

TO: PLANNING & REGULATORY COMMITTEE **DATE:** 18 November 2014
BY: PLANNING DEVELOPMENT TEAM MANAGER
DISTRICT(S) Surrey Heath Borough Council **ELECTORAL DIVISION(S):**
Bagshot, Windlesham and
Chobham
Mr Goodman

PURPOSE: FOR DECISION **GRID REF:** 491429; 162759

TITLE: SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL PROPOSAL SU14/0852

SUMMARY REPORT

Land at Connaught Junior School, Manor Way, Bagshot, Surrey GU19 5JY

Erection of single storey extension comprising two classrooms; installation of external staircase and external door replacing a window in existing building; installation of new and widened pathways; provision of fire appliance access and additional bicycle parking spaces.

Connaught Junior School caters for 360 pupils. The school is located in a residential area of Bagshot with primary road access from Bagshot Green/Manor Way and secondary access from Green Lane/Broomsquires Road. The site is adjoined by residential uses to the north, east and west and by a nursery and a youth and community centre to the south.

The current proposal is for a flat roofed single storey two classroom extension to accommodate expansion from 3 Form Entry (360 pupils) to 4 Form Entry (480 pupils). The extension would be situated at the southern end of a single storey, pitch roofed wing. The extension would join onto a portion of the building with a flat roof. The location was chosen to enable year groupings to be kept together and for reasons of accessibility and minimising effects on visual amenity, informal play space, trees and urban green space. The proposed facing brick would match that of the parent building. The development includes ancillary components - additional parking for bicycles, new and widened pathways and a new staircase and external doorway, as well as access for fire engines.

The main issues relate to transportation aspects and residential amenity. Seven representations from neighbours raise the issues of traffic congestion, on-site and on-street parking, road safety especially of pedestrians and to a lesser extent residential amenity particularly through loss of trees. The County Highway Authority finds the development acceptable, endorsing the finding of the submitted Transportation Assessment that there would be sufficient capacity on nearby residential roads for temporary parking of parents' vehicles during the morning and afternoon peak periods. The County Highway Authority recommends that the present on-site car park be used for the parking of staff vehicles as well as those of visitors. Officers consider that the impact of the proposal in transportation terms is satisfactory, subject to applying conditions relating to the dual use of the existing visitors' car park, the provision of additional cycle parking

spaces, the updating and implementation of the School Travel Plan and the regulation of construction related traffic.

Officers consider that the development would have no adverse impacts on residential amenity. Although some small trees would be lost to the development, these trees are not considered to be significant in amenity terms. The remaining trees would be protected and are considered to offer sufficient visual screening. Conditions are recommended to protect these trees.

The proposal is considered to comply with the Development Plan policies.

The recommendation is to PERMIT subject to conditions

APPLICATION DETAILS

Applicant

Estates Planning and Management

Date application valid

12 September 2014

Period for Determination

7 November 2014

Amending Documents

Application form dated 04/07/14 and received on 03/10/14
Site Location Plan, Drawing number B1727800/A/050.001, Rev P3, dated 10/09/14
Proposed Site Plan, Drawing number B1727800/A/050.003, Rev P4, dated 04/11/14
Proposed Block Plan, Drawing number B1727800/A/050.005, Rev P3, dated 03/11/14
Proposed GA Floor Plans, Drawing number B1727800/A/100.002, Rev P4, dated 26/09/14
Proposed Elevations, Drawing number B1727800/A/140.002, Rev P5, dated 26/09/14
Arboricultural Implication Assessment & Method Statement dated February 2014 and received on 31/10/14

SUMMARY OF PLANNING ISSUES

This section identifies and summarises the main planning issues in the report. The full text should be considered before the meeting.

	Is this aspect of the proposal in accordance with the development plan?	Paragraphs in the report where this has been discussed
Design and Visual Amenity	YES	19-21
Impact on Residential Amenity	YES	22-26
Effect on Urban Green Space	YES	27-29
Transportation Considerations	YES	30-41
Impact on Trees	YES	42-46

ILLUSTRATIVE MATERIAL

Site Plan

Plan

Aerial Photographs

Aerial

Map

Street Map

Site Photographs

Figure 1: Looking southeast towards location of extension and school playing fields

Figure 2: View to the northwest towards location of extension

Figure 3: Looking north along Bagshot Green towards its junction with Manor Way

Figure 4: View to the north along Green Lane from the easterly entrance to the school

