

# PETITION REQUIRING COUNCIL DEBATE – PLANNING APPLICATION 2414/APP/2012/2812 – KINGS COLLEGE PLAYING FIELDS

Reporting Officer: Head of Democratic Services

## SUMMARY

To inform Council of a petition that has been received regarding a planning application at the Kings College playing fields site that requires debate.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:** That Council note the petition and the views of the petitioners and refer the petition to the North Planning Committee for consideration with all other representations and relevant material when determining the planning application to which it refers.

## BACKGROUND

1. If a petition is submitted to the Council containing more than 2,500 signatures of people aged over 18 years of age it will, in most circumstances, trigger a Council debate. The Council will endeavour to consider the petition at its next meeting, although on some occasions this may not be possible and consideration will then take place at the following meeting.
2. The petition organiser (or their representative) will be given five minutes to present the petition at the meeting and the petition will then be debated by Members. The petition organiser will not be able to take part in the debate with Members. A maximum of two petitions will be allocated for discussions at any one Council meeting. The Council will decide how to respond to the petition at this meeting. They may decide to take the action the petition requests, not to take the action requested for reasons put forward in the debate, or to commission further investigation into the matter, for example by a relevant committee.

## THE PETITION

4. On 8 February 2013, a petition was received by Democratic Services containing approximately 5,500 signatures, led by Mr Mike Grimmel of Park Avenue, Ruislip. The petition states:

*"We the undersigned, object to Eastcote Hockey's Club's plans to fence off another area of Kings College Playing fields for the construction of a second Astro turf pitch. These are public playing fields for the use of the whole community and not just for the exclusive benefit of Eastcote Hockey Club. If these plans are allowed to go ahead, as well as issues with visual impact, noise and light pollution, extra traffic and flood risk, we will lose trees to make way for another car park on the fields."*

5. Democratic Services confirm that in accordance with the petition rules the minimum of 2,500 of the signatures were valid and of adult age.

6. The petition relates to a planning application ref: 2414/APP/2012/2812, submitted by The Eastcote Hockey Club, based at Kings College Road, Ruislip on 13 November 2012 for the following development:

*Construction of an all-weather, sand dressed multi-purpose sports playing pitch, with associated floodlighting, fencing and car parking.*

7. The pitch would be located immediately to the south east of the existing club house and occupy an area of 101.4 x 63 metres, which inclusive of its fenced enclosure would total 6,737 square metres. The proposed pitch would be similar in scale and appearance of the existing all-weather pitch, located to the south of the River Pinn. The proposed pitch would be enclosed by a 4 metre high fence, which increases to 4.5 metres in height behind each goal end.
8. The existing club car park would be extended to the south and the metal containers in the existing car park removed to accommodate a further 30 car parking spaces (including 3 disabled parking spaces). Access to the pitch would be via a new footpath from the south east corner of the club house to the entrance to the pitch. 4 no. 15 metre high floodlights are proposed on either side of the new pitch (8 floodlights in total), located approximately 1 metre from the perimeter fencing.
9. 752 local residents/ amenity groups have been consulted. To date, 485 individual responses have been received and it is anticipated that, at the earliest, the application will be reported to the 26 March North Planning Committee.

### **Financial Implications**

10. There are no specific financial implications arising directly from this report.

### **Legal Implications**

11. Under Part 5 (E) of the Council's Constitution, the Council has the power to hear and debate this petition in accordance with procedures set out.
12. In considering the recommendations, Council's role is to:
  - Consider and listen to the views of the petitioners;
  - Debate the matter in accordance with Standing Orders and;
  - Make a decision on what action to take.
13. In doing the above, Council should be aware that, under the terms of the Constitution, authority for determining planning applications is delegated to the two area based Planning Committees where speaking rights for petitioners are well established.
14. Council must have regard to the requirements of Article 13 of the Council's Constitution which sets out the seven principles that should be followed when making decisions and should not seek to make a determination on a planning application without full access to all the relevant material.

BACKGROUND PAPERS: Planning application ref: 2414/APP/2012/2812