

GLOUCESTER CITY COUNCIL

COMMITTEE : **PLANNING**

DATE : **1ST NOVEMBER 2016**

ADDRESS/LOCATION : **PLOCK COURT/FORMER BISHOPS COLLEGE PLAYING FIELDS**

APPLICATION NO. & WARD : **16/00945/REM LONGLEVENS**

EXPIRY DATE : **19TH NOVEMBER 2016**

APPLICANT : **UNIVERSITY OF GLOUCESTERSHIRE, ASPIRE SPORTS AND CULTURAL TRUST AND GLOUCESTER CITY COUNCIL**

PROPOSAL : **Reserved matters application for the approval of the appearance, landscaping, layout and scale of the Sports Hall, Plock Court access road and Pavilion development (pursuant to outline permission ref. 15/01190/OUT)**

REPORT BY : **ADAM SMITH**

NO. OF APPENDICES/ OBJECTIONS : **SITE PLAN**

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION AND PROPOSAL

- 1.1 The application site comprises part of the former Bishops College playing fields, part of Plock Court playing fields and the approach roads and circulation areas to the tennis centre. The application is for reserved matters approval pursuant to the University's outline planning permission ref. 15/01190/OUT granted earlier this year. That outline permission also included the means of access, so this application seeks approval of the remaining reserved matters of appearance, landscaping, layout and scale for this phase.
- 1.2 The proposal is for the sports hall, the pavilion and the associated car park and access road. The sports facilities have been divided into two phases with the sports pitches submitted as a separate reserved matters application. The layout has moved on from that suggested in the outline permission indicative masterplan. The sports hall is now sited at the northern edge of the complex. The pavilion is sited immediately north of the sports hall and car park beyond the hedge line into Plock Court playing fields (with a link taken through), with cricket nets proposed to the west side. The access would be taken off the existing tennis centre car park, between the tennis building and the existing all

weather pitches and into a new car park in front of the new sports hall building.

- 1.3 The sports hall would be a 12-court format for a variety of sports. The hall would be surrounded by single storey accommodation for the entrance, café, changing rooms, classrooms and stores. The hall section would have a curved tensile fabric roof, up to 17.6m high at its peak, and 9m high side walls, to the main part of the building. The main entrance area would project out to the west at single storey, with various cladding panels as the finish to this ground floor element. On the south elevation another single storey element would project out, housing the changing rooms.
- 1.4 The pavilion would be a single storey building on a slightly curved footprint, with a stepped/seating area in front. It provides for two team changing areas, two officials' changing areas, social space/kitchen, and associated stores, etc. It would have a profiled metal mono pitched roof (up to 5.2m at highest) with the external walls likely to be clad in a timber finish.
- 1.5 The application is referred to the planning committee given the scale and as it involves the City Council and is subject to representations.

2.0 RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

15/01190/OUT

- 2.1 Outline planning application (with all matters reserved except for access) for the erection of a new 10,000sqm business school, the provision of new student accommodation (up to 200 beds) & the creation of additional car parking at the University of Gloucestershire Oxstalls Campus, Oxstalls Lane & the Debenhams Playing Field, Estcourt Road. Provision of new and improved sports facilities at Oxstalls Sports Park, Debenhams Playing Field, Oxstalls Campus & Plock Court Playing Fields, including on land currently occupied by the Former Bishops College, to include - the provision of new multi use sports hall, 2 x 3G all weather sports pitches with associated 500 seat spectator stand, floodlighting, replacement cricket pavilion & additional parking; improved vehicular access at Oxstalls Lane, Plock Court & Estcourt Road, new vehicular access at Estcourt Close, improved pedestrian & cycling connections & associated highways, landscaping & ancillary works. Granted outline permission subject to conditions and s106 agreement 28th July 2016.

16/01012/REM

- 2.2 Application for approval of reserved matters of appearance, landscape, layout and scale for 2 no. sports pitches and associated development including floodlights, storage equipment, noise barrier and boundary fencing (pursuant to outline planning permission ref. 15/01190/OUT). Pending consideration.

3.0 PLANNING POLICIES

- 3.1 The following planning guidance and policies are relevant to the consideration of this application:

Statutory Development Plan

- 3.2 The statutory Development Plan for Gloucester remains the partially saved 1983 City of Gloucester Local Plan ("1983 Local Plan").
- 3.3 Paragraph 215 of the National Planning Policy Framework ("NPPF") states that *'...due weight should be given to relevant policies in existing plans according to their degree of consistency with this framework (the closer the policies in the plan to the policies in the Framework, the greater the weight that may be given.'*
- 3.4 The 1983 Local Plan is more than thirty years old and, according to the Inspector who dealt with an appeal relating to the Peel Centre, St. Ann Way (13/00559/FUL), *'...its sheer ages suggests it must be out of date...'* (par. 11 of the Inspector's report). Members are advised that the 1983 Local Plan is out-of-date and superseded by later planning policy including the NPPF.