BACKGROUND

Site Description

1. Connaught Junior School is a 3 Form Entry (FE) school located in a residential part of Bagshot about 300m north of the M3 Motorway. The site has access from the north via residential roads, from Manor Way and Bagshot Green to the main entrance leading to the 17 space staff car park and from Green Lane and Broomsquires Road to a secondary entrance to the east. This entrance serves a 12 space overflow car park used by visitors. The access roads are all residential roads.
2. The building dates from the 1960s and features red brick walls, white window and door frames and predominantly pitched roofs with brown tiles. The school was previously a secondary school. Consequently it is oversized for its current use, having a number of specialist teaching spaces for subjects such as French, music, food technology, ICT and art/pottery. The building occupies the northwest part of the site, which slopes down slightly towards its northern and western boundaries. The hall and a two storey wing take advantage of this, being at a lower level than the rest of the building. There is a fenced hard play area marked out as a ball court to the east of the building, with playing fields to the south and the east. The northern, eastern and western site boundaries are lined with trees, with a small copse wrapping around the northwest and southern elevations of the building, including where the extension is proposed to be located.
3. The site adjoins residential uses on the north, east and west, separated from those on the west by a footpath set in woodland. To the south is a nursery and a youth and community centre with playing fields.

Planning History

4. There is no recent planning history at this site.

THE PROPOSAL

5. This proposal is for a single storey extension comprising two year 6 classrooms served by a new corridor which would extend an existing one. The project includes the conversion of two specialist spaces to classrooms. The scheme as a whole would increase the capacity of the school from 360 pupils (3FE) to 480 children (4FE) by providing four new classrooms. The number of staff would increase from 51 to 60. The extension would have 171 sq m of floorspace and is proposed to be located at the southern end of a single storey wing which extends in a southwesterly direction. The location of the extension was selected to enable year groupings to be kept together. Other advantages are ease of accessibility, and minimising visual impact, effect on existing informal play areas, impact on trees and intrusion into urban green space. The applicant considered four other options for locating the building, but none of these was pursued for various reasons including distance from the existing year 6 classrooms, loss of informal play space and accessibility. The extension has a modern design featuring a flat roof consistent with the adjacent part of the existing building, facing brickwork to match existing, floor to ceiling windows with a brise soliel along the top to provide solar protection, grey powder coated aluminium window and door frames and white powder coated aluminium doors.

- 6. The proposal includes the installation of a fire escape and associated external door, new and widened paths, improvements to access for fire appliances and the provision of an additional 18 spaces for cycle parking, resulting in 48 in total.
- 7. The proposal originally included the installation of another external staircase connected with the internal refurbishment and reorganisation of the school. This staircase and the associated door were subsequently dropped from the scheme.
- 8. The application is supported by a Transport Statement, a School Travel Plan, an Arboricultural Report and details of access by contractors.

CONSULTATIONS AND PUBLICITY

District Council

- 9. Surrey Heath Borough Council: No objection (email, to be confirmed in writing)

Consultees (Statutory and Non-Statutory)

- 10. County Highway Authority –
Transportation Development Planning: No objection subject to conditions and the present car park for visitors being made available for members of staff
- 11. County Arboricultural Manager: No comments received

Parish/Town Council and Amenity Groups

- 12. Windlesham Parish Council: No comments received

Summary of publicity undertaken and key issues raised by public

- 13. The application was publicised by the posting of 2 site notices. A total of 121 owner/occupiers of neighbouring properties were directly notified by letter. Seven representations were received raising issues relating to transportation aspects (mainly traffic congestion and on-street parking) and amenity matters (proximity of the proposed extension to residential properties and the loss of trees). Suggestions are made for improving the transportation situation.

