to built facilities, Sport England's Sports Facility Calculator estimates that a development of 164 dwellings would generate additional needs equivalent to approximately 3% of a sports hall and 2% of a swimming pool. Sport England is unaware of whether any local assessments have been undertaken to establish the extent of need for new or improved built sports facilities in Saffron Walden. However, Sport England (using our Active Places Power strategic planning tool) can provide an indication of quantitative levels of supply and demand for built facilities in the area upon request. If there are existing deficiencies (quantitative or qualitative) in such provision which would be exacerbated by the proposed residential development, I consider that justification would exist for provision to be made for the same reasons set out above in relation to outdoor sports facilities.



Crescent House, 19 The Crescent, Bedford, MK40 2QP

www.sportengland.org

Chair: Lord Carter of Coles Chief Executive: Stephen Baddeley (Interim) Regional Sports Board Chair: Mr Stephen Castle Regional Director: Chris Perks

In terms of how such provision should be made, a financial contribution towards the provision or improvement of local facilities in lieu of direct provision would be acceptable. Sport England is willing to provide advice on the appropriate level of such a contribution. Alternatively, securing the community use of Friend's School sports hall would in principle be an acceptable alternative on this occasion for the same reasons as set out above in relation to outdoor sports facilities. Again, the acceptability of this approach would be dependent on an appropriate community use agreement being completed and the extent that community use would be increased above current levels.

In conclusion, as there are no clear proposals at present for addressing the additional community sports facility needs generated by the residential development, Sport England would object to this aspect of the planning application as a non-statutory consultee. However, if it can be satisfactorily demonstrated that there is not a need to make such provision or if provision is made as set out above I would be willing to consider withdrawing this objection. I would be happy to discuss this objection with the applicant and/or the District Council, with a view to reaching a mutually agreeable solution.

I hope these comments can be given full consideration when a decision is made. Please contact me if you would like to discuss my comments further. I would be grateful if you could advise me of the decision, when available, by e-mailing or sending me the decision notice.

Yours faithfully



Roy Warren
Senior Planning Manager

cc Christopher Knight, Savills

RW/cer

