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Dear Sir or Madam,
Please find attached representations submitted on behalf of Southend United Football Club.
I would be grateful if you could confirm receipt.
Please let me know if you also require a hard copy.
Kind regards,
Catherine
Catherine Mason BA (Hons) MA MRTPI
Principal Planner
Savills Plc
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## Representation Form

## Development Management Proposed Submission

This form has two parts -
Part A - Personal Details
Part B - Your representation(s)

Please fill in a separate sheet for each representation you wish to make.

## Part A

Personal Details - if an agent is appointed, please only complete Title, Name \& Organisation boxes below but complete the full contact details of the agent.

| Title | MS |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| First Name | MARY |  |
| Surname | POWER |  |
| Job Title* | DIRECTOR |  |
| Organisation* SOUTHEND UNITED FOOTBALL CLUB | SAVILLS PLC |  |
| Address line I | 20 GROSVENOR HILL |  |
| Address line 2 |  | LONDON |

Address line 3

Address line 4

Postcode

Telephone No

Email Address*

Agent Details (if applicable)

POWER

DIRECTOR

SAVILLS PLC

20 GROSVENOR HILL

LONDON

W1K 3HQ

MPOWER@SAVILLS.COM

## Part B - Please use a separate sheet for each representation

In order to ensure that the scope and content of your representations on the Development Management DPD Proposed Submission version is focused on issues of soundness and legal compliance, you are requested to make your representation on this official form that has been specifically designed to assist you in making your representation or alternatively an interactive version of the Development Management DPD Proposed Submission is available on the Council's consultation website www.southend.gov.uk/ldf.

The Planning Inspectorate has issued guidance 'Local Development Frameworks - A Brief Guide to Examining Development Plan Documents (September 2010) http://www.planningportal.gov.uk/uploads/pins/dpd_procedure_guide.pdf.

Name or Organisation SOUTHEND UNITED FOOTBALL CLUB
1.To which part of the DPD does this representation relate?

Paragraph
Policy
Proposals Map
2. Do you consider the DPD is
2.I Legally compliant

Yes
No
2.2 Sound**

Yes
No
**The considerations in relation to the DPD being 'Sound' are explained in Planning Policy Statement I2 in paragraphs $4.36-4.47,4.5 \mathrm{I}$ and 5.52 and the boxed text. If you have entered No to 2.(2), please continue to Q3. In all other circumstances, please go to Q4.
3. Do you consider the DPD is unsound because it is not:
3.1 Justified
3.2 Effective
3.3 Consistent with national policy
4. Please give details of why you consider the DPD is not legally compliant or is unsound. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of the DPD, please also use this box to set out your comments.

[^0]5. Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the DPD legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified at 3 above where this relates to soundness. You will need to say why this change will make the DPD legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

```
THE PROPOSALS MAP MUST BE UPDATED TO SHOW FOSSETTS FARM AS A PRIORITY URBAN AREA
TO REFLECT ITS DESIGNATION IN THE ADOPTED CORE STRATEGY. THE DESIGNATIONS
CURRENTLY SHOWN ON THE EMERGING PROPOSALS MAP MUST BE DELETED. THIS WILL ENSURE
THAT THE PROPOSALS MAP IS JUSTIFIED AND EFFECTIVE IN ACCORDANCE WITH PPS12.
```

Please note your representation should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to support/justify the representation and the suggested change, as there will not normally be a subsequent opportunity to make further representations based on the original representation at publication stage.

After this stage, further submissions will be only at the request of the Inspector, based on the matters and issues he/she identifies for examination.
6. If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the examination?

No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination.

Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination
7. If you wish to participate at the oral part of the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary:

```
SOUTHEND UNITED FOOTBALL CLUB'S REPRESENTATIONS RAISE ISSUES OF SIGNIFICANT
IMPORTANCE THAT QUESTION THE SOUNDNESS OF THE DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT PLAN.
WE THEREFORE REQUEST PARTICIPATION IN THE ORAL EXAMINATION TO ENSURE OUR CASE
CAN BE FULLY MADE AND SUBJECT TO QUESTIONS BY THE INSPECTOR AS APPROPRIATE.
```

continue on a separate sheet if necessary
Please note the Inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the oral part of the examination
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Representations on behalf of Southend United Football Club<br>$27^{\text {th }}$ April 2011

## Proposals Map

The emerging Proposals Map shows land at Fossetts Farm with a combination of the following designations: protected green space, Green Belt and agricultural land.

This does not correspond with the current position and is inconsistent with the designations of the site in the adopted Core Strategy (2007). The Core Strategy Key Diagram identifies the site as a Priority Urban Area.

The Core Strategy Examination in Public Inspector's report states (paragraph 5.28):
'Another PC would add after point 4 of the policy that the relocation of Southend United Football Club's stadium to Fossetts Farm area is supported in principle. I endorse this given the long acceptance of this principle and that the FC itself has an important part in the town's identity and future '.

Furthermore the Proposals Map does not even take into account the changes brought into effect by the Second Alteration (1999) which designated most of the site as safeguarded land outside of the Green Belt (except for an 'anomalous' piece of land addressed in the Inspectors Report referred to below).

Planning Permission (SOS/06/01300/FUL) was granted by the Secretary of State on 30th June 2008 for a mixed use scheme on the site comprising of a Stadium, hotel, retail floorspace, residential units and associated development. The Inspector's report on the application, dated 31 December 2007, addresses the Green Belt issues on the site (paragraphs 10.19 - 10.31). The Inspector concluded (paragraph 10.24) that:
the indication in the key Diagram is sufficient to show that none of the land south and west of the Fossetts Farm PUA carries a Green Belt notation'.

We assume that these are drafting errors, but it is critical that this is amended immediately to avoid any unintended future ambiguities. The current designations are unjustified and will cause the Council's policies to be ineffective and contrary to national policies in PPS12 and contrary to the adopted Core Strategy, which has been found sound.


[^0]:    PLEASE SEE ATTACHED SHEET