Central Government Guidance - National Planning Policy Framework

- 3.5 This is the latest Government statement of planning policy and is a material consideration that should be given significant weight in determining this application.

Decision-making

The NPPF does not alter the requirement for applications to be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. In assessing and determining applications, Authorities should apply the presumption in favour of sustainable development. For decision-making, this means:

- approving development proposals that accord with the development plan without delay; and
- where the development plan is absent, silent, or relevant policies are out of date, granting planning permission unless:
 - any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the NPPF as a whole; or
 - specific policies in the NPPF indicate development should be restricted.

Authorities should look for solutions rather than problems and decision-takers should seek to approve applications for sustainable development where possible.

Core planning principles

Planning should:

- Be genuinely plan-led;
- Be a creative exercise in ways to enhance and improve places;
- Proactively drive and support sustainable economic development to deliver the homes, business and industrial units, infrastructure and thriving local places that the country needs;
- Secure high quality design and a good standard of amenity;

- Take account of the different roles and character of different areas;
- Support the transition to a low carbon future, take account of flood risk and encourage the use of renewable resources;
- Contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment and reducing pollution;
- Encourage the effective use of land by reusing brownfield land;
- Promote mixed use developments;
- Conserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance;
- Actively manage patterns of growth to make the fullest possible use of public transport, walking and cycling, and focus significant development in locations which are or can be made sustainable;
- Take account of and support local strategies to improve health, social and cultural wellbeing and deliver sufficient community and cultural facilities and services to meet local needs.

The NPPF includes relevant policy on;

Promoting sustainable transport, including the statement that development should only be prevented on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts of development are severe.

Requiring good design

Promoting healthy communities

Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change

Conserving and enhancing the natural environment

Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

Planning obligations and conditions

Planning obligations should only be sought where they meet all of the following tests:

- Necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms;
- Directly related to the development; and
- Fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.

Planning conditions should only be imposed where they are

- Necessary;
- Relevant to planning and to the development to be permitted;
- Enforceable;
- Precise; and
- Reasonable in all other respects.

For the purposes of making decisions, the NPPF sets out that policies in a Local Plan should not be considered out of date where they were adopted prior to the publication of the NPPF. In these circumstances due weight should be given to relevant policies in existing plans according to their degree of consistency with the NPPF.

The National Planning Practice Guidance has also been published to accompany and in part expand on the National Planning Policy Framework.

Emerging Development Plan

Draft Joint Core Strategy for Gloucester, Cheltenham and Tewkesbury

- 3.6 The City Council is currently working on a new Development Plan that will replace the 1983 Local Plan. The new Development Plan will comprise the Joint Core Strategy for Gloucester, Cheltenham and Tewkesbury ("JCS") and Gloucester City Plan ("City Plan") once they are adopted.
- 3.7 The JCS was submitted to the Government for Inspection in November 2014. Policies in the Submission Joint Core Strategy have been prepared in the context of the NPPF and are a material consideration.
- 3.8 Paragraph 216 of the NPPF states that weight can be given to relevant policies in emerging plans according to:

The stage of preparation of the emerging plan;
The extent to which there are unresolved objections to relevant policies; and
The degree of consistency of the relevant policies in the emerging plan to the policies in the NPPF

- 3.9 The JCS is part way through the Examination process and the Inspector published their Interim Report in May 2016. However, a number of proposed modifications are expected to be made to the policies in the plan. The Council has received legal advice to the effect that the JCS can only be given limited weight at this time.
- 3.10 Relevant policies from the Draft JCS are:
- SD1 – Presumption in favour of sustainable development
 - SD4 – Sustainable design and construction
 - SD5 – Design requirements
 - SD7 - Landscape
 - SD9 – Historic environment
 - SD10 – Biodiversity and geodiversity
 - SD15 – Health and environmental quality
 - INF1 – Access to the transport network
 - INF2 – Safety and efficiency of the transport network
 - INF3 – Flood risk management
 - INF4 – Green infrastructure
 - INF5 – Social and community infrastructure

Gloucester City Plan

- 3.11 The Gloucester City Plan ("City Plan") is at a much less advanced stage than the JCS. The City Plan will be presented in three parts: Part 1 will set out the context for the City Plan, including the main challenges facing the city, a strategy for development and key development principles. Part 2 will identify development management policies. Part 3 will identify development opportunities.
- 3.12 Part 1 was subject to consultation in 2012 and is to be reviewed. Part 2 was subject to consultation in 2013 on potential future development sites in the

City as well as a draft vision and strategy for the city centre. Parts 2 and 3 have also yet to be completed.

