

Meeting	Planning Committee
Date	13 April 2026
Present	Councillors Crawshaw (Chair), Fisher (Vice-Chair), Ayre, Baxter, J Burton, Clarke, Cullwick, Melly, Steward, Watson and Whitcroft
In Attendance	Gareth Arnold – Development Manager Sandra Branigan - Senior Lawyer Erik Matthews – Senior Planning Officer

19. Apologies for Absence (4:34pm)

There were no apologies for absence.

20. Declarations of Interest (4:34pm)

Members were asked to declare at this point in the meeting any disclosable pecuniary interest or other registerable interest they might have in respect of business on the agenda, if they had not already done so in advance on the Register of Interests. Cllr Steward noted that he had attended St Peter's School and Cllr Burton noted that she had attended Queen Anne Grammar School. There were no further declarations of interest.

21. Public Participation (4:34pm)

It was reported that there had been no registrations to speak at the meeting under the Council's Public Participation Scheme on general matters within the remit of the Planning Committee.

22. Plans List (4:35pm)

Members considered a report of the Head of Planning and Development, relating to the following planning application, outlining the proposals and relevant policy considerations and setting out the views of consultees and officers.

**23. St Peter's School, Clifton, York, YO30 6AB [25/02526/FUL]
(4:35pm)**

Members considered a full application from St Peters School for the erection of an outdoor multi-use games area (MUGA) with associated boundary treatment and landscaping at St Peters School, Clifton, York.

The Development Manager gave a presentation on the application. He was asked and explained that:

- The boundary between the fence to the North Parade properties boundary was 11m and he showed it on the screen. The Chair clarified that it was not known whether the structures next to the boundary were occupied. The Development Manager added that some of the structures were habitable.
- The proposal did not include netting over the MUGA.
- The boundary fence was 3m and the hedge approximately 3m, with variances in places. The tree planting in the plans looked to replicate the existing tree planting, which was approximately 6-8m high.
- The size of the MUGA.
- The storage of the cricket nets would not be micromanaged.
- The depth of the single storeys on the North Parade properties adjoining the boundary wall was approximately 4-5m.
- Regarding noise impact, Public Protection colleagues had been consulted.
- The cricket pitches had been in use post 2017.

The Senior Planning Officer gave an update on the application, noting the additional policy clarification regarding policy ED8, an additional representation regarding the noise impact assessment and two additional conditions regarding the restriction of uses and new landscaping.

Public Speakers

Tim Bradbury, a resident on North Parade, spoke in objection to the application. He explained that the noise impact assessment was not fit for purpose, adding the noise profile out of lessons was different to informal lessons. He noted that there was no noise management plan or complaints policy. He noted his concerns regarding a lack of a construction management plan. He was asked and described the current noise situation. He was also asked and explained that noise for neighbouring houses varied with the different house extensions.

Giles Roberts (Director of Operations at St Peter's School) spoke in support of the application. He explained that the application included the existing grassed area and that it would make the area more usable primarily for Years 7 and 8. He explained the hours of use, that there were

no floodlights on the pitch and that the MUGA would not be available for use by the general public. He explained that the landscaping would protect neighbours' privacy and would provide a noise barrier. He noted that it was not felt that a construction management plan was needed.

Giles Roberts was joined by his colleague Tracey Allain (Head of Senior School) and Janet O'Neill (Planning Consultant) to answer to any questions in relation to the application. In response to Member questions, they explained that:

- School started at 8.20am and it was not envisaged that more than 15-20 pupils (supervised) would use the MUGA before school. It was currently envisaged that Years 7 and 8 would use the MUGA.
- The MUGA would be used as a playground and for informal use for Years 7 and 8 during break and lunchtime, which would be supervised.
- The area at the far side of the site would be used for the storage of the cricket covers and mobile nets.
- Regarding the Sport England guidance, the school was entitled to use its facilities for the purpose of education. The use class was education and it was currently used by pupils every lunchtime.
- Regarding reaching out to the community for use, Clifton Green Primary School used the pool for free.
- Regarding a potential condition regarding netting, they would consider it.
- The school was a boarding school and there was a vetting system for lettings. If children came with a club to the site, the school had a responsibility for all children on the site. They needed to control the site and make sure it was secure.
- Regarding unstructured play activities, currently at lunchtime 15-20 Year 11 pupils would play football and at other times, there would be 3-4 pupils working with a coach.

