

<b>Application Ref:</b>	15/01086/R4FUL
<b>Proposal:</b>	Creation of a new external sports pitch (3G Artificial Grass Pitch) with perimeter ball-stop fencing, floodlights (artificial lighting), access and outdoor storage for maintenance equipment and onsite vehicular parking  Refurbishment and extension of pavilion to form new changing rooms accommodation with administration facilities.
<b>Site:</b>	Sports Ground, Fulbridge Road, Peterborough,
<b>Applicant:</b>	Mr Stephen Munday, The Voyager Academy
<b>Agent:</b>	Mr Tom Betts, Surfacing Standards Ltd
<b>Referred by:</b>	Werrington Neighbourhood Council and Councillor Fower
<b>Reason:</b>	Unacceptable impact upon the amenities of neighbouring occupants; traffic concerns; impact upon wildlife
<b>Site visit:</b>	21.09.2015
<b>Case officer:</b>	Miss Louise Lovegrove
<b>Telephone No.</b>	01733 454439
<b>E-Mail:</b>	louise.lovegrove@peterborough.gov.uk
<b>Recommendation:</b>	<b>GRANT</b> subject to relevant conditions

## 1 Description of the site and surroundings and Summary of the proposal

### Site and Surroundings

The application site comprises a grass playing field which is a satellite site associated with The Voyager Academy school. The total site area extends to approximately 1.9 hectares and is located to the rear of residential properties along Fulbridge Road (to the east), Brookside (to the south) and Storrington Way (to the west). To the north of the site is a large area of overgrown scrub land and the residential cul-de sac of Walnut Close.

Vehicular access to the site is granted via a junction onto Brookside albeit this has no formalised markings. There is no formal car parking provision at present, albeit there is a hard surfaced turning head to the south-eastern corner.

The site includes a run down and almost derelict single storey pavilion building situated to the north-eastern corner of the site.

### Proposal

The application seeks planning permission for the following:

- Construction of an all-weather third generation pitch (AWP) with associated floodlighting (columns to a maximum height of 15 metres) and fencing;
- Renovation and extension of the existing pavilion;
- Construction of a hardsurfaced car parking and turning area with 32 parking bays and 2 mini-bus parking bays;
- Earthworks to create noise attenuation bunds along the southern, western and eastern boundaries of the site;
- Construction of hardsurfacing to the northern boundary of the site to provide pedestrian access to the AWP; and
- Off-site highway works to formalise the vehicular access onto Brookside.

The scheme has been amended from that which was originally submitted in order to address the comments raised by the City Council's Wildlife Officer, Drainage Engineer and the Local Highway Authority. This has resulted in the relocation of the sports pitch slightly to the south, amendment to the lighting layout, amendment to the internal car parking layout, off-site highway works and provision of a French drain along the southern and western boundaries.

## **2 Planning History**

<b>Reference</b>	<b>Proposal</b>	<b>Decision</b>	<b>Date</b>
14/01026/R4FUL	Siting of a Portacabin (Retrospective)	Withdrawn	26/11/2014

## **3 Planning Policy**

Decisions must be taken in accordance with the development plan policies below, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

### **National Planning Policy Framework (2012)**

#### **Section 8 - Social, Cultural and Recreational Facilities**

Developments should plan for the provision and use of shared space, community services and other local services; guard against the unnecessary loss of valued services/facilities; allow established shops, facilities and services to develop/modernise; and ensure an integrated approach to the location of housing, economic uses and communities facilities and services.

#### **Section 8 - Open Space**

Existing open space, sports and recreational buildings/land (including playing fields) should not be built on unless an assessment has been undertaken which clearly shows the open space is surplus to requirements; the open space would be replaced by an equivalent or better provision; or the development is for alternative sports and recreation provision, the needs for which clearly outweigh the loss.

#### **Section 11 - Biodiversity**

Development resulting in significant harm to biodiversity or in the loss of/deterioration of irreplaceable habitats should be refused if the impact cannot be adequately mitigated, or compensated. Proposals to conserve or enhance biodiversity should be permitted and opportunities to incorporate biodiversity into new development encouraged.

Development within or outside a Site of Special Scientific Interest or other specified sites should not normally be permitted where an adverse effect on the site's notified special interest features is likely. An exception should only be made where the benefits clearly outweigh the impacts.

The presumption in favour of sustainable development does not apply where development requiring Appropriate Assessment under the Birds or Habitats Directives is being considered or determined.

#### **Section 11 - Noise**

New development giving rise to unacceptable adverse noise impacts should be resisted; development should mitigate and reduce to a minimum other adverse impacts on health and quality of life arising. Development often creates some noise and existing businesses wanting to expand should not be unreasonably restricted because of changes in nearby land uses.

#### **Section 11 - Light Pollution**

Lighting should be designed to limit pollution on local amenity, intrinsically dark landscapes and areas of nature conservation.

#### **Section 12 - Conservation of Heritage Assets**

Account should be taken of the desirability of sustaining/enhancing heritage assets; the positive contribution that they can make to sustainable communities including economic viability; and the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness. When considering the impact of a new development great weight should be given to the asset's conservation.

Planning permission should be refused for development which would lead to substantial harm to or total loss of significance unless this is necessary to achieve public benefits that outweigh the harm/loss. In such cases all reasonable steps should be taken to ensure the new development will proceed after the harm/ loss has occurred.

### **Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011)**

#### **CS14 - Transport**

Promotes a reduction in the need to travel, sustainable transport, the Council's UK Environment Capital aspirations and development which would improve the quality of environments for residents.

#### **CS16 - Urban Design and the Public Realm**

Design should be of high quality, appropriate to the site and area, improve the public realm, address vulnerability to crime, be accessible to all users and not result in any unacceptable impact upon the amenities of neighbouring residents.

#### **CS17 - The Historic Environment**

Development should protect, conserve and enhance the historic environment including non-scheduled nationally important features and buildings of local importance.

#### **CS18 - Culture, Leisure and Tourism**

Development of new cultural, leisure and tourism facilities will be encouraged particularly in the city centre.

#### **CS21 - Biodiversity and Geological Conservation**

Development should conserve and enhance biodiversity/ geological interests unless no alternative sites are available and there are demonstrable reasons for the development.

#### **CS22 - Flood Risk**

Development in Flood Zones 2 and 3 will only be permitted if specific criteria are met. Sustainable drainage systems should be used where appropriate.

### **Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012)**

#### **PP02 - Design Quality**

Permission will only be granted for development which makes a positive contribution to the built and natural environment; does not have a detrimental effect on the character of the area; is sufficiently robust to withstand/adapt to climate change; and is designed for longevity.

#### **PP03 - Impacts of New Development**

Permission will not be granted for development which would result in an unacceptable loss of privacy, public and/or private green space or natural daylight; be overbearing or cause noise or other disturbance, odour or other pollution; fail to minimise opportunities for crime and disorder.

#### **PP12 - The Transport Implications of Development**

Permission will only be granted if appropriate provision has been made for safe access by all user groups and there would not be any unacceptable impact on the transportation network including highway safety.