- 3.13 On adoption, the Joint Core Strategy, City Plan and any Neighbourhood Plans will provide a revised planning policy framework for the Council.

Gloucester Local Plan, Second Stage Deposit 2002

- 3.14 Regard is also had to the 2002 Revised Deposit Draft Local Plan. This has been subjected to two comprehensive periods of public and stakeholder consultation and adopted by the Council for development control purposes. This cannot be saved as it is not a formally adopted plan, however with it being adopted for development control purposes it is still judged to be a material consideration, albeit of limited weight.

2002 Plan allocations

- 3.15 None on the school fields part.
Plock Court location for the pavilion is public open space and landscape conservation area.

2002 Plan policies

- 3.16 Members are advised that the following “day-to-day” development management policies, which are not of a strategic nature and broadly accord with the policies contained in the NPPF, should be given some weight:

B.7 – Protected species

B.10 – Trees and hedgerows on development sites

B.11 – Tree preservation orders

FRP.1a – Flood risk

FRP.6 – Surface water run-off

FRP.9 – Light pollution

FRP.10 – Noise

FRP.11 – Pollution

FRP.15 – Contaminated land

BE.1 – Scale, massing and height

BE.2 – Views and skyline

BE.4 – Criteria for the layout, circulation and landscape of new development

BE.5 – Community safety

BE.6 – Access for all

BE.7 – Architectural design

BE.8 – Energy efficient development

BE.12 – Landscape schemes

BE.14 – Native species

BE.21 – Safeguarding of amenity

TR.9 – Parking standards

TR.11 – Provision of parking for people with disabilities

TR.12 – Cycle parking standards

TR.31 – Road safety

TR.33 – Providing for cyclists/pedestrians

OS.1 - Public open space

LCA.1 - Landscape conservation area

SR.2 – Playing fields and recreational open space
SR.4 – Indoor sports facilities

All policies can be viewed at the relevant website address:- Gloucester Local Plan policies – www.gloucester.gov.uk/planning; and Department of Community and Local Government planning policies - www.communities.gov.uk/planningandbuilding/planning/.

4.0 CONSULTATIONS

- 4.1 The Highway Authority has not yet commented but a response is expected. Members will be updated at the Committee meeting.
- 4.2 The Lead Local Flood Authority raises no objection subject to conditions to secure a detailed surface water drainage strategy and SuDS maintenance scheme.
- 4.3 Sport England raises no objection but made several detailed observations to the applicants.
- 4.4 The Police have not commented.
- 4.5 The Drainage Engineer raises no objection subject to securing the precise detail of the flood compensation arrangement and the detail and maintenance of the drainage system.
- 4.6 The Urban Design Officer has not commented.
- 4.7 The Environmental Health Protection Officer has not commented.
- 4.8 The Landscape Architect has the following comments on the amended scheme;

Happy to see the cricket nets and pavilion repositioned further towards the edge of the main playing field.

Require more detail on the proposed levels of the nets and the new pavilion in relation to the adjoining field.

Would be nice to see a slightly better relationship between the back of the pavilion and the access path into the sports hall area. At the moment this all seems rather awkward and not particularly logical in design. Could there be a single, better designed route?

We need to see how this will fit with the main footpath running along the Plock Court field from the main campus. Where and how will the two paths join?

The orientation of the pavilion is not as directly facing the cricket pitch as it was previously, is there an intention to move the cricket pitch in the future?

Are the ECB happy with this revised arrangement of the building in relation to the pitch?

Need to see how the drainage features for the whole development will be incorporated into the layout, without detriment to the main playing field.

- 4.9 The Tree Officer has not commented.

4.10 The Waste team has not commented.

5.0 PUBLICITY AND REPRESENTATIONS

5.1 163 neighbouring properties were notified and press and site notices were published. A second consultation period was undertaken, expiring on 25th October 2016.

5.2 3 representations have been received;

Revised layout removes previous concerns about significant visual impact of sports hall on residents of Gambier Parry Gardens.

The acoustic fencing will need to be enhanced by a visual screen to reduce the impact on residents

If there are no plans for the vacant area behind the rugby pitch then no concerns are raised, but any future development of this area which would impact residents would need to be assessed.

Overshadowing and overbearing effects of sports hall. Building is equivalent to height of a 5 storey building and width of a major industrial building.

The cladding material and colour are unsympathetic to the tennis centre.

Environmental effect.

Traffic and associated noise.

No screening on the original residents side – this would help to soften the area.

Need for a school in 2017. It is not environmentally friendly moving children out of the area when there is a solution here, - the area should be kept for school use only.