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

14. The County Council as County Planning Authority has a duty under Section 38 (6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 to determine this application in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) (1990 Act) requires local planning authorities when determining planning applications to “have regard to (a) the provisions of the development plan, so far as material to the application, (b) any local finance considerations, so far as material to the application, and (c) any other material considerations”. At present in relation to this application the Development Plan consists of the policies of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012 and the Surrey Heath Local Plan 2000.
15. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was adopted in March 2012. This document provides guidance to local planning authorities in producing local plans and in making decisions on planning applications. The NPPF is intended to make the planning system less complex and more accessible by summarising national guidance which replaces numerous planning policy statements and guidance notes, circulars and various letters to Chief Planning Officers. The document is based on the principle of the planning system making an important contribution to sustainable development, which is seen as achieving positive growth that strikes a balance between economic, social and environmental factors. The Development Plan remains the cornerstone of the planning system. Planning applications which comply with an up to date Development Plan should be approved. Refusal should only be on the basis of conflict with the Development Plan and other material considerations.
16. The NPPF states that policies in Local Plans should not be considered out of date simply because they were adopted prior to publication of the framework. However, the policies in the NPPF are material considerations which planning authorities should take into account. Due weight should be given to relevant policies in existing plans according to their degree of consistency with the NPPF (the closer the policies are to the policies in the Framework, the greater the weight they may be given).
17. The NPPF highlights that the Government attaches great importance to ensuring that a sufficient choice of school places is available to meet the needs of existing and new communities. It continues by stating that Local Planning Authorities should take a proactive, positive and collaborative approach to meeting this requirement, and to development that will widen choice in education. It states that Local Planning Authorities should, inter alia, give great weight to the need to create, expand or alter schools.
18. The part of the site containing the existing buildings is within the Urban Area designation in the Core Strategy. The proposed extension is located in a Green Space within a settlement area. The planning issues are design and visual amenity, impact on residential amenity, effect on urban green space, transportation considerations and impact on trees.

Design and Visual Amenity

Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012

Policy DM9 – Design Principles

19. Core Strategy Policy DM9 requires high quality design that respects and enhances local character, paying particular regard to matters such as scale, and materials. The policy requires development to respect the amenities of occupiers of neighbouring properties.
20. The extension would have walls of red facing brick and a flat roof, matching the brickwork and roof of the adjoining portion of the existing building. The external staircase is proposed to be of galvanised steel painted green to match other external metal work such as handrails and a balcony. Officers consider that the design of the extension is in keeping with the features and materials of the main building, and that the extension would not detract from local character.
21. The development is considered to accord with this Development Plan policy.

Impact on Residential Amenity

Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012

Policy DM9 – Design Principles

22. Core Strategy Policy DM9 requires development to respect the amenities of occupiers of neighbouring properties.
23. The nearest residence to the proposed extension is located approximately 28m to the northwest. There are other residences abutting the school site on the west, and these would be more than 30m from the extension. All of these dwellings are located beyond a belt of trees situated along the school site boundary and separated by a footpath set in woodland.
24. One representation questions the location of the extension close to residential properties and this and another representation both express concern with the impact of the removal of some of the intervening trees in terms of privacy, noise and visual amenity.
25. In view of the distance between the proposed extension and the closest dwellings and the presence of the retained intervening vegetation that would provide considerable visual screening, Officers consider that the development would have no detrimental effect on residential amenity. Details of the impact of the development on trees are found in paragraphs 40 to 44.
26. The proposal is considered to comply with these Development Plan policies.

Effect on Urban Green Space

Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012

Policy DM15 – Protection of Green Spaces and Recreational Facilities

Surrey Heath Local Plan 2000

Policy UE1 – Green Spaces within Settlement Areas

27. The existing school buildings are situated in the Urban Area as defined by the Core Strategy, but the proposed extension is located in a Green Space within a settlement area. Core Strategy Policy DM15 states that such green spaces will be protected by restricting development to appropriate informal recreation uses. Local Plan Policy UE1 does not permit the loss or reduction in size of Green Spaces as defined on the Proposals Map. However, development proposals for the operational requirements of schools, on land within Green Spaces, are acceptable provided that any adverse effect on the function of the Green Space is minimized and there is no conflict with other policies of the Local Plan.
28. The extension would be located near to one edge of the area designated as Green Space and would be relatively small scale in the context of the portion of the site within this designation. The proposed development is required to enable the school to carry out its operational requirements. Officers consider that the proposal would have no adverse effect on the recreational function of the Green Space, since the development would not encroach on any playing fields.
29. Thus the development is considered to accord with these Development Plan policies.

Transportation Considerations

Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012

Policy DM11 – Traffic Management and Highway Safety

30. Core Strategy Policy DM11 states that development which would adversely impact the safe and efficient flow of traffic movement on the highway network will only be permitted if it can be demonstrated that measures can be implemented to reduce and mitigate such impacts to acceptable levels.
31. The applicant has submitted a Transport Statement (TS) which indicates that at present 58% of children live within a kilometre (a 15 minute walk) of the school, with 31% living within half a km but 34% living more than 2 km away from the school. As a result, the school has a comparatively high car modal share with 58% of pupils coming by car, 37.2% walking, 2.3% using bicycles, 2% using scooters and 0.5% coming by car and then walking. Applying these modal shares to the expanded school would result in around 279 cars taking children to and from school, compared to 205 currently. This is a worst case scenario as it takes no account of siblings in the school, car sharing or the successful implementation of measures in the School Travel Plan (see below).