#### **PP13 - Parking Standards**

Permission will only be granted if appropriate parking provision for all modes of transport is made in accordance with standards.

#### **PP16 - The Landscaping and Biodiversity Implications of Development**

Permission will only be granted for development which makes provision for the retention of trees and natural features which contribute significantly to the local landscape or biodiversity.

#### **PP17 - Heritage Assets**

Development which would affect a heritage asset will be required to preserve and enhance the significance of the asset or its setting. Development which would have detrimental impact will be refused unless there are overriding public benefits.

### **4 Consultations/Representations**

#### **Werrington Neighbourhood Council (18.08.15)**

Objection on the following grounds:

- The proposals are completely unsuitable for this location. It is too close to residential properties which will suffer an unacceptable loss of amenity from noise, light and intrusion.
- We do not appear to have the highway comments but if the use is to be continuous and significant it does seem to create real problems around the access road and the junction with Fulbridge Road.
- The use of the site for school football is accepted but this is of a completely different order with late evening use.
- There are better places for this type of facility where the investment can be fully utilised without serious implications for residents.
- Hours of use would seem to be a crunch point but even if the use was restricted to a more reasonable hour, the fencing and increased intensity of use would make it a very bad neighbour. In this quiet environment the continual shouting associated with competitive football will have significant impact on the enjoyment and amenity of the significant number of surrounding properties especially at weekends.

#### **PCC Tree Officer (13.08.15)**

No objections - The trees/shrubs surrounding the site should not be impacted by the creation of the bunds.

#### **Environment Agency (24.09.15)**

No objections - The environmental risk is considered relatively low.

#### **PCC Pollution Team (14.09.15)**

No objections - In over 25 years experience, no noise nuisance complaints have been encountered in relation to football matches. In addition, there are examples at Ginton and Northborough of such facilities in close proximity to residential properties. A condition should be imposed relating to compliance of the floodlighting with the Institute of Lighting Engineers guidance for the reduction of obtrusive light. Consideration should also be given to imposing suitable hours of use.

#### **PCC Wildlife Officer (18.09.15)**

No objections - The revisions to the proposal will ensure dark corridors are maintained for bat populations. Request conditions relating to lower lighting levels during bat activity months and protection of trenches to ensure mammals do not become trapped.

#### **Archaeological Officer (21.09.15)**

No objections - The evaluation that has taken place is sufficient and no further work is deemed necessary.

#### **Police Architectural Liaison Officer (23.09.15)**

No objections - The use of bollard lighting columns to the car park is not sufficient as not enough lighting is provided when cars are parked close to them. The security of the pavilion is also of vital

importance as this is likely to be of high interest to miscreants.

**PCC Transport & Engineering Services (23.09.15)**

No objections - The existing D2 use of the site shall not change and the proposal would solely upgrade the existing sports pitch to a MUGA. The existing access to the site is of an adequate width however formalisation through 'give-way' markings and vehicle-to-vehicle visibility splays should be provided. There is adequate on-site parking and turning for all vehicles.

**Lead Local Drainage Authority (17.09.15)**

No objections - Whilst the submitted drawings show a French drain being provided along the southern and western boundaries, details of this are still required along with flow rates and acceptance from Anglian Water for the discharge.

**Sport England (12.08.15)**

No objections - The proposal meets with the Exception Policy as it would involve the upgrading of a sports facility. Request a condition limiting the hours of use to 8am-10pm Monday to Friday and 8am-8pm Saturday/Sunday/Bank Holiday.

**Local Residents/Interested Parties**

Please note that the number of representations detailed below are correct as of 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2015. There is a revised period of consultation underway which will not expire until 2<sup>nd</sup> October 2015. Any additional representations received in the intervening period will be presented within the Briefing Update Report.

Initial consultations: 40

Total number of responses: 184

Total number of objections: 33

Total number in support: 144

33 objections have been received from immediately surrounding local residents (except 1 which came from elsewhere in the City). Their objections are on the following grounds:

**Neighbour amenity - noise**

- The development proposal is not compatible with the quiet residential development of Brookside where I have lived and enjoyed living for the past 22 years (No.15 Brookside).
- Residents should be able to sit in their houses and gardens in peace and quiet for at least some of the time. Noise pollution will affect resident's enjoyment of their homes. This already occurs from time to time at weekends when teams are playing and there is shouting from noisy players and spectators. The situation will be far worse with heavy evening and weekend usage.
- There will inevitably be a level of bad language that we will be forced to put up with.
- This is a quiet retired area (Storrington Way) and elderly people can do without the disturbance that this would impose on us.
- At present the site is not well used and the proposal will increase noise and general disturbance, particularly from cars. The proposed car park will be directly behind my house (Fulbridge Road).
- Although the application states that action will be taken to limit noise levels on the field, I believe (No.9 Brookside) that the noise of people coming on/off the field and traffic entering/leaving the area will be unacceptable, particularly in the evening.
- The bunds along the western and southern boundaries are not continuous and therefore will not act as a measure to mitigate noise but instead amplify it.
- The predicted noise levels within the Environmental Noise Report are predicted from modelling exercise and may, in practice, not truly reflect the impact on residents or be accurate. They do not take into account weather conditions which can amplify sounds, alter its direction or take into account any acoustic 'skip over' of the bunds which will affect first floor windows.
- The sports sessions are proposed to end at 22:00 hours however the noise will continue with users of the changing rooms, as well as slamming car doors, voices and vehicles leaving the

site.

- The predicted noise levels are optimistic and pay insufficient attention to multiple noise generating events, peak noise, duration, the effects on first floor windows and inadequacies of the acoustic mitigation features. The impact will be unacceptable.

### **Neighbour amenity – light spillage**

- The light pollution will affect residents of Brookside and detract from the enjoyment of their houses and gardens. It is difficult to assess how bad this will be, but on autumn and winter nights there is likely to be a serious effect with the sports ground lit up like a football stadium.
- The lights would be a significant problem both in height and intensity, as well as the duration of the time that it would be on for.
- The floodlights will disturb by sleeping at night.
- The assessment of the existing site as falling within Environmental Zone E2 is a fair appraisal. The use of floodlighting as well as ancillary lighting to the car park/accommodation areas will drastically alter this.
- It is a concern that overspill lighting contours are at ground level (height of 1.75 metres) and that above this the light will be increasingly intrusive.
- There are also possibilities of cloud glare and light refraction from low cloud. This will funnel the light overspill.

### **Neighbour amenity – loss of privacy/overbearing/overshadowing**

- My garden (No.73 Storrington Way) is private at the moment but people standing on the bund will be able to see in.
- The bunds and acoustic fencing will be too close to residential boundaries and will be ugly. They will also overbear and overshadow private gardens.