I strongly object for the following reasons.

1. The existing Access road.

The access road is too narrow and is presently incapable of two way traffic as a coach or lorry takes up the whole road. It cannot be widened due to the hedge abutting properties and the beech trees. It has a right hand bend where, despite speed bumps, cars frequently speed and slam on their brakes to avoid one another when passing. I have pictures where cars park along the access road causing obstruction to other cars and pedestrians as they partially park on the pavement. The road, pavement and abutting grass area flood frequently in four places. due to a high water table and water unable to freely drain. It has flooded 4 times this month alone. It is a matter of time before a serious accident occurs.

2. Access from Tewkesbury Road.

Traffic on the Tewkesbury road is heavy and fast as it comes off the northern bypass. This road will become increasingly busy when 3000+ new homes are built at Longford, Twigworth and Innsworth. It currently takes an hour to travel

from Kingsholm rugby ground to Plock Court when there is a home match. People already leave the match early or do not go due to the congestion caused. Residents from all parts of the city due to the congestion stay at home which is detrimental to the economy of the city. Tewkesbury road was closed from Escourt Road roundabout all the way to Tewkesbury as recently as February 2014 due to flooding, despite the flood report saying otherwise.

3. Access from Tewkesbury road to the barrier to join the existing Access Road.

Plock Court is a narrow cul de sac and it takes just one car parked to cause problems with traffic being able to pass not being able to pass without causing obstruction to oncoming traffic. This results, on a daily basis, to cars mounting and driving along the pavement to pass each other. If a car wants to turn right onto Tewkesbury Road it is again common practice for cars, on a daily basis, to mount the pavement to pass to turn left. This is illegal and very dangerous as there is a high incidence of dog walkers, joggers, families with babies in prams and toddlers and children using the pavement. The police and local councillors have been notified on many occasions, yet it seems to be an acceptable practice. A PCSO witnessed it and I have taken pictures, but it is no deterrent. The police have informed me that it will take a serious accident before anything is done. Cars also park partially on the pavement which again causes obstruction to pedestrians, who are forced out between cars into the path of cars often travelling at excessive speed. Coaches or heavy goods lorries take up the whole width of both Plock Court and the access road and have difficulties negotiating the entrance through the barrier. Cars have to physically reverse onto pavements to allow large vehicles to pass otherwise they would be backing onto the main Tewkesbury road. Again it is only a matter of time before a serious accident occurs.

4. Plock Court

The layout of this cul de sac is that if you park in front of someone's house you block access to the drive of the house opposite even if you park partially on the pavement. You have to partially park on the pavement to allow another car to pass due to the narrow width of the cul de sac. The road has a bend and again pedestrians are forced into the road from behind parked cars. It has been accepted that rugby and music events at Kingsholm causes problems for residents in Gambier Parry and match day restrictions apply there. Also the UOG has accepted the frustrations of residents in the Oxstalls area and are proposing a 5 year monitoring system for that area. Yet we are being trapped in our houses because of congestion and obstruction and despite many residents voicing their concerns with councillors and university staff at public consultations no provision is being made for inconsiderate and dangerous parking in our road. We have a high incidence of elderly people and young children and yet there would be serious repercussions if an ambulance could not gain prompt access and egress to us. Also we have a high volume of traffic missing the junction to the Tennis Centre and with so many parked cars have to result to turning on people's drives often at speed. There have been many cases of children being run over and killed by their family member because they did not see them on the drive. What chance do our children and grandchildren have when neither they or the

inconsiderate driver are expecting each other to be on a residents drive. We also experience the problem of cars just driving straight out through the barrier, not expecting anyone to want to drive up such a quiet cul de sac. Again it is only a matter of time before an accident occurs, as this proposed development will only exasperate problems. Traffic lights are not the answer as traffic will just tail back causing more obstruction. Railings or bollards on the pavements means that traffic has no where to go and double yellow lines does not address the problem of large vehicles passing one another or stop people mounting the pavement to turn left. Also the road cannot be widened because of the need for pedestrian access.

5. Air and Noise Pollution.

An increase of another sports hall, 3 more pitches and a 500 seater spectator stand and additional car parking facilities, resulting in more events will result in an enormous amount and frequency of traffic causing tailbacks as access and egress to the sports facilities is already impractical. Scientific studies have proven that noise and air pollution is detrimental to the health and wellbeing and can cause chronic illnesses and result in early death. Plock Court is going to the the only entrance to all of these facilities and yet we are not being offered any buffer. The council hedge at the rear of our gardens is in poor condition and is practically bare from October to May inclusive and is no screen form noise and air pollution. Scientific studies have advised people not to loiter at traffic lights. What respite do we have from a significant increase and frequency of traffic at the front and particularly the rear of our properties, where it is expected that people spend a large part of their lives working, playing, entertaining and relaxing. This will be very intrusive into our daily lives and have serious health implications without adequate screening,

6. Events

There has been 3 events this year where the police have been informed about ensuing traffic delays, congestion and obstruction, which would make it difficult for the 999 services to attend residents in Plock Court.