32. Parking surveys undertaken by the applicant indicate that there are 209 on-street parking spaces available within 350m of the school, both in the morning and in the afternoon. Observations indicate that there are problems close to the school caused by inconsiderate parking (driveways being blocked, parking on double yellow lines and parking on kerbs blocking footways) but that there is space available slightly further away. In the morning peak, from 08.30 to 08.45, there were 112 cars parked and 97 spaces free. In the afternoon peak, from 15.15 to 15.30, there were 149 cars parked and 60 spaces free. Assuming the same temporal distribution as currently exists, which reflects that all parents do not arrive simultaneously, the development would result in a total of 149 cars in the morning peak and 171 cars in the afternoon peak, compared with the identified capacity of 209 spaces. The TS concludes that these vehicles can be accommodated on the existing highway network.
33. The school currently has two car parks. The staff car park has capacity for 17 cars and the overflow/visitors' car park has space for 12 cars. The County Highway Authority has noted that the staff car park is often double parked, indicating that it has insufficient capacity for the current school, without catering for the cars of an additional 9 staff members. In comparison the overflow/visitors' car park is under-utilised and often has 10 car parking spaces free. The County Highway Authority recommends that this car park be used also for staff vehicles, thereby providing sufficient additional spaces for the expanded school. In view of the staff car park having insufficient space, Officers endorse this recommendation of the County Highway Authority and recommend a planning condition.
34. The application includes a School Travel Plan (STP). This outlines the current traffic issues of inconsiderate parking and obstruction of residential drives during school peak times, parking on the zig-zag lines outside the entrance to the site from Bagshot Green despite efforts by the Headteacher to discourage this behaviour, and partly parking on the path outside the entrance to the site from Green Lane. The STP also lists the current sustainable travel initiatives. These include all pupils taking part in the annual Golden Boot Challenge; training of pupils on using bicycles; holding frequent assemblies with reminders about safe and considerate ways to come and leave the school; and enabling pupils to be collected inside rather than outside of the school gates in the afternoon peak. The STP contains the objectives of increasing the amount of car sharing; having all parents park considerately and legally at school peak times; reducing the number of incidents of aggressive toward residents and school staff members; not having pupils dropped off in roads; and looking at the feasibility of having a drop-off area within the school site. The school is already implementing measures to address each of these objectives. Specific measures to be carried out include: greater involvement of Police Community Support Officers; continuing to update residents via a newsletter and other communications; training for pupils on pedestrian safety; continuing to give parents guidance about road crossing safety; and liaising with County Council officers regarding an on-site drop-off and pick-up area.
35. The TS contains the additional measures of investigating 'park and stride' options (that is encouraging parents to park their cars further away from the school) and implementing an informal one-way system for parents' cars on the highway network in the vicinity of the school.

36. Seven representations have been received, raising the issues of traffic congestion, on-street parking, speeding, safety and access by construction vehicles, and suggesting the provision of additional on-site car parking (including that for parents' cars) and improvements to the vehicular access for parents dropping off and collecting pupils. The aspect of the safety of pupils, infants, parents and residents was also raised.
37. The proposal of creating a drop off and pick up area within the school site, by connecting the two vehicular entrances, was also made by a local resident in a representation. Officers consider that this arrangement needs to be examined, but it is considered that this arrangement could be of little benefit in reducing traffic congestion and pressure for parking since very few additional parking spaces would result. Officers also consider that the proposal for an informal one way system outside the site would be just as effective as an internal drop off and pick up facility. Under the latter arrangement, which parents would be encouraged to use, they would enter either via Manor Way and exit via Bagshot Green or enter via Green Lane and turn left into Broomsquires Road, returning to Green Lane in an anticlockwise direction. Officers endorse this idea and recommend the imposition of a condition requiring the STP to be updated prior to the occupation of the development to ensure that this measure is addressed. This condition also requires the STP to consider options for a 'park and stride' facility, another idea that is supported by Officers as a practical way of reducing congestion and demand for parking in the vicinity of the school.
38. Two representations express concerns about an apparent suggestion by another resident that improvements be made to the footpath linking the school to the adjoining nursery building and thence to the Connaught Park housing estate. This suggestion is not reflected in the plans but Officers consider that it deserves to be addressed in the STP as another potential measure to tackle the issue of congestion and on-street parking. Again a condition is needed relating to this requirement.
39. The County Highway Authority also recommends conditions requiring the overflow/visitor's car park to be made available for the parking of staff cars, adherence to construction traffic management measures and restrictions to movements of construction traffic during term time, as well as requiring additional parking spaces for bicycles.
40. Officers consider that taken as a whole the measures contained in the application will alleviate the problems of traffic congestion and on-street parking sufficiently to satisfy Officers that the transportation implications of the proposal are acceptable. In conclusion Officers consider that the concerns expressed by residents relating to transportation are addressed by the School Travel Plan and the process of updating and implementing the Travel Plan where practicable, as stipulated in a planning condition.
41. Officers consider that the proposal complies with the Development Plan policy on transportation.