### **Neighbour amenity – general**

- I have had a robbery in the past (No.73 Storrington Way) where my fence was cut through to gain entry. With the proposed bund, people will be able to cut their way onto my property whilst hidden from view.
- We presently have nice views out over a field, this will be ruined by the lighting columns and fencing.
- This will affect the whole local community, not just the few neighbouring residents and the Applicant suggests.
- As a resident of the Sugar Way development (No.16 Candy Street) I have to deal with similar adverse effects from the Riverside Pavilion, which has significantly more parking spaces and is situated further from houses. Access to my driveway can be difficult at peak times for the pavilion's activities and surrounding streets can be completely blocked because of cars entering/exiting the site. Noise is an issue and the public cycle path into the City Centre is also affected by the increased traffic, with conflict between pedestrians, cyclists and drivers a regular occurrence.
- The footing of the football pitch is too close to my fence (No.25 Brookside).
- The potential for throwing litter and missiles into gardens will be enhanced as the bunding will provide cover from normal sight lines.
- Our fence (No.427 Fulbridge Road) runs the entire length of Brookside and we are responsible for maintenance/repair when it gets damaged.
- Groups of youths will loiter at the corner entrance of the site causing noise and keeping children awake. The incidents of balls being kicked against the fence will increase and when we (No.427 Fulbridge Road) ask them to stop, we get foul language back. Litter will also increase.

### **Hours of use**

- The current proposal envisages usage from 08:00 to 22:00 hours seven days a week and including Bank Holidays which is totally unacceptable. Whilst I don't like these, during the week I have tried to adopt a pragmatic view. However at weekends, sports fields would generally be used on a more limited basis, say 09:00 to 17:00 hours on a Saturday and on a

Sunday 09:30/10:00 to 14:00 hours. There should be no usage at all on Bank Holidays. If such usage is required, an alternative venue needs to be found.

- Reassurance is required about the use and opening times of the building.

### **Parking provision and traffic**

- There is inadequate parking within the proposed development which is likely to give rise to overspill parking along Brookside. We have already experienced problems at weekends with cars parked along the grass verges and pavements along Brookside. The proposal will only make this matter worse.
- The suggestion that players will be dropped off and picked up later is laughable and has not been thought through properly.
- There should be a total restriction to prevent burger vans, fish and chip vans or ice cream vans from accessing the site.
- The junction into the site is dangerous and will cause an accident with lots more traffic.
- The extra traffic will be at peak times which will cause delays.
- Previous planning applications for housing have stumbled over using Brookside as an access route – it being deemed unsuitable for the volume of traffic. I would expect traffic to peak at far higher volumes than residential uses.
- Access and egress from Brookside are affected by the narrow nature of the entrance road, the bottle neck, the tight and narrow bend and the difficult (and busy) junction with Fulbridge Road and Gunthorpe Road.
- The proposed parking area is insufficient and unrealistically small given the proposed use of the development.
- Brookside was deliberately designed to be narrow and hard to park on because the houses have their own driveways. It is not a street to park along and there will be incidents of driveways being blocked and perhaps the whole street being blocked entirely.
- Large vehicles, such as minibuses and coaches, could reasonably be expected as part of the entourage accompanying a football game. The street cannot cope with such vehicles as coaches cannot physically fit. Parcel delivery vans and home removal vans have been known to block the street in the past.
- Visitors will use the end of Brookside to turn and this will result in issues of privacy as well as noise and blockages.
- The pedestrian access from Brookside, across Werrington Brook, to the Arundel Road estate and beyond is busy and used by many vulnerable demographics (children, families and the elderly) as a shortcut to Fulbridge Road and Gunthorpe Road. A considerable increase in traffic will significantly increase the risk to these groups when they are trying to cross Brookside itself.
- The predicted traffic generation figures accompanying the application are flawed and based on statistical assumptions that do not take into account human nature and its propensity not to do what is expected.
- The bend and vehicle choke point into Brookside makes it difficult for two vehicles to pass and visibility is reduced.
- Visibility onto Fulbridge Road is often impeded by parked cars. Safety will be compromised as vehicles take changes to turn onto the road which frequently suffers from speeding motorists.
- Peak hours for the facility – 6pm to 10pm – will also conflict with increased vehicle usage by Brookside residents and their visitors. This will inevitably cause issues as vehicles accessing/leaving the facility will meet with residential traffic. There is a financial imperative in the response from Sport England for these times to be used by the bigger spending adult teams. Without this aspect, Sport England suggests that the project may not be financially viable.
- The car parking is not sufficient for the number of users and spectators. Also, there will be users waiting to play until the pitch is free, therefore doubling the amount of car parking required.
- There will be no enforcement of parking and so visitors and players alike can park where they like, most likely along Brookside as overflow.
- The proposed development does not meet with the ten key objectives of the Peterborough

Local Transport Plan.

### **Flooding and surface water run-off**

- The proposed bunding would not stop the surface water entering onto my property (No.75 Storrington Way) and may even make it worse.
- The break in the banking at the bottom of our garden (No.77 Storrington Way) will collect all the surface water run off which will flow into the garden.
- Concerned that the southern bund will negate the effectiveness of the French drain.
- The City Council's Drainage Team report is incorrect as the surface water floods not only into Brookside but also to properties adjacent to the western boundary – Storrington Way.

### **Ecology and wildlife**

- There will be environmental impact from this major development, particularly caused by the loss of natural habitat caused by the artificial surface.
- The extra tall ball stop fencing will act as a physical barrier to the wildlife that currently use the field and surrounding areas.
- The site provides an oasis for wildlife in a residential area, attracting a wide variety of species. The loss of habitat through the proposed development will inevitably reduce the wildlife potential.

### **Visual impact**

- The 4.5 metre ball stop fence will be an eyesore, especially after it has caught a few months of litter.
- The proposed commercial redevelopment and use of the field will be totally out of scale with what it was designed for and out of character with the current neighbourhood.
- The whole development has an overbearing appearance of being shoehorned into a totally inadequate location both in terms of size and location. The design will be visually obtrusive with overbearing high fences and ugly acoustic bunding.

### **Consultation on the application**

- The consultation on the application was a token gesture, with only those properties on the northern side of Brookside written to.
- We feel we should have been informed about this development (No.14 Brookside).
- The neighbour notification letter telling residents about the application was misleading as it failed to include the intended hours of use. This is a critical point and should have been highlighted, especially for local elderly residents or families with young children.
- Residents on the northern side of Fulbridge Road did not receive notification letters.

### **Other matters**

- Has any consideration been given to how emergency vehicles will access Brookside if cars are parked all the way along?
- The supporting material states that the pavilion will provide refreshments to the wider community. What is being envisaged here is clearly some kind of commercial operation.
- Concern regarding loss of property values.
- The pitch is traversed by a large capacity cast iron water main. This has been subject to several leaks causing flooding to houses in Brookside. Are the developers proposing to engage with Anglian Water to mitigate the possibility of this happening as a result of the development?
- Voyager Academy and Ken Stimpson Community School both have facilities that could accommodate this type of development without such negative impact on nearby residents.
- I live in close proximity to the proposed development (No.21 Brookside) and my property backs onto the proposed development. I seek to offer the following suggestions for alternative locations which would be far less obtrusive and better placed for the proposed intensity of use:
  - The frontage of Voyager Academy itself which would also be able to integrate with the existing facilities. There is a larger area to accommodate vehicles and coaches, with much better and controlled access to the site. Residential properties are at a greater



distance and would therefore be less affected.