A university of Gloucester cross country event on 7 February 2016 resulted in 45 minute traffic delays and joggers running up and down Plock Court and the access road to warm up causing problems for motorists. An official was 30 minutes late and asked to park outside my house, as he could not access the tennis centre to park, He informed me that all participating universities were informed there was no parking in the vicinity. This was not adhered to. The problem was exasperated by people being dropped off and vehicles trying to exit against the volume of incoming traffic. The field was left littered with rubbish and the broken frame of a gazebo. Yellow uni tape and general rubbish was in the brook, which seeing that the field was flooded form 7 Feb - till 13 Feb and I have pictures of scum in the water and on the field. The field was so churned up by the runners that it took 6 months to recover.

A Big health check and Social Care day incorporating a special Olympics, organised specifically for people with learning disabilities resulted in two cyclists narrowly missing being knocked over by a speeding motorist taking a right hand bend, on the opposite side of the road. I spoke to a steward who took my name and address, but I received no response to my concerns. I was informed that they tried to marshall the plock Court entrance the previous

year, but it just resulted in traffic delays. They said everyone would be arriving and leaving at the same time and turning left to exit onto Tewkesbury Road. They failed to factor in that taxis and mini buses were dropping people off and turning against the flow incoming traffic causing obstruction etc. They also did not factor in that Jo public would be using the sports field and that vulnerable people with learning impairments and physical handicaps were weaving in and out of the traffic. They were expecting 1000 cars and they were being marshalled outside the Tennis Centre to stop them blocking the area by The Gala Club barrier. They were being parked on the Oxstalls school site, yet they had to access and egress through Plock Court, Why could they not use the school entrance.

We have had to endure a sports beat festival for 3 years with the ensuing traffic chaos, with traffic consisting of cars hgvs,taxis,service and catering vehicles and fun fare lorries travelling in 14 different directions mingling with pedestrians, cyclists, walkers, joggers young children and families, and drunken festival goers, falling about drunk into incoming traffic in the dark,with no marshalling or speed restrictions or notices of traffic or lessons learnt from the previous years. Again parking was encouraged on the school site to boost the coffers, despite the traffic chaos.caused. I have videos of cars driving on pavements, and speeding and causing obstruction to verify..

I find it odd that the stage, each year, has to face our homes which are nearest to the event. We don't hear the music like they do in Kingsholm/Oxstalls/ Longford/Armscroft and other parts of Longlevens. We just hear a noise distortion and vibration which sends our animals mental. I close the windows and turn the volume of the telly up to 30 from 18 and still hear the boom boom during a 11 hour period for two days, which affects my heart rhythm. Appartantly this intrusion of noise is not acceptable, according to your noise evaluation report, but is acceptable to the council, and organisers, despite protestations, they allow the event to continue and wish to grow the event in size. The organisers have informed many residents that the council told them not to discuss the organisation and impact of the event with residents, as we will only complain. It would nolt be acceptable to others if they had to endure the parking obstructuions and distorted noise.

7. Parking

It would be detrimental to Joe Public if they have to pay to park or cannot park as spaces used by university staff, students, and visitors or hospital workers or rugby fans. It seems that all facilities are at the bottom half of the field, and yet all parking has to accessed through a road travelling over half the length of the field, that is identified as being in the highest zone for flood risk. Plock Court playing field is a Public Utility area to be enjoyed by Jo Public and to deny accessibility is against the spirt of the status endowed on it by Queen Elizabeth.

8. Bus services

Out of a long list of bus services mentioned the only relevant bus service along Tewkesbury Road is the 97/98 bus that runs alternatively every half hour and after 1940 there is a bus at 2130 and then 2305on Mon - Sat. The

sunday service is hourly and finishes approx. The 71 Tewkesbury bus is hourly and the last bus is at 1815. There is no sunday service. The 97/98 bus is so full that it often is unable to take buggies, mobility aids or wheelchairs leaving bus users stranded with no guarantee that they will catch the next bus or make the return journey. I queried with uni staff why provide more parking as I worked for 30 years and raised 3 children and was not entitled to a parking space at work. She informed me that if they did not provide car parking people would not use the facilities

9. Flooding

Despite the environment agency flood reports I can verify with pictures that the field floods in different areas to encompass the whole field to include where football pitches are being proposed. I have written on numerous occasions to my local councillors and MP to no avail. The field and road have been flooded yearly since 2007 and recently on 14 Feb 14 when Tewkesbury road was closed. I have pictures of the access road flooded on 14/10/14, 8, 9 and 10/2/16, 20/2/16, 28/3/16 and 10/9/16.

