

ADDENDUM REPORT

Planning Committee



Item Number: 6.3

Site: Marine Academy Plymouth, Trevithick Road Plymouth

Planning Application Number: 13/02082/FUL

Applicant: Marine Academy Plymouth

Page: 19

Representation

An additional letter has been received claiming that Marine Academy has no vehicular rights over Newton Avenue. This would infringe the pedestrian access rights for the residents of Newton gardens, Cayley Way and adjoining streets

Applicant's additional comments

The applicant has submitted a statement outlining the key facts. Many of the points are covered in the report. It states that:

'The school's central vision is to "create an all age campus for lifelong learning, at the centre of an engaged, regenerated community". The development of an AGP [artificial grass pitch] is part of that vision and is NOT a project based on commercial interests.'

It elaborates the site selection section in paragraph 27 of the report. The additional points raised are that:

- the application site is the established use for the matches and training;
- the southern site:
 1. would involve demolition of buildings [which the applicant had propose to do having carried out the prior notification procedure, reference 12/01709/3];
 2. would affect the new primary school; and
 3. would require a new access/movement strategy and separation works between Marine Academy Plymouth (MAP) and the AGP.

The application site is the preferred location.

On the consultation exercise covered in paragraph of the report it states that the event held on 13 November 2013 was attended by about 15 local residents. Attendees were pleased that the hours would be reduced [in the spring and summer] and noise attenuation is provided but repeated their concerns that the hours had not been reduced enough.

The benefits outlined in points 1 – 10 on page 23 and paragraph 6 are re-emphasised.

A further reduction in hours could not be supported and would result in the project not proceeding.

The site would be managed at all times. Users would be subject to a code of conduct. Residents and local users would be represented on the community forum.

The spectators would be restricted to the western side of the development away from neighbours' properties.

The objectors' comments on the noise barrier and its impact are inaccurate. The survey predicts that the noise from the development at 50 dB would be 20dB below the road traffic noise. The applicant believes that the neighbours' living conditions would not be harmed and, in its opinion, would be improved compared with the existing situation.

The security of the site would be improved upon the existing situation and could include a CCTV system.

The statement provides examples of a number of similar developments that have been permitted including Plymstock School and those at other authorities. The applicant states that often the distances between the pitch and adjoining dwellings are similar to those at the application site as are the hours of use. It also cites two appeal decisions at Bromley Kent and Greater Manchester where the inspectors allowed the appeals deciding that the health, fitness, sporting needs and operational benefits of the schemes were important considerations and there would not be significant harm to the living conditions of neighbouring properties.

The applicant concludes that the scheme provides significant benefits while not causing harm to the living conditions of the adjoining properties. The applicant states that the proposal is supported by paragraph 72 of the National Planning Policy Framework NPPF which attaches great weight to developments to alter schools. If the Council refuses permission the applicant is confident that an appeal would be successful.

Comments on the additional representations

On the issue of vehicular access this is a private civil matter. However officers understand that MAP does have vehicular and pedestrian rights of access over Newton Avenue.

The applicant has cited references to other similar developments that have been permitted but the summaries are brief and, where allowed on appeal, has not provided the full Inspectors' decision letters. So officers do not know the full facts and considerations of those cases and how they compare with the proposed development. And, as members know, each case is determined on its own merits.

Point of clarification

Officers suggest that, for the sake clarity on page 26 the following should be added at the beginning of paragraph 11:

“11 The proposed development would enable the facility to be used throughout the year in all conditions and at times of darkness. The applicant is proposing hours of use from 8.00am to 9.00pm during the week from 1 September to 31 March and 8.00am to 7.00pm from 1 April to 31 August, 9.00am to 7.00pm on Saturdays and 10.00am to 6.00pm on Sundays, Bank and public holidays. This is a total of 83 hours in the winter and 73 hours in the spring and summer.”

Recommendation

The recommendation is the same as in the report.