From: Peter Barnett
Sent: 16 September 2013 10:53
To: 'Chris.Bartlett@westsussex.gov.uk'
Subject: WSCC/077/13/SU
Attachments: Report 1077.doc

Chris

Please find attached my report and recommendation in respect of the above consultation.

Regards

Peter Barnett

Peter Barnett - Principal Planning Officer, Development Management | Adur & Worthing Council Services
Location: Portland House, 44 Richmond Road, Worthing, West Sussex, BN11 1HS
Internal: 1310 | External: 01903 221310 | E-mail: peter.barnett@adur-worthing.gov.uk
Follow us on Facebook and Twitter - or search Adur and Worthing

Please think before you print this and save paper

Development Management - Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/1077/13 **Recommendation – No objection subject to re-siting**

Site: St Nicolas and St Mary C E Primary School, Eastern Avenue, Shoreham-By-Sea, West Sussex, BN43 6PE

Proposal: West Sussex County Council Consultation for construction of a tarmacadam netball court on school playing fields.

Date of site visit: N/A

Neighbours checked: N/A

Additional neighbour notifications: N/A

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

This application will be determined by West Sussex County Council and is referred to this Council for consultation purposes only. The application is submitted under Regulation 3 of the Town & Country Planning General Regulations 1992.

The site is within the built up area of Shoreham. The school is due to undergo building works as it expands its pupil numbers and, as a result of the works, a portion of the playground will be unavailable for use. The proposal is therefore to construct a hardsurface netball court on part of the school playing field. The school enjoys a large area of playing field and this proposal would not compromise the ability to still provide two 7-a-side football pitches and a running track. The court would double up as a hard play area during break times.

The school currently has two netball courts but this will reduced to one after the expansion works, and this is another reason why the school wishes to construct a new netball court to ensure that it can continue to offer suitable resources for sport.

The court will not be floodlit. It will measure 33m by 20m and is to be located to the south of the school building, just 8.6m from the boundary with 95 Eastern Avenue.

Consultations

Under the relevant Regulations, all consultations with statutory and other bodies and publicity are carried out by WSCC and replies including by the public are made direct to WSCC.

Adur & Worthing Councils: The Environmental Health Officer comments that he has no objections in principle but suggests, if it is feasible, to move the Court in order that the western edge of the Court abuts the blue line on the

submitted site plan. The extra distance would help with noise control and would be more in keeping with the policy objectives of the NPPF and NPSE.

Third Parties: [NB. Representations from Third Parties are made direct to WSCC]

Relevant Planning Policies

Adopted Adur District Local Plan 1993-2006 (ADC 1996) (saved policies): AG1, ACS1
National Planning Policy Framework (CLG 2012)

Planning Assessment

Principle

Policy ACS1 states that the District Planning Authority will support or permit new education facilities on sites within the built up area. There is no objection in principle to this development.

Visual amenity

The building is not clearly visible when viewed from the road and surrounding area. There is no adverse impact on the visual amenity of the locality.

Residential amenity

The nearest residential properties are approximately 8.6 metres away in Eastern Avenue to the east. The proximity of the court is a concern and, while the whole of the playing field is available for sports activity, the formation of a formal sports area which is likely to be more intensively used than the playing field, is considered to be more likely to generate some noise disturbance and WSCC are requested to consider relocation of the court further west.

Recommendation

That West Sussex County Council be informed that the District Council has no objection to the proposal in principle but requests that the court is relocated further west to enable greater separation to the nearest dwellings. .

Is recommendation contrary to letter(s) of representation? N/A

Case Officer: Peter Barnett Date: 13 September 2013

Authorised by: Gary Peck Date: 16 September 2013