- Open spaces around the Werrington Centre.
- The role that Sport England is taking with this proposal is less than transparent. The supporting planning application documents identify them as being a member of the partnership to redevelop the sports field and are a major funder. Their comments on the planning application are clearly demonstrating a conflict of interest.
- The role of Peterborough City Council in the application is unacceptable. The supporting planning application documents identify that PCC are expected, but not confirmed, to provide funding to the scheme. In addition, there is correspondence that states that PCC can be helpful should the application be refused. I trust that the consideration of the planning application is undertaken in a fair and transparent manner.

In addition, **Councillor Fower** has also objected on the following grounds:

1. Impact on adjacent properties, specifically relating to light infiltration, noise, increase in traffic and parking overflow.
2. The impact on wildlife and the direct environment.
3. The failure to provide realistic alternative venues, thus projecting an image that this is the only option.
4. Operating hours will not be conducive to the neighbourhood.

144 letters of support (including a petition of 5 signatories) have been received from across the City area, with only 1 from the immediately surrounding residents. The support is based upon the following grounds:

- Excellent opportunity to provide facilities on disused land that will promote healthy living, fitness and sport for young people.
- Young boys deserve the opportunity to play football.
- Glinton and Northborough is an excellent football club, with a superb reputation and several FA awards, but they do not have a home. This excellent facility will enable over 400 players to have a modern facility that will enable them to be constructively engaged – surely a benefit to them and to society as a whole.
- It would be the ideal home to an organised, community-focused football club.
- Will give sport to the local area.
- As the field to the rear of Brookside has always been a playing field, I cannot see why anyone could object to the renovation of a recreational area. To move next to an amenity such as this, and then complain when it is better utilised, seems hypocritical at the very least.
- There are as many residents in favour of this development as there are objectors.
- As long as the scheme is well-planned and thought through with residents in mind, which it seems to be, it will turn an unused eyesore into a facility for the whole community to use.
- It will provide much needed leisure facilities to all ages of the community – from children to adults.
- Will provide security for residents by rejuvenating an area previously targeted by delinquents.
- It will enhance sports at Voyager school.
- It would undoubtedly bring additional income to surrounding businesses.
- The land is being wasted at the moment and anything that improves the lives of youths can only be positive.
- Would be of huge benefit to young people wanting to play football and get off the streets.
- Our coaches teach us not only football but how to behave and respect others. The site will be great to set up as a home ground as normally only big clubs get the best places.
- It would be a shame if all the community work the organisers and supporters do was not assisted with the approval of this application.
- A community managed facility for the community is always a good idea.
- It is a necessity to keep facilities like these updated as we know the benefits regular exercise and team games have on children's (and consequently adults) wellbeing and health.
- It would be great to now see my son use a local weatherproof pitch and see future generations benefit from up to date facilities which are lacking for the North of Peterborough.
- This application should be considered because it creates lots of opportunities for young and

- old to create a happy social community.
- This is a great opportunity to encourage participation in sports in Peterborough, a city that prides itself on being environmentally advanced and indeed healthy living should be promoted too.
- Standards of performance will improve.
- This will benefit many families in the surrounding villages.
- Having a home would create the sense of belonging that all sports participants desire and with it, the ownership to ensure this facility is looked after and used to its full potential.
- Without more of these facilities many children will drop out of sport. It's worked for Netherton FC so why not here.
- This will provide an outlet for youngsters energy rather than them being left to wander aimlessly and get into trouble.
- Local Council support is vital to the aspirations of parishioners and people of all ages.
- There will be concern from local residents about the intensification of use however it appears that the Management Group have considered the immediate impact and have put in place procedures for continuing consultation and dialogue with the local community to resolve any issues.
- In the winter we have problems sourcing these kind of facilities and this can cause our children to miss training sessions which impacts on their health and wellbeing.
- Added security will increase property prices.

In addition, **Councillor Sharp** has also supported the proposal as follows:

I believe this meets the Council's policy on growth of sport within Peterborough. This would be the first step towards making sure that football is developed further in Peterborough, and therefore I am in full support of this planning application going ahead.

## **5 Assessment of the planning issues**

The main considerations are:

- Principle of development
- Design and impact upon the character and appearance of the surrounding area
- Neighbour amenity
- Parking, access and highway implications
- Ecology
- Surface water drainage
- Archaeology
- Trees and landscape implications

### **a) Principle of development**

As detailed in Section 1 above, the application site is presently a grass playing field with redundant pavilion and informal grass parking. The proposal seeks to construct an all-weather floodlit pitch with associated improvements to the pavilion and car parking to enable use of the facility throughout the year and evenings. It is intended that the resultant facility would not only be used by The Voyager Academy, but also by community groups with input from the Peterborough District Football League. Both Policy CS18 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and paragraph 70 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) (NPPF) seek to not only protect but also enhance existing leisure facilities in order to meet the demand for improving the range and quality of the City and surrounding areas.

The proposal would clearly meet with this aim and would provide much needed improved sports facilities to the north of the Peterborough District. The Peterborough Open Space Study update 2011 identifies that within Werrington South, there is a shortfall of 1 hectare of outdoor sports facilities and within the northern area as a whole (covering Paston, Walton and Werrington) there is a shortage of 5.1 hectares. Whilst this document is now 4 years old, the position has not altered and, whilst the proposal would not provide new space, it would provide an enhanced facility which would enable sport to be played throughout the year instead of

during periods of good weather and daylight only.

In addition to the above, Sport England (who are a statutory consultee for all developments on designated open space/playing fields) have raised no objections to the proposal as it accords with their exceptions policy in relation to development on playing fields. They have deemed that the proposed development, which is for an outdoor sports facility, is of sufficient benefit to sport to outweigh the detriment caused by the loss of the playing field.

On the basis of the above, it is considered that the proposal would give rise to a considerable benefit to the wider community through the provision of an enhanced playing facility. Furthermore, the pitch would enable usage throughout the year whereas at present the grass playing fields can only be used during periods of good weather and daylight. Accordingly, the proposal is in accordance with paragraphs 70 and 74 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) and Policy CS18 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011).

**b) Design and impact upon the character and appearance of the surrounding area**

The proposal would introduce new structures onto the site which will dramatically alter its overall appearance. Of particular impact will be the 15 metre high floodlighting columns and fencing which would extend to a maximum height of 4.5 metres (along the eastern and western boundaries of the pitch). It is accepted that the height of the columns would result in features which are prominent within the site itself, given that at present it is a large flat expanse. However, the lighting columns are proposed to be of relatively slim profile and the luminaires would also be of limited size. When the lights are in use in the evenings, they will appear more prominent structures by virtue of the sky glow that results (this is set out in more detail below), particularly given that the site at present is intrinsically dark. However, subject to appropriate restrictions on the times that these lights can operate, it is not considered that the impact would be significantly harmful. Accordingly, it is considered that they would not appear unduly prominent or obtrusive features within the locality.

With regards to the fencing, it is acknowledged that 4.5 metres in height is far in exceedance of the existing residential fencing structure which surround the site. However this fencing would be of weldmesh design, which permits light and views in/out and reduces the impact of the fencing. Furthermore, the overall extent of such fencing is similar to several other sites within the Peterborough district and is not an unusual feature for playing field sites.