In answer to Member questions, officers explained that:

- The use class was as an educational facility which was the only control as the planning authority.
- The hours were based on the noise impact. There was no condition regarding who could use the MUGA and there was nothing in planning conditions saying that the MUGA could not be used for holiday clubs. The hours recommended were because of noise issues and not who would be using it. The Chair noted that the committee could condition that the MUGA could not be used for interschool competitive activities.
- It was clarified that under the current community use agreement the demand for facilities was low as the area was hired out infrequently. It was confirmed that community use could be conditioned.

- Regarding the requirement for a contraction management plan, these would normally be for major developments and there would not normally be on a scheme of that nature on the site.
- The Sports England guidance was in respect of noise and glare from floodlighting. There had been a noise assessment that adequately covered sports assessment.
- It was explained how the public benefits would be met. There was nothing in the NPPF and council planning policies regarding fee paying education. The policy was regarding improving educational facilities, then the public benefit applied. The Senior Lawyer confirmed that something could be a public benefit if it only benefitted certain sections of the public.
- The MUGA was not to be used for padel and there was no requirement for hard panels for noise mitigation.
- Condition 10 covered lighting. The lighting ran the length of the path next to the hedge.

[The meeting adjourned from 5.59pm until 6.06pm.]

Members debated the application. During debate the Chair noted that Sport England were a statutory consultee and had not objected. Cllr Fisher proposed and Cllr Ayre seconded a condition for netting to protect the amenity of residents from ball strike. This was carried with three Members voting in favour, two against, and 6 abstentions.

A Member asked if a condition regarding community use could be added. The Development Manager noted the policy and explained the school had no intention to enter into a community use agreement. The Chair proposed that there be no interschool letting and no letting to outside bodies to protect the amenity of residents. This was seconded by Cllr Melly. This was carried with nine Members voting in favour, none against and two abstentions. Cllr Watson then proposed the recommendation to approve with two additional conditions detailed in the update, a condition relating to netting and condition for no interschool letting and no letting to outside bodies. Following a vote with ten Members voting in favour, none against and one abstention, it was:

Resolved: That the application be approved subject to the additional conditions below:

Additional Conditions

Restriction of uses

The Multi-Use Games Area hereby authorised shall not be marked out for the playing of hockey or Padel and shall not be used for the playing of hockey or Padel.

Reason: To safeguard the residential amenity of neighbouring properties and secure compliance with Policies D1 and ENV2 of the Local Plan.

New landscaping

The development shall not be brought into use until there has been submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority a detailed landscaping scheme for the tree/shrub planting buffer shown on the proposed site plan which shall illustrate the number, species, height and position of trees and shrubs. This scheme shall be implemented within a period of six months of the completion of the development. Any trees which die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of a similar size and species, unless alternatives are agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: So that the Local Planning Authority may be satisfied with the variety, suitability and disposition of species within the site in the interests of residential amenity and the character and appearance of the area.

Installation of netting

That netting be installed above the MUGA.

Reason: To protect the amenity of residents from ball strike.

Letting

That there be no interschool letting and no letting to outside bodies.

Reason: To protect the amenity of residents.

Reason: In terms of the overall planning balance the proposal would address the requirements of Policies HW3 and ED6 of fulfilling unmet sports provision at the school. It would however generate a degree of harm to the significance of the Conservation Area by partially eroding its open character although that degree of harm is felt to be modest and outweighed in the balance by the

provision of unmet need for practise provision. There is scope arising from the development to harm residential amenity of neighbouring properties by virtue of additional noise and disturbance which should be afforded significant weight. That can however be addressed by planning conditions to the extent that it can be mitigated to an acceptable level. Within the overall planning balance the proposal is therefore felt to be acceptable.

Cllr Crawshaw, Chair

[The meeting started at 4.31 pm and finished at 7.01 pm].