Impact on Trees

Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012

Policy DM9 – Design Principles

42. Core Strategy Policy DM9 requires development to protect trees worthy of retention and requires development to respect the amenities of occupiers of neighbouring properties.
43. An Arboricultural Assessment and Method Statement prepared by the applicant's Arboricultural Consultant indicates the loss to the development of eight young to early mature trees of small to medium stature (an apple, a purple plum and a sweet chestnut, with the rest being English oaks) and a small part of a group of English oak trees. The report suggests that this loss would have a limited impact on the adjoining residential properties. Tree protection measures are recommended in the form of protection fencing. The report also offers guidelines for operating within the Root Protection Areas (RPAs) of retained trees. The report does not recommend replacement planting.
44. Comments have not been received from the County Arboricultural Manager.
45. Two residents living in Drayhorse Drive, whose properties adjoin the part of the school site where the extension is proposed, have expressed concern over the loss of intervening trees. Officers note that none of the trees that would be felled to accommodate the development are mature and none are along the site boundary. Officers consider that these trees have little amenity value in their own right given the extent, size and age of the trees to be retained. Officers conclude that their loss would have a negligible effect on the amenity of the occupiers of these and other properties in Drayhorse Drive and no adverse impact on local landscape amenity. Officers endorse the recommendation that no new tree planting is needed in view of the well treed nature of the site, especially in the vicinity of the proposed extension.
46. It is considered that the development accords with the above noted Development Plan policy.

HUMAN RIGHTS IMPLICATIONS

47. The Human Rights Act Guidance for Interpretation, contained in the Preamble to the Agenda, is expressly incorporated into this report and must be read in conjunction with the following paragraph.
 48. The Officer's view is that there are no impacts on amenity. This proposal does not engage any of the articles of the Convention and has no Human Rights implications.
-

CONCLUSION

49. Officers consider that the proposed extension and ancillary development will have no detrimental impact on visual and residential amenity provided that retained trees are protected during the development process. The proposal is considered to be acceptable in design terms. The transportation implications are acceptable subject to the imposition of conditions. There are no adverse impacts on Urban Green Space. All relevant planning policy tests are considered to have been met. The development is recommended for planning permission.

RECOMMENDATION

That pursuant to Regulation 3 of the Town and Country Planning General Regulations 1992, Application No. SU14/0852 be PERMITTED subject to the following conditions:

Conditions:

1. The development to which this permission relates shall be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of this permission. Written notice of commencement shall be provided to the County Planning Authority within 7 days of the implementation of the development.
2. The development hereby approved shall be carried out in all respects strictly in accordance with the following plans/drawings:

Site Location Plan, Drawing number B1727800/A/050.001, Rev P3, dated 10/09/14
Existing Site Plan, Drawing number B1727800/A/050.002, Rev P3, dated 04/07/14
Proposed Site Plan, Drawing number B1727800/A/050.003, Rev P4, dated 04/11/14
Proposed Block Plan, Drawing number B1727800/A/050.005, Rev P3, dated 03/11/14
Existing GA Floor Plans, Drawing number B1727800/A/100.001, Rev P3, dated 09/09/14
Proposed GA Floor Plans, Drawing number B1727800/A/100.002, Rev P4, dated 26/09/14
Proposed Contractor's Constraints Plan, Drawing number B1727800/A/100.002, Rev P3, dated 04/07/14
Existing Elevations, Drawing number B1727800/A/140.001, Rev P3, dated 09/09/14
Proposed Elevations, Drawing number B1727800/A/140.002, Rev P5, dated 26/09/14
Tree Protection Plan, Drawing Number TPP-01, Rev A, dated 11/08/14 (contained in the Arboricultural Implication Assessment & Method Statement dated February 2014 and received on 31/10/14).