Turning next to the renovated and extended pavilion building, it is proposed for this to be altered from its present flat roof form, to a standard dual pitched design. The resultant extended building would still be of limited size given the overall site area and of limited height, extending to a maximum of 4.6 metres to the ridge. Subject to the use of appropriate materials, it is not considered that this feature would appear unduly dominant or obtrusive within the context of the site.

The proposal also includes the creation of significant earth bunds as part of the noise mitigation measures (detailed in Section c below). These bunds would vary in height from 2 metres along the eastern boundary, to 2.2 metres along the southern boundary and 2.8 metres along the western boundary. Given that these would extend almost the entire lengths of these boundaries, they represent significant earthworks within the locality. However, their heights are not considered to be excessive and would not appear incongruous within the site or its surroundings.

Finally, with regards to the proposed car park, it is considered that this has been sensitively designed so that a natural grass buffer is retained along the outer boundaries of the site. The hardstanding areas have been kept to a minimum and would represent only a small amount of the total site area. Accordingly, they would not appear out of keeping with the character of the site or its locality.

On the basis of the above, it is considered that the proposal would not result in any

unacceptable impact upon the character, appearance or visual amenity of the surrounding area and as such, the proposal is in accordance with Policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policy PP2 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012).

### **c) Neighbour amenity**

#### ***Noise impact***

At present, sport is played on the grass pitch during summer months until the light fails and in the winter during daylight hours and when the weather conditions permit. Furthermore, there is no formalised or restricted position associated with the existing pitch and as such, games/activities can take place in close proximity to the site boundaries with residential properties. It must therefore be noted that a certain level of impact already results to neighbouring residents through noise and general disturbance.

However, the application proposal would allow sport to be played throughout the year and would introduce certain features (such as fencing) that would generate additional noise impacts. Furthermore, the Applicant has requested that the usage of the site be permitted up to 22:00 hours throughout the week. It is therefore accepted that the proposal would represent an intensification in the usage of the site and that the noise and disturbance impacts felt by surrounding residents would be extended.

The application has been accompanied by a Noise Assessment however, the City Council's Pollution Control Officer has advised that there is no specific guidance on assessing noise from sporting facilities and that attempting to use objective values for such a situation is not entirely satisfactory (as there is no robust evidence base for judgements to be made). Such noise assessment therefore can only reasonably consider noise which is generated continuously, and cannot factor incidental noise which is of particular relevance to sports pitches i.e. shouting, whistles blowing and balls hitting fencing.

The nearest residential properties to the proposed pitch are No.73 Storrington Way (37.2 metres), No.33 Brookside (48.7 metres) and Nos.433-443 Fulbridge Road (81.8 metres). It is acknowledged that this represents a close relationship, however the Pollution Control Officer has given examples of similar pitches in Glinton and Northborough whereby the relationship is far closer - 30 metres and 20 metres respectively. The Officer has also advised that, during their professional lifetime, no noise nuisance complaints have ever been received in relation to football matches.

Notwithstanding this, the application scheme includes a number of mitigation measures. It is proposed for the following acoustic fencing to be erected:

- 2 metres high along the eastern boundary of the site to Nos.429-437 Fulbridge Road
- 3 metres high along the southern boundary of the site, set in 3 metres from the shared boundary with Nos.30 and 33 Brookside; and
- 3 metres high along the northern boundary of the site, set in 6 metres from the shared boundary with No.1 Walnut Grove.

In addition, the proposal also includes the creation of earth bunds along the southern, eastern and western boundaries of the site.

These measures are noted and the Pollution Control Officer has advised that they will be effective in reducing noise impacts to surrounding residential properties. However, it is not considered that the use of the pitch to 22:00 hours, as proposed, is acceptable. At other sites within the City where such development proposals have been accepted, a condition has been imposed which restricts the usage of the pitch to 21:30 hours, with the associated floodlights turned off at 22:00 hours (to ensure sufficient light to enable users to safely exit the premises). The proposed use of the site from 08:00 is considered acceptable. These times correlate with daylight hours during summer months and are considered to be those which would not reasonably harm the amenities of neighbouring occupants. Such hours would be applicable only during weekdays (Monday to Friday).

At weekends and on Public/Bank Holidays, it is considered that further reduced hours of use should be applied as these are the times at which residents would reasonably be wishing to enjoy their properties the most. As such, it is proposed that on these days, the usage be restricted to only 08:00 hours to 19:30 hours, with the lights being turned off at 20:00 hours.

Whilst it is accepted that there will be some neighbouring properties which consider this timing to be unacceptable, owing to young children going to bed earlier, shift work etc., the grass playing field can already be used to this time during the summer and therefore the impact already occurs. Accordingly, it is considered reasonable.

### ***Light spillage and intrusion***

It is proposed that the lighting columns, at a height of 15 metres, will each have 2 luminaires set to the horizontal in order to prevent outward light spillage to the surrounding area and sky glow. Whilst it is acknowledged that the lights will be powerful (200 Lux at their maximum), the Applicant has provided a detailed Lighting Assessment and associated light spillage diagram (Appendix 1) with indicative lighting levels spilling out of the site. There are two different light spillage diagrams as the Applicant is proposing two different lighting levels in order to address the impact upon bat populations (detailed further in Section e below). These diagrams both clearly show that some spillage beyond the pitch will occur as a result of the proposal however this is to be expected.

However, taking into account the 'worst-case scenario' of 200 Lux, the corresponding spillage diagram shows that the level of lighting that will reach the rear gardens of neighbouring residential properties will be limited to only 5 Lux (equivalent to the levels of street lights) and the levels to primary habitable windows will be far lower at 2 Lux or less. The properties subject to this impact are those along Storrington Way and Brookside, with properties on Fulbridge Road subject to lower levels.

The lighting levels indicated are in line with the Institute of British Lighting Engineers Guidance (ILE) for light intrusion into residential properties. The area is considered to fall within category E2 (dark urban areas) as at present, the area is unlit but has some sky glow by virtue of the street lighting to the residential area surrounding. The ILE guidelines clearly state that in this type of area light trespass into windows should be limited to 5 Lux pre-curfew (23:00) and post-curfew to 1 Lux. Therefore, it is anticipated that the impact from the floodlights will be minimal.

As detailed above, the Applicant is proposing for the pitch to be in operation up to 22:00 hours. Whilst it is considered that the lighting will not have a significant impact upon residential amenity, ceasing play at 22:00 hours would result in the lighting still remaining on until the site is cleared. Therefore, it is considered that the hours of use be suitably conditioned so that play ends at 21:30 and the lights be turned off no later than 22:00 hours (on weekdays). All times are before the standard curfew of 23:00 hours as set out in the ILE Guidance.

Furthermore, to ensure future compliance with these restrictions and the ILE guidance, it is proposed to impose a further condition which requires the Applicant to demonstrate compliance in the event of any reasonable noise complaint. This would ensure that neighbour amenity is protected into the future, and prevents any modifications to the luminaires (e.g. altered angle) from taking place.

