

TO: PLANNING & REGULATORY COMMITTEE **DATE:** 16 July 2014

BY: PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL TEAM
MANAGER

DISTRICT(S) ELMBRIDGE BOROUGH COUNCIL **ELECTORAL DIVISION(S):**
West Molesey
Mr Mallett

PURPOSE: FOR DECISION **GRID REF:** 512826; 168523

TITLE: SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL PROPOSAL EL/2014/0363

SUMMARY REPORT

Land at former John Nightingale School site, Hurst Road, West Molesey, Surrey KT8 1QS

Erection of new single, one and a half and two storey Hurst Park primary school (420 places) and nursery (30 places) together with provision of 26 parking spaces, and cycle and scooter parking; access off Hurst Road; laying out of outdoor learning and play areas and sports pitches; landscape planting and ecological habitats.

The site of the new Hurst Park Primary School fronts onto the south side of Hurst Road in a residential part of West Molesey. The existing Hurst Park Primary School lies to the northeast, on the opposite side of Hurst Road and backing onto the River Thames. Two vehicular access points and the main pedestrian access point would be from Hurst Road. A secondary pedestrian access is proposed from the eastern extent of Freeman Drive, within the Bishop Fox Estate, which abuts the site on the west.

The new school would provide 2 forms of entry, replacing and doubling the size of the existing Hurst Park Primary School. The school building is proposed to be located on a plateau adjacent to Hurst Road, in order to avoid floodplain land, the southern two thirds of the site being either in a medium risk or high risk areas of flooding. Nevertheless there is sufficient space between the buildings and Hurst Road for planting, which is

considered important to enhance the building and the area. The new building would comprise a combination of single and two storey accommodation. This is necessary primarily to keep the entire building, outdoor learning and play areas, the staff car park and the access area for service vehicles on the plateau, thereby providing level access to all of these components of the school.

The principle of developing the site for a new primary school is acceptable.

The development will result in a change in the traffic and parking conditions in the locality of the school, compared with the current situation. The impact would be felt most by residents living in Freeman Drive and other residential roads near to the western site boundary, where the secondary pedestrian access is proposed to be located. Officers consider that there would be sufficient capacity for parking in residential roads in the vicinity of the site, however they remain concerned about the potential adverse impact on amenity. Measures have been incorporated in the scheme to mitigate the impacts of the traffic and parking, particularly the requirement for the provision of a facility for the purposes of 'park and stride' and staff vehicle parking. Planning conditions and informatives are recommended relating to these measures.

It is considered that the design is appropriate to the context and that it would enhance the site and the area. There would be no adverse impacts in terms of visual amenity, ecology, archaeology, flooding and surface water drainage or sustainability including BREEAM requirements. Officers are satisfied that the amended scheme would build on the contribution made by existing trees and vegetation. The loss of trees and the principle of new planting are considered acceptable. It is also considered that the harm to residential amenity from traffic and noise would not be unacceptable in a school context.

Elmbridge Borough Council have raised no objection to the proposal as amended, subject to various suggested requirements and conditions.

The development is considered to satisfy relevant Development Plan and national planning policies and therefore it can be permitted.

The recommendation is to PERMIT the application, subject to conditions.

APPLICATION DETAILS

Applicant

Date application valid

23 January 2014

Period for Determination

20 March 2014

Amending Documents

Drawing No. 12261.05 / L(PA)003, Rev. P3, Proposed Roof Plan, dated 17 January 2014

email dated 7 February 2014 from the Agent, enclosing Hurst Park Planning Statement

email dated 14 February 2014 from the Agent

Transport Assessment dated March 2014

Drawing No. 12261.05 / L(PA)100, Location Plan, Rev. P4, dated 27 March 2014

Drawing No. 12261.05 / L(PA)101, Landscape Site Plan, Rev. P3, dated 27 March 2014

Drawing No. 12261.05 / L(PA)104, Existing Trees Retention & Removal Plan, Rev. P3, dated 27 March 2014

Drawing No. 12261.05 / L(PA)105, Soft Landscape Plan – Sheet 1, Rev. P3, dated 27 March 2014

Drawing No. 12261.05 / L(PA)105, Soft Landscape Plan – Sheet 2, Rev. P3, dated 27 March 2014

Drawing No. 12261.05 / L(PA)001, Proposed Ground Floor Plan, Rev. P3, dated 27 March 2014

Landscape Management Plan dated 27 March 2014

email dated 2 May 2014 from the Agent

email dated 17 June 2014 from the Agent (with attachments – SUDs / Main Drainage Maintenance Strategy and seven documents detailing micro drainage calculations for soakaways)

Drawing Number CS-064160-400, Rev. C1, Drainage Layout, dated 1 April 2014.

Drawing Number CS-064160-401, Rev. C1, Drainage Construction Details, dated 24 June 2014

Drawing Number CS-064160-402, Rev. C1, Impermeable Areas Layout, dated 24 June 2014

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
Principle of Development	Yes	33-36
Highway and Traffic Implications	Yes	37-58
Design and Visual Amenity	Yes	59-66
Impact on Residential Amenity	Yes	67-80
Ecological Considerations	Yes	81-93
Trees and Landscape Matters	Yes	94-102
Archaeology	Yes	103-108
Flooding and Surface Water Drainage	Yes	109-116
Sustainability	Yes	117-120

ILLUSTRATIVE MATERIAL

Site Plan

Plan

Aerial Photographs

Aerial

Site Photographs

Figure 1: Looking southwest from north side of Hurst Road towards western entrance to site, with Lime trees on either side

Figure 2: View to the west along Hurst Road towards western site entrance

Figure 3: Looking west along Hurst Road from western entrance to site

Figure 4: View looking east along Hurst Road from near western entrance to site

Figure 5: Junction of Hurst Road and Freeman Drive, looking southwest

Figure 6: East end of Freeman Drive, looking towards location of secondary pedestrian entrance to site

Figure 7: Looking west from south of western entrance towards location of service area and houses on Lytcott Drive

Figure 8: View looking north towards Hurst Road (with two Lime trees in centre) from plateau where building is proposed to be located

Figure 9: Looking east from plateau towards No. 436 Hurst Road and houses in Boleyn Drive

Figure 10: View to southeast from plateau towards houses in Boleyn Drive and Weldon Drive

Figure 11: Looking south from plateau towards houses in Weldon Drive

Figure 12: View looking east from plateau showing location of MUGAs and houses in Boleyn Drive

Figure 13: Looking southwest from edge of plateau to end of Freeman Drive (see Figure 6)

Figure 14: Looking south along footpath with the site on right and No. 436 Hurst Road on the left

BACKGROUND

Site Description

1. The application site lies on the south side of Hurst Road in the urban area of West Molesey. The site is located about 500m west of the existing Hurst Park Primary School, which backs on to the River Thames. The new school is proposed on an approximately 1.8ha property formerly occupied by the John Nightingale School. Since the closure of the latter school this site has been empty and has become overgrown. The ground level of the site drops by about 2m from the northern boundary to the southern one. Near to the road is a concrete 'slab' which formed a foundation for the former school buildings, with hard standing between it and the road. Together the slab and this hard standing constitute a plateau which constitutes the northern third of the site and which is within Flood Zone 1 (low risk). The middle third of the site is at a lower level and is within Flood Zone 2 (medium risk). The southern third is lower still and is located within Flood Zone 3 (high risk). There are mature and semi-mature trees and bushes along the site frontage and most of the remaining site boundaries.
2. There are two existing vehicular access points from Hurst Road. Public Footpath 3, which connects Hurst Road and Walton