3. The overflow/visitors' car park (shown as Overflow Car Park on the Proposed Site Plan, Drawing B1727800/A/050.003, Rev P3, dated 04/07/14) shall also be made available for the parking of staff vehicles and thereafter shall be retained and maintained for this use.
4. Prior to the occupation of the development hereby permitted, the 18 new cycle parking spaces, shall be installed in the location shown on the Proposed Site Plan, Drawing B1727800/A/050.003, Rev P3, dated 04/07/14.

5. Prior to the occupation of the development hereby permitted, the School Travel Plan shall be updated (and shall include details of 'park and stride' measures to manage the parking of parents' vehicles and the feasibility of providing an informal one-way access system on the site and making improvements to the footpath linking the school to the adjoining nursery building), submitted to and approved by the County Planning Authority, and shall be implemented and thereafter maintained, monitored and developed.
6. To manage construction related traffic, the development hereby permitted shall be implemented strictly in accordance with paragraph 5.7 of the Design and Access Statement dated September 2014 (Rev 2) and the proposed Contractor's Constraints Plan, Drawing number B1727800/A/100.004 Rev P3, dated 04/07/14.
7. During term time, there shall be no HGV movements to and from the site between the hours of 08.30 and 09.15 and between 15.00 and 15.45, nor shall there be any HGVs associated with the development hereby permitted laid up, waiting, in Green Lane, Broomsquires Road and Elizabeth Road during these times.
8. Before any equipment, machinery or materials are brought on to the site for the purposes of carrying out the development hereby permitted, protective fencing shall be installed in accordance with the details described in the Arboricultural Implication Assessment & Method Statement dated February 2014 and received on 21 August 2014 and as shown on the Tree Protection Plan, Drawing Number TPP-01, Rev A, dated 11 August 2014. The protective fencing shall thereafter be maintained until all equipment, machinery and surplus materials have been removed from the site. For the duration of works on the site no materials, plant or equipment shall be placed or stored within the protected areas.

Reasons:

1. To comply with Section 91 (1)(a) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by Section 51 (1) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.
2. For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.
3. To ensure that the development will not prejudice highway safety, nor cause inconvenience to other highway users or to pedestrians, in accordance with Policy DM11 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012.
4. To ensure that the development will not prejudice highway safety, nor cause inconvenience to other highway users or to pedestrians, in accordance with Policy DM11 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012.
5. To ensure that the development will not prejudice highway safety, nor cause inconvenience to other highway users or to pedestrians, in accordance with Policy DM11 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012.
6. To ensure that the development will not prejudice highway safety, nor cause inconvenience to other highway users or to pedestrians, in accordance with Policy DM11 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012.

7. To ensure that the development will not prejudice highway safety, nor cause inconvenience to other highway users or to pedestrians, in accordance with Policy DM11 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012.
8. To ensure the protection of trees on the site, in the interests of the visual amenities of the site and the locality, in accordance with Policy DM9 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012.

Informatives:

1. This approval relates only to the provisions of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and must not be taken to imply or be construed as an approval under the Building Regulations 2000 or for the purposes of any other statutory provision whatsoever.
2. The attention of the applicant is drawn to the requirements of Sections 7 and 8 of the Chronically Sick and Disabled Persons Act 1970 and to Building Bulletin 102 'Designing for disabled children and children with Special Educational Needs' published in 2008 on behalf of the Secretary of State for Children, Schools and Families, or any prescribed document replacing that note.
3. The County Planning Authority confirms that in assessing this planning application it has worked with the applicant in a positive and proactive way, in line with the requirements of paragraph 186-187 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.

CONTACT

Nathan Morley

TEL. NO.

020 8541 9420

BACKGROUND PAPERS

The deposited application documents and plans, including those amending or clarifying the proposal, responses to consultations and representations received as referred to in the report and included in the application file and the following:

Government Guidance: The National Planning Policy Framework March 2012 (NPPF)

The Development Plan: The Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012 and the Surrey Heath Local Plan 2000