Subject to the above, the City Council's Pollution Control Officer raises no objections and it is considered that the proposed lighting would not result in any unacceptable impact to the amenities of neighbouring occupants.

### ***Overlooking/loss of privacy***

At present, the ground within the application site is relatively flat and therefore, standard boundary treatments are sufficient to prevent any potential overlooking into neighbouring

gardens and primary habitable rooms. However, the proposal would introduce new earth bunds along the boundaries of the sites to levels of between 2 metres and 2.8 metres. Spectators and users of the pitches could stand upon these bunds and would be able to view directly into neighbouring properties resulting in an unacceptable loss of privacy for occupants. Whilst the proposed acoustic fencing would provide some protection from this to certain properties, it would not wholly resolve the issue and therefore it is considered both necessary and appropriate to seek a scheme of significant landscaping to these bunds to act as a natural barrier. Providing that the planting is of a sufficient depth and contains species which prevent access, this would prevent persons from standing in a close enough proximity to permit views and therefore would protect the amenities of neighbouring occupants.

#### ***Overbearing/overshadowing impact***

As set out above, some of the proposed acoustic fencing would extend to a height of 3 metres which is far in excess of 'permitted development' level so 2 metres. However, where such high fencing is proposed, it would be set away from the residential boundaries by at least 3 metres and it is considered that this is sufficient to prevent any unacceptable levels of overbearing or overshadowing impact.

#### ***Conclusion***

Taking all of the above into account, it is accepted that some level of harm will result to neighbouring occupants by virtue of extended periods of noise and general disturbance throughout the year. However, it is considered that the level of impact would not be to an unacceptable level and that any harm which results, is outweighed by the significant benefit arising from providing an enhanced sports facility which will serve the needs of the north of Peterborough, where there is presently a considerable under provision of playing fields.

#### **d) Parking, access and highway implications**

##### ***Traffic generation and impact upon highway junctions***

It is noted that several objections from local residents, primarily those living within Brookside, have raised concerns with regards to increased traffic using the highway linking Fulbridge Road and Brookside. Their concerns specifically relate to conflict with residents accessing their properties, queuing at peak times, conflict with pedestrian users and safety concerns when exiting onto Fulbridge Road. Whilst these concerns are noted, the consideration of the planning application must look to the impacts arising above and beyond the present situation.

The Local Highway Authority (LHA) has not raised any objections to the proposal. At present, the site has a lawful D2 (assembly and leisure) use and games can be played without restriction in terms of hours of use or numbers. It is acknowledged that at present, the site is not heavily used because the facilities are insufficient to support high usage. However, as described above, the site presently has no restrictions upon its usage other than weather and daylight. The existing pavilion building is currently not in use owing to its dilapidated state however no planning permission would be required to bring it back into use and therefore the baseline for the present assessment must include the maximum capacity of the existing site with all facilities available.

The proposal would enable the present use to be extended throughout the year and therefore represents an intensification only with regards to extended use. It does not represent an intensification of use in terms of more traffic generation, as the maximum capacity of the site shall not be increased from the present situation. Only one pitch would be provided within the site and the pavilion is proposed for purposes incidental to the use of the pitch. Whilst the pavilion does provide office space, it is proposed for this to be used by the Peterborough District Football League and/or Voyager Academy and therefore shall not represent a separate planning unit.

In light of this, the LHA has advised that only a formalisation of the existing access is required by way of 'give way' markings and the provision of a vehicle-to-vehicle visibility splays. The

land which would provide this splay is also within the ownership of the City Council and therefore can be secured by way of a condition. The proposal does not generate any further demand for off-site highway works and to require these would not meet the relevant tests that conditions must pass to be imposed (i.e. necessary to make the development acceptable).

With regards to impact upon Brookside and the junction with Fulbridge Road, it is accepted that the extended impact resulting from the maximum usage of the site may result in some conflict with residents. However, the requested 'give way' markings would ensure that residents have priority in terms of traffic flows and therefore any delays will be experienced into the site.

Given this baseline situation and the fact that the proposal will not increase the overall capacity of the site, the proposal would not pose an unacceptable risk to highway safety in accordance with Policy CS14 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policy PP12 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012).

### ***Parking and turning provision***

Again, several objections from local residents have raised concern with regards to the proposed parking provision within the site being insufficient, and resulting in overflow parking along Brookside.

At present, there is no formalised parking provision within the site and cars must park on the grassed area adjacent to the gated access. This inevitably results in ad-hoc parking which does not maximise the capacity of the site and has resulted in vehicles parking along Brookside. The proposal would provide formalised parking for 32 cars (3 of which are disabled spaces) and 2 mini-buses. This parking provision accords with the maximum parking standards set out in Policy PP13 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012). Accordingly, the proposal provides adequate on-site parking provision and to resist the application on the basis of insufficient car parking would be at odds with adopted policy.

With regards to turning space, the proposal provides adequate turning facilities for mini-buses and refuse collection/emergency service vehicles.

### **e) Ecology**

The application has been accompanied by a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal and subsequent Bat Survey Report, both of which were undertaken in June 2015. The surveys indicate that the site boundaries, particularly the south-western and south-eastern corners are presently used by foraging and commuting bats. Lighting can have a considerable impact on these species, particularly as the proposal would introduce lighting into the evenings at times when bats are most active. As such, careful consideration must be made to ensure that bat populations are not harmed by the proposal.

The originally submitted scheme would have resulted in lighting levels which were far too high along the site boundaries (up to 50 Lux) and this would have had an unacceptable level of harm to their ability to forage and commute. Accordingly, the position of the pitch has been slightly relocated further south, and the lighting scheme amended. The revised lighting scheme proposes a reduced lighting level of 120 Lux during the active bat period of April to September. This would now ensure that dark corridors with only a 2 Lux overspill would be retained. The City Council's Wildlife Officer has advised that this is within acceptable tolerances and therefore raises no objections.

To further mitigate against any undue impact to bat populations, the Bat Survey also identifies further measures such as appropriate 'bat-friendly' planting and the provision of bat roosting boxes within the site. These measures can be secured by condition.

In addition to the above, the site boundaries contain areas of scrub/hedgerow which are likely to support wild nesting birds. As such, an informative is required drawing the Applicant's

attention to legislation which does not permit the disturbance of such nesting birds between March to August and therefore any clearance of these areas to install the proposed acoustic fencing will need to ensure that there are no birds present before works begin.

Finally, the site contains suitable habitat to support hedgehog populations. Therefore, the Wildlife Officer has requested a condition which requires all trenches be covered overnight and/or a means of escape be provided, to ensure that no hedgehogs or other mammals become trapped.

On the basis of the above, it is considered that the proposal would not result in any unacceptable impact to protected species and therefore the proposal is in accordance with paragraph 118 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012), Policy CS21 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policy PP16 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012).

**f) Surface water drainage**

Whilst the application site is located within Flood Zone 1 (at least risk of flooding), there have been historic incidents of surface water flooding to the gardens of residential properties along the southern boundary – Brookside. This flooding was found to have been caused by excess water flowing over the application site following saturation of the ground. Accordingly, to alleviate this issue, a French drain was installed along the southern and western boundaries of the site.