The road will either be repeatedly flooded, bearing in mind the 3000+ houses being built in the vicinity and the proposed expansion of The Longford Inn and the UOG planning proposals or access will be difficult, hazardous and time consuming which could have serious risks for the success of the development and the standing of the University. When I visited the UOG on 6/9/16 3 different people raised issues re flooding concerns. Flooding or being at risk of flooding is detrimental to the health and well being of residents so I found it quite insightful when a uni representative said everyone flooded in 2007 and I find that quite insulting and dismissive of my concerns.

I have warned you of the dangers and if you do not heed them it will leave you very vulnerable when the Health and Safety Executive have to be involved and they become aware that you were informed of the serious health and safety implications of this development.

Another university could study the impact of this planning application on residents health and wellbeing.

The above is based on my daily experiences of living at Plock Court and using the playing field.

- 5.3 The full content of all correspondence on this application can be inspected at Herbert Warehouse, The Docks, Gloucester, prior to the Committee meeting.

<http://planningdocs.gloucester.gov.uk/default.aspx?custref=16/00945/REM>

6.0 **OFFICER OPINION**

- 6.1 It is considered that the main issues with regard to this application are as follows:

- Design and landscaping
- Traffic and transport
- Residential amenity
- Drainage and flood risk

6.2 The principle of development has already been established in the outline permission, restricted by certain conditions, including the principle of using part of the school fields. Given the scale of development and limited scope for relocation of the buildings, the development was assessed in some detail at the outline stage. There are no concerns raised by this detailed scheme in respect of local plan designations, ecology, archaeology or land contamination that are not already addressed by conditions of the outline consent.

Design and landscaping

6.3 The revised layout for the sports facilities works better than the outline indicative masterplan whereby the sports hall is visible along the approach road, is further out of view from the residents that were concerned about it, and provides easier access from it to both pitches.

6.4 The sports hall is of a substantial size at up to 17.6m at the peak of the roof, by comparison I understand the tennis centre is approximately 9.7m high. I am advised that the height is necessary to ensure a 9m clear height above the courts with the structural zone of the roof above. It has been designed with a dual pitched roof and rounded corners to seek to reduce the bulk that is often a feature of sports halls.

6.5 Given the building's height and the surroundings it would clearly be perceived from local residences and within the surrounding public areas, including from Plock Court where it would be side-on when viewed from the fields to the north. The mass of the roof tapers from the 9m high side walls to the ridge at 17.6m and the light grey tensile fabric to the roof should also help to soften its appearance. I see no reason to match the materials to the tennis centre and do not agree with the representation that the indicated materials are unsympathetic (they would be subject to detailed approval by condition anyway). The design of the hall building is a product of its function but it is considered that it would sit comfortably in the built and landscape context as an additional to the existing sports complex.

6.6 The relocation of the pavilion back towards the building complex is welcome and it would be perceived as part of that cluster of structures rather than more prominently sited in the fields as originally proposed. The pavilion is low level with an interesting angled design and with cladding to the facing walls, and is also considered acceptable in terms of its design. The principle of the pavilion being sited within the landscape conservation area and open space is already accepted. The design is considered appropriate to this landscape context. There will also be some modest loss of hedgerow for access, etc, which is not objectionable. There needs to be a reconciliation of the wider path infrastructure towards the University campus and the drainage system when both of those matters are considered in detail.

6.7 A combination of sustainability measures are proposed including natural ventilations, heat recovery, air source heat pumps, high efficiency plant, and

low U' values. Solar hot water panels, rainwater collection and re use of the existing wind turbine are also possibilities for future integration.

- 6.8 In terms of the associated facilities, the car park is broken up with tree planting, which will improve its appearance and is welcomed. The open area behind the rugby pitch would be laid to meadow seeding (a resident mentions this area, and any future development proposals for this space would have to be considered on their merits at that stage). A footpath link is now provided through here and out to the Bishops College fields south of the tennis centre. Its inclusion is welcomed and would help improve the connectivity of the local area if the residential scheme on the college grounds goes ahead. I do consider it necessary to review and approve the boundary treatments by condition, in the interests of good design, and this appears to correlate with the residents' comments on the appearance of the scheme facing the residents to the west. The noise fence is dealt with in the other 'sports pitches' reserved matters application, but it is welcome that this fence is not needed along this western edge as it should hopefully allow the use of a less imposing boundary treatment. In addition there may be the possibility of the City Council enhancing the planting on this edge, should the residential scheme come forward and the fields be adopted as open space.
- 6.9 Overall there are no objections to the proposed design and landscaping subject to conditions, the proposal is considered to comply with the above cited policy context.

