

From: ?

Sent: 31 March 2021 20:40

Dear Sir/ Madam

I appreciate the deadline for objections is 1 April, and as I have not received a response to my concerns stated in my Pre- Application Consultation Response I sent to LRM on 1/11/20 (see below), unless I have missed it on the Council website, these issues have not been addressed, some 5 months later.

'As my garden backs onto the school playing field, I have concerns about noise, light pollution and security, especially if the 3G pitches are to be used by the community from 7-9 pm every weekday and 9-5 on weekends. Such use will have an adverse effect on my enjoyment of my garden and home. From research, noise is likely to be the worst issue: has consideration been given to the proximity of the pitches to residents on Caerphilly Road and The Griffin?

Are there regulations regarding the proximity of pitches to residential gardens and or houses? If so, what are they? Do the current plans comply with them?

The plan of the middle 3G pitch is very close to the boundary of my garden, where there are 2 trees, a large oak and a smaller holly. Is there some sort of tree root protection zone as there's a risk of damage during construction of the 4.5 metre fence and the pitch surface? If not, could the pitch be moved back towards the stream a small distance? It is important to me to retain these trees as some sort of partial screen.

From the plans it appears the three proposed rugby pitches are of three different sizes, if so why?

I note the middle of the pitches, which is the largest, is floodlit and is for both football and rugby. Does this mean it is envisaged it will be used the most? If so, would it be better sited as far away as possible from residences?

4.8 of the Planning Statement comments there are currently 2 floodlit playing pitches in use, one is the aging MUGA, where is the other?

Is it possible to see an image of similar 3G pitches the same size with 4.5 metres around its entire boundary and 15 metre columns for floodlights? Am I correct with these dimensions? (The detail on the plan is difficult to see clearly)

In addition I am concerned about the aspect from my house and garden. In particular, the close proximity of the artificial pitches with high fences all around and enormous columns for the floodlights will dominate my view. What colour is the fence around the pitches? I understand black is easier than green to see through, is this correct?

2.8 of the Planning Statement comments there could be vehicular access from Caerphilly Road. Is this for construction purposes or ongoing maintenance/ some other purpose?

In respect of community use, I am concerned that the cost of supervision and maintenance, and security issues will outweigh the benefit to the school. Research suggests that to run a 3G pitch on a sustainable financial basis, it should be sited at a major sports amenity such as a leisure centre to provide the required supervision and security in the evenings and weekends. Please comment.

If the plans go ahead, what would LRM envisage as the best boundary provision to preserve residents' privacy, security, and reduce noise and light pollution?

I also have concerns regarding sustainability and health, and one of the reports states the importance of a 'sustainable development'. At a time when there is increasing concern about the use of 'plastics', it seems contradictory to be digging up a large proportion of the grass playing fields and replacing them with manmade surfaces. These pitches are not environmentally sustainable, they last 8-10 years, and then placed in landfill or otherwise disposed of. There are also concerns about the toxic chemicals in 3G rubber crumb artificial sports fields with suggestions that microplastics are carcinogenic. Have these issues been considered? From the 'key comments' of staff 'environmental sustainability' was an issue, I assume this was in relation to all expansion plans including sports facilities? Were the sustainability and health issues stated above discussed and/ or brought to staff and schoolchildren's attention during 'consultations'? If so, what was the outcome?

I am concerned about the likely increase in traffic and parking issues in Bassaleg, during community use and on an everyday basis. Already there are times of the day traffic is at a standstill or moving very slowly.

Is it proposed the rest of the school to be used by the community?

Has a lux plot/ light spillage report been created? If so, could this be made public? If not, why not? What time would floodlights be turned off and the site vacated following community use on weeknights, 9pm or later?

Currently, there are a number of bright white lights at the school at night. Are these security lights? Will there be more with the new building? If night lights are necessary could they be changed to yellow lights so less light pollution and angled in such a way they don't project across the playing fields? This would minimise adverse effects for people and wildlife

I have concerns about wildlife especially bats and hope thorough checks are carried out as detailed. Will reports detailing such checks and their results be available for public viewing, such as those in 5.2.1-5.2.3 in the Ecology Report?