The application proposal in itself will not generate any additional surface water run-off, however the proposed noise mitigation bunds would be constructed over this French drain and would therefore render them ineffective. To address this, the scheme has been revised to reposition this drain and ensure that it remains as an interceptor of water run-off from the site. No formal details of the design of this drain, or predicted run-off rates have been provided and as such, the City Council's Drainage Engineer has requested that a condition be imposed to include technical specifications of the drains and management of overland flows from the site. This is considered both reasonable and necessary, to ensure no flooding issues arise elsewhere.

On the basis of the above, the proposal would not result in any increased flood risk within or outside the site and therefore the proposal is in accordance with paragraph 100 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) and Policy CS22 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011).

**g) Archaeology**

The application site is located within an area of known archaeological potential. To the north, a field-walking survey carried out within the allotments site produced pottery dating to the Roman, Anglo-Saxon, medieval and post-medieval periods. Amongst the Roman materials found were fragments of a box flue tile which would have originally associated with the hypocaust of a bathhouse. Accordingly, the application site itself may contain evidence for Roman settlement and associated activities.

In light of this, the Applicant has undertaken detailed archaeological evaluation by way of a geophysical survey and targeted trial trenching. The method for this evaluation was agreed pre-submission with the City Council's Archaeologist. The application has been accompanied by the results of this evaluation which found no significant archaeology, only post-medieval/modern furrows, ditches and made ground. Accordingly, the proposal would not pose any unacceptable risk to unknown buried heritage assets and no further evaluation is required.

On this basis, the proposal is in accordance with paragraph 128 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012), Policy CS17 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policy PP17 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012).



#### **h) Trees and landscape implications**

The City Council's Landscape Officer has advised that whilst the proposal would not directly impact upon the trees and hedgerows which surround the site, the earthworks associated with creating the bunds could indirectly result in compaction of the soil. However, given the limited space between the bunds and site boundary, it is anticipated that the heavy machinery will construct the bunds from the inside of the site and therefore, it is not considered that significant harm will result. On this basis, the proposal would not harm trees and other key landscape features and is therefore in accordance with Policy PP16 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012).

#### **i) Other matters**

In response to the neighbour objections received but not specifically dealt with above:

**Crime risk** – It is proposed for the site to be fully secured outside of the hours of use. This will not alter from the present situation.

**Inadequate public consultation** – 40 initial neighbour notification letters were issued to any property with an immediately adjoining boundary. This fulfilled the City Council's statutory duty with respect of public consultation on the planning application.

**Water main** – The presence of the water main and the ability to build above it is a matter for Building Regulations and is not a material planning consideration.

**Alternative locations for the pitch** – The City Council must determine the proposal submitted on its own merits and the availability (or otherwise) of alternative locations is not a material planning consideration.

**Property values** – This is not a material planning consideration.

**Role of Sport England** – Whilst Sport England will provide grant funding for the application proposal, they are a Statutory Consultee on planning applications involving playing fields and their views must be taken into account. Sport England has its own policy to apply in considering such planning applications and this is separate from any grant funding applications.

**Role of Peterborough City Council** – The Local Planning Authority has a legal duty to determine all planning applications submitted. As the application site is within the City Council's ownership, the constitution dictates that a certain procedure must be followed and accordingly, the application is being determined by Members and not through delegated powers. The application has been considered on its own merits and in accordance with the adopted Local Plan.

## **6 Conclusions**

Subject to the imposition of the attached conditions, the proposal is acceptable having been assessed in the light of all material considerations, including weighing against relevant policies of the development plan and specifically:

- the proposal would give rise to a considerable benefit to the wider community through the provision of an enhanced playing facility and the opportunity for usage throughout the year, in accordance with paragraphs 70 and 74 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) and Policy CS18 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011);
- the all-weather pitch and associated facilities would not result in an unacceptable impact upon the character, appearance or visual amenity of the surrounding area, in accordance with Policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policy PP2 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012);
- the proposal floodlighting would not result in any unacceptable light intrusion to neighbouring

properties however it is acknowledged that some increased noise and disturbance would result to residents. It is considered that this harm is outweighed by the public benefit arising from the improved facilities on the site;

- the proposal provides adequate on-site parking to meet the needs of the development and would not result in any harm to the safety of the surrounding public highway network, in accordance with Policy CS14 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policies PP12 and PP13 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012);
- subject to appropriate mitigation the proposal would not result in any unacceptably harmful impact to ecology present within and surrounding the site, in accordance with paragraph 118 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012), Policy CS21 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policy PP16 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012);
- the proposal, subject to further details being provided, would ensure that surface water run-off is effectively managed and does not increase flood risk elsewhere, in accordance with paragraph 100 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) and Policy CS22 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011);
- adequate archaeological evaluation has taken place to demonstrate that the proposal would not pose a risk to undiscovered buried heritage assets, in accordance with paragraph 128 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012), Policy CS17 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policy PP17 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012); and
- the proposal would not pose any unacceptable risk to established trees and shrubs surrounding the site, in accordance with Policy PP16 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012).

## **7 Recommendation**

The Director of Growth and Regeneration recommends that Planning Permission (Regulation 4) is **GRANTED** subject to the following conditions:

- C 1 The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: In accordance with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

- C 2 The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following drawings and documents:

- Drawing number SSL1925-01 Rev 00 'Topographical Survey'
- Drawing number SSL1925-02 Rev 05 'Block Plan of Site'
- Drawing number SSL1925-03 Rev 06 'Proposed Site Plan'
- Drawing number SSL1925-05 Rev 03 'Isometric View'
- Drawing number SSL1925-06 Rev 01 'Proposed Site Plan'
- Drawing number T7914/PH-SK01 'Swept Path Analysis'
- Drawing number CC6081 Sheet 1 of 1 '15m Flanged AMARU Mid Hinged Column'
- Drawing number CM1308-015-01 'Location Plans'
- Drawing number CM1308-015-02 'Existing Ground Floor Plan'
- Drawing number CM1308-015-03 'Existing Roof Plan'
- Drawing number CM1308-015-04 'Existing Elevations 1 of 2'
- Drawing number CM1308-015-05 'Existing Elevations 2 of 2'
- Drawing number CM1308-015-06 'Proposed Ground Floor Plan'
- Drawing number CM1308-015-07 'Proposed Roof Plan'
- Drawing number CM1308-015-08 'Proposed Elevations 1 of 2'
- Drawing number CM1308-015-09 'Proposed Elevations 2 of 2'
- Drawing number CM1308-015-10 'Visualisations'
- Environmental Noise Report (reference 6092/DO/pw dated September 2015)
- Floodlighting Performance Results (Revision 03)

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt.

- C 3 No development other than groundworks and foundations shall take place on the pavilion extension until details of all external materials have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details submitted for approval shall include the name of the manufacturer, the product type, colour (using BS4800) and reference number. The development shall not be carried out except in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: For the Local Planning Authority to ensure a satisfactory external appearance, in accordance with Policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policy PP2 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012).