Traffic and transport

- 6.10 The principle of the development has already been agreed including the impact on the local highway network, which is referred to in representations.
- 6.11 The new access road between the tennis centre car park and the new car park bends around the tennis centre extension on the north side, and the changes in direction are also proposed as a means of naturally calming traffic. The access road includes two angled crossing points, with fencing between on the tennis centre side to direct crossing to these locations.
- 6.12 120 parking spaces and 54 cycle spaces are proposed as required by the outline permission. The precise cycle facilities will still need to be agreed.
- 6.13 The applicants have provided indicative details of construction traffic arrangements given Officers' concerns regarding the use of the access road in front of the tennis centre. A construction method statement is required already under the outline condition, but the indicative arrangements give some comfort as to the proposals, which will ultimately be drawn up in detail by their principal contractor. They consider there are plenty of systems in place now for traffic management and a competent contractor should be able to deliver this. They also propose that the strategy will be agreed with the tennis centre directly. Their current strategy includes management of the existing access road for large vehicle movements to avoid blockages, a vehicle holding area before the new access road, a traffic control point at the start of the new road, a speed limit, hoarding to restrict ad hoc pedestrian

crossing of the new access road and a secure gate to the entrance of the site immediately east of the tennis centre, where the site compound is proposed. This is suggested to be the minimum expectation to ensure pedestrian and vehicular safety.

- 6.14 The Highway Authority's comments have not yet been received however the principle of development in this general arrangement has been accepted. Further conditions requiring details may be necessary depending on the Highway Authority's observations.

Residential amenity

- 6.15 The nearest residential properties would be about 170m to the north, 150m to the west and 240m to the south. In addition, there is a resolution from Committee to grant outline permission for residential development of the former Bishops College campus to the south/west.

- 6.16 No significant impact would be caused to the amenities of local residents from these proposals. Although the sports hall is a substantial building, given the separation distances to residential properties I do not agree that it would cause harmful overbearing or overshadowing effects. The elements included in this scheme are unlikely to cause any significant harm by virtue of noise. A noise fence is included in the other 'sports pitches' application. Controls over the construction phase are secured by conditions of the outline permission including times of work and management of construction activities.

- 6.17 The proposals would accord with the above cited policy context in terms of residential amenity.

Drainage and flood risk

- 6.18 Detailed drainage proposals are required under a condition of the outline permission, but the layout proposed here is compatible with providing a satisfactory drainage solution. Surface water flows from the hall, car park, pavilion and the pitches will be routed via a short swale to the side of the pavilion under the fields to the brook.

- 6.19 As the pavilion is within flood zone 3, flood plain compensation measures are proposed by lowering ground levels by around 20cm in the vicinity of the cricket nets to ensure that overall flood storage will not reduce within the floodplain. In practice this is more likely to be a levelling-off rather than a significant depression. The Drainage Engineer has confirmed that the proposals are acceptable in principle. The precise detail of the measures and their implementation should be secured by condition. The sequential test and principle of development of the area is established and there are no new issues that indicate that reserved matters approval should be withheld on drainage/flood risk grounds.

- 6.20 The proposals comply with the above cited Policy context for drainage and flood risk matters subject to conditions.

7.0 CONCLUSION

- 7.1 Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 provides that where regard is to be had to the development plan for the purpose of any determination to be made under the Planning Acts, the determination must be made in accordance with the plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.
- 7.2 The scheme complies with the outline permission and subject to several further conditions to secure specific details, is considered acceptable in terms of design, residential amenity and flood risk/drainage, and raises no new concerns that are not already assessed and addressed by conditions of the outline permission. The outstanding matter is of highways impact, in relation to which the principle of development is agreed. If the Highway Authority raises no objection, subject to any necessary conditions, the proposal would comply with the above cited policy context.

8.0 RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE DEVELOPMENT CONTROL MANAGER

- 8.1 That subject to there being no material planning considerations that have not already been addressed raised in representations received prior to 26th October 2016, and there being no objections from the Highway Authority that cannot be resolved by conditions, reserved matters approval is given subject to the following conditions and any further conditions necessary as a result of the outstanding responses;

Condition

The development shall be undertaken in accordance with the plans referenced

Proposed site plan UOG-GDA-V1-ZZ-DR-A-05_20-9002 Rev. P08 received by the Local Planning Authority on 10th October 2016.

Sports hall GA elevations UOG-GDA-V1-ZZ-DR-A-05_20-0003 Rev. P01 received by the Local Planning Authority on 2nd August 2016.