Given the size and complexity of some of the documentation and the extent of the development, it would have been helpful to have had a virtual tour/ video of the proposed changes online, in the absence of being able to see a model at the council offices, as would usually be available in non Covid times.

The old OS map used by Powell Dobson, although it shows the school boundaries, does not accurately reflect the number of private residences close to the school, and therefore affected by the proposed plans. Could any future plans be accurate in this regard?

The report of the hedge boundaries is not comprehensive/ accurate e.g., it states one hedge is patchy in places but does not comment on mine when it is in a similar condition.

Bassaleg school undoubtedly needs new facilities, but the proposal of 3G pitches for community use presents a range of issues: noise and light pollution, security issues and problems with traffic and parking.'

I would appreciate it if you could acknowledge receipt of this email and let me know how and when my concerns will be addressed.

Yours sincerely



From: NCC - School Reorg

Sent: 07 April 2021 12:45

Firstly, please accept my apology for this delayed confirmation of having received your email.

Secondly, I would like to advise that the statutory School Reorganisation consultation and proposal, and the Pre Application Consultation (PAC) process are separate and independent processes.

The School Reorganisation consultation process is one through which the council must consider and determine the proposal to, in this case, increase the capacity of the school. This process ensures that a public consultation is undertaken and that people are given the opportunity to object to the proposal. Any objections are summarised and duly considered before the proposal is determined by Cabinet.

The PAC process conducted by LRM Planning on behalf of the Council represents the initial part of the planning process. It is through the planning application process that the acceptability of *how* the proposal can be delivered is considered and determined, by the Council's planning committee.

Responses submitted to LRM Planning as part of the PAC process are taken into consideration and will be addressed in a report submitted with the planning application, to the Planning Authority. If you have raised these queries with LRM I would expect them to be addressed within the planning application submission.

I have very limited knowledge of the details concerning the planning matters, but offer the information below as far as my understanding allows.

- 1) The potential impact of light and noise pollution from the proposed pitches on local residences is being fully assessed with options considered to minimise this impact. There are regulations which set acceptable limits, and the acceptability of our proposal will be considered by Environmental Officers as statutory consultees to the planning application.
- 2) The trees to which you refer will be retained/protected. Again, details of any protection requirements will be provided during the planning application process.
- 3) The pitches of differing sizes are proposed to maximise the available sports pitch provision to pupils, within the constraints of the school site.
- 4) The Council is advised that the Football Association of Wales have concluded that there is no evidence to support claims that 3G pitches pose any threat to the environment or to the health of people using them.
- 5) We are aware of traffic and parking concerns and further traffic surveys were conducted in December. The proposals will be considered and commented on by Highways Officers as part of the planning process.
- 6) I understand that consideration is being given to making the hall, drama and music studios available for community use, although ultimately this will be a matter for the school.
- 7) Bat and other Ecology surveys will be conducted over the spring/summer period, prior to the submission of the full planning application.

I appreciate that I am not able to answer many of your queries, and that for you an understanding of some of the detail is key to your position on the proposal. These details will be considered as part of the planning application process and all relevant information will be made available on the Council's planning portal.

In the meantime, I will be grateful if you confirm whether you wish your points below to be registered as an objection to the school reorganisation proposal?

Best wishes,

Swyddog Trawsnewid Addysg / Education Transformation Officer

Dear Richard

Thank you for your email

Although the statutory School Reorganisation Consultation and proposal and PAC process are separate and independent processes, as you have stated the detail is key, and as yet no detail received, so I am unable to comment on whether I object or not. You state you 'expect' my concerns

to be addressed and have given some general comments, which is helpful in a broad way but is insufficient in detail.

To date the process is, in my view, been inequitable to residents such as myself, I had a month to object, which was later increased to 6 weeks, whereas 5 months later still no PAC report published. It would have been helpful if the PAC report was made public at least a month before the deadline for objections, to allow residents to decide whether they needed to object or not.

Kind regards