- C 4 The use of the all-weather sports pitch hereby permitted shall not take place outside the following hours:

Monday to Friday - 08:00 to 21:30 hours

Saturday / Sunday / Public or Bank Holidays - 08:00 to 19:30 hours

All external lighting within the site shall not be used outside the following hours:

Monday to Friday - 08:00 to 22:00 hours

Saturday / Sunday / Public or Bank Holidays - 08:00 to 20:00 hours

Reason: In order to protect the amenities of neighbouring occupants and ensure viable use of the sports facility, in accordance with Policies CS16 and CS18 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policy PP3 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012).

- C 5 Notwithstanding the details hereby approved, the floodlighting to the all-weather pitch shall be reduced to an output of 120 Lux from 18:00 hours until the lights are switched off (in accordance with the times specified in condition C4) during the bat activity period of 1 April to 30 September (inclusive).

Reason: In order to protect bat populations within/around the site, in accordance with paragraph 118 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012), Policy CS21 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policy PP16 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012).

- C 6 The noise mitigation measures contained within Chapter 7 of the submitted Environmental Noise Report (reference 6092/DO/pw dated June 2015) shall be implemented in full and prior to first use of the all-weather pitch hereby permitted. The mitigation measures are specifically:

- Acoustic barriers to a minimum surface density of 10 kilograms per metre squared sited in the areas shown on drawing number SSL1925-03 Rev 06 'Proposed Site Plan'; and
- Acoustic bunds sited at the locations and to the heights shown on drawing number SSL1925-03 Rev 06 'Proposed Site Plan'.

Thereafter, those measures shall be retained in accordance with the above details in perpetuity.

Reason: In order to protect the amenities of neighbouring occupants, in accordance with Policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policy PP3 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012).

- C 7 Notwithstanding the details hereby permitted, the use of the lighting columns shall not exceed the obtrusive light limitations for sky glow, light into windows, source intensity and

building luminance specified in environmental zone E2 in the Institution of Lighting Engineers document 'Guidance Notes for the Reduction of Obtrusive Light GN01:2011'.

In the event of any reasonable complaint to the Local Planning Authority in respect of light intrusion to neighbouring properties, the Applicant (or their successors in title) will be required to demonstrate compliance with these limits within 28 days of written notice from the Local Planning Authority. Should any breach be found, a scheme of mitigation to bring the lighting into accordance shall be provided and implemented in accordance with a timetable agreed.

Reason: In the interests of protecting the amenity of local residents, in accordance with Policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policy PP3 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012).

C 8 Prior to first use of the all-weather sports pitch hereby permitted, a scheme for the hard and soft landscaping of the site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall include details of the following:

- Planting plans including species, numbers, size and density along the noise mitigation bunds in order to prevent pedestrian use;
- Hard surfacing materials;
- Boundary treatments (including colour finish); and
- Refuse collection points and bins.

The approved hard landscaping scheme shall be carried out prior to first use of the all-weather sports pitch and pavilion extension. The approved soft landscaping scheme shall be carried out no later than the first planting season following first use of the all-weather sports pitch.

Any trees, shrubs or hedges forming part of the approved landscaping scheme that die, are removed or become diseased within five years of the implementation of the landscaping scheme shall be replaced during the next available planting season by the developers, or their successors in title with an equivalent size, number and species to those being replaced. Any replacement trees, shrubs or hedgerows dying within five years of planting shall themselves be replaced with an equivalent size, number and species.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity, to protect the amenities of neighbouring residents and to enhance the biodiversity of the site, in accordance with Policies CS16 and CS21 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policies PP3 and PP16 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012).

C 9 Prior to the commencement of development, a detailed surface water drainage strategy shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The strategy shall include:

- Confirmation from Anglian Water that connection to the nearby surface water sewer can be achieved;
- A final drainage layout with technical specifications of all drainage assets, including details relating to changes in the existing drainage and bunding; and
- Calculations supporting the agreed discharge rates (should they change).

The surface water drainage strategy shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details and prior to the commencement of development.

Reason: To ensure that no increased flood risk results beyond the boundary of the site, in accordance with Policy CS22 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011). The

condition is required pre-commencement as elements of the drainage details shall be implemented first, before other development takes place.

- C10 During the period of construction, any trenches which are to be left overnight shall be covered and/or a graduated means of escape shall be provided for mammals.

Reason: To ensure no harm results to protected species, in accordance with paragraph 118 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012), Policy CS21 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policy PP16 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012).

- C11 Prior to first use of the floodlights hereby permitted, details of bat roosting boxes to be installed within the site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The boxes shall be installed in accordance with the approved details and prior to first use of the floodlights hereby permitted.

Reason: To ensure no harm results to protected species, in accordance with paragraph 118 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012), Policy CS21 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policy PP16 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012).

- C12 Prior to the commencement of development, details of temporary facilities for materials storage, wheel cleansing and parking/turning/loading/unloading of all vehicles visiting the site during the period of construction shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Those facilities shall be provided in accordance with the approved details and throughout the period of construction.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety, in accordance with Policy CS14 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policy PP12 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012). The condition is required pre-commencement to ensure that no harm results to highway safety once construction begins.

- C13 Prior to first use of the all-weather pitch and extended pavilion hereby permitted, the areas shown on drawing number SSL1925-03 Revision 06 'Proposed Site Plan' for the parking and turning of vehicles shall be laid out (including demarcation) in accordance with the approved details. Thereafter, those areas shall not be used for any purpose other than the parking and turning of vehicles in connection with the use of the site in perpetuity.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety, in accordance with Policy CS14 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policies PP12 and PP13 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012).

- C14 Notwithstanding the submitted details and prior to first use of the all-weather pitch and extended pavilion hereby permitted, details of the off-site works to the public highway comprising 'give-way' markings shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and prior to first use of either the pitch or extended pavilion, whichever is earlier.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety, in accordance with Policy CS14 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policy PP12 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012).

- C15 Notwithstanding the submitted details and prior to first use of the all-weather pitch and extended pavilion hereby permitted, vehicle-to-vehicle visibility splays measuring 2.4 metres x 43 metres shall be provided on both sides of the vehicular access to the site. Thereafter, those splays shall be kept clear of any obstruction above a height of 600mm from ground level in perpetuity.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety, in accordance with Policy CS14 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policy PP12 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012).

- C16 Notwithstanding the submitted details and prior to first use of the all-weather pitch and extended pavilion hereby permitted, details of covered cycle parking for 20 bicycles (10no. Sheffield cycle stands) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The cycle parking shall be provided in accordance with the approved details and prior to first use of either the pitch or extended pavilion, whichever is earlier. Thereafter, the cycle parking shall be retained in perpetuity.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety, in accordance with Policy CS14 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policy PP12 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012).

- C17 The areas shown on drawing number 06 'Proposed Ground Floor Plan' as an office and training room shall be solely used for purposes ancillary to the use of the all-weather sports pitch and shall not be sold, leased or rented as a separate unit.

Reason: The site does not contain sufficient car parking to accommodate an additional separate planning unit, in accordance with Policies PP12 and PP13 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012).

Copies to Councillors: D Fower, P V Thacker MBE, J Davidson