Sports hall Proposed GA Plan UOG-GDA-V1-00-DR-A-05_20-0001 Rev. P04 received by the Local Planning Authority on 2nd August 2016.

Sports hall Proposed roof plan UOG-GDA-V1-R1-DR-A-05_20-0001 Rev. P04 received by the Local Planning Authority on 2nd August 2016.

Sports hall GA Sections UOG-GDA-V1-ZZ-DR-A-05_20-0004 Rev. P01 received by the Local Planning Authority on 2nd August 2016.

Cricket pavilion – GA Plan UOG-GDA-V2-00-DR-A-05_20-0001 Rev. P01 received by the Local Planning Authority on 2nd August 2016.

Cricket pavilion – GA Elevations UOG-GDA-V2-ZZ-DR-A-05_20-0002 Rev. P01 received by the Local Planning Authority on 2nd August 2016.

Cricket pavilion – GA Sections UOG-GDA-V2-ZZ-DR-A-05_20-0003 Rev. P01 received by the Local Planning Authority on 2nd August 2016.

Landscape context - 150/101 Rev. C received by the Local Planning Authority on 10th October 2016.

Landscape GA 150/102 Rev. D received by the Local Planning Authority on 10th October 2016.

Sports centre plant schedule Rev. C received by the Local Planning Authority on 10th October 2016.

(Any additional plans agreed by the Highway Authority)

except where otherwise required by conditions of this approval.

Reason

To ensure the works are carried out in accordance with the approved plans.

Condition

This approval relates only to the sports hall, car park and pavilion and associated development and not to the proposals shown hatched out on plan ref. UOG-GDA-V1-ZZ-DR-A-05_20-9002 Rev. P08 Proposed Site Plan.

Reason

To clarify the terms of this approval.

Condition

Notwithstanding that shown on the submitted plans, fences/railings and other means of enclosure shall be implemented only in accordance with details (set out on scaled plans) that have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason

To ensure that the design and materials are appropriate to their context, in accordance with Policy SD5 of the Gloucester, Cheltenham and Tewkesbury Joint Core Strategy Submission Version November 2014, Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework and Policies BE.5 and BE.7 of the Second Deposit City of Gloucester Local Plan (2002).

Condition

The public access path and gate adjacent to the tennis centre providing access to and from the former Bishops College fields shall be completed in accordance with that shown on the Proposed site plan UOG-GDA-V1-ZZ-DR-A-05_20-9002 Rev. P08 (not that indicated on the landscape context plan) prior to the commencement of use of the second of the two sports pitches

hereby granted reserved matters approval or to an alternative timetable and/or specification to be agreed to in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason

Its provision provides a convenient and sustainable link for residents to and from the recreation facilities and to maximise the design opportunities of the site in accordance with the NPPF, Policy SD5 of the Gloucester, Cheltenham and Tewkesbury Joint Core Strategy Submission Version November 2014 and Policy BE.4 of the Second Deposit City of Gloucester Local Plan (2002).

Condition

Above ground construction of the pavilion shall not commence until flood plain compensation measures have been fully implemented in accordance with details to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority (that shall be broadly in accordance with that shown on drawing no. 8160668/SK06 Rev. B 'Drainage Strategy' included as Appendix F of the Flood Risk Assessment received by the Local Planning Authority on 20th October 2016 unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority).

Reason

To secure the detail and implementation of measures to ensure that overall flood storage will not reduce within the floodplain, in accordance with Policies FRP.1a and FRP.3 of the City of Gloucester Second Deposit Local Plan 2002, Policy INF 3 of the Joint Core Strategy Pre-Submission Document 2014, and Paragraphs 100 and 103 of the NPPF.

Condition

No building shall be occupied until a SuDS maintenance plan for all SuDS/attenuation features and associated pipework has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved SuDS maintenance plan shall be implemented in full in accordance with the agreed terms and conditions and shall operate for the lifetime of the development.

Reason

To ensure that the development is provided with a satisfactory means of drainage as well as to reduce the risk of creating or exacerbating a flooding problem and to minimise the risk of pollution, in accordance with Policies FRP.1a, FRP.6, FRP.11 of the City of Gloucester Second Deposit Local Plan 2002 Policy INF3 of the Gloucester, Cheltenham and Tewkesbury Joint Core Strategy Submission Version 2014 and Paragraph 103 of the NPPF.

Condition

This approval does not relate to the wind turbine originally submitted with the application.

Reason

To clarify the terms of the application as agreed with the applicant as the outline permission does not relate to this development.

Decision:

Notes:

.....

.....

Person to contact: Adam Smith
(Tel: 396702)

16/00945/REM

**University Of Gloucestershire
Oxstalls Lane
Gloucester
GL2 9HW**

Planning Committee 01.11.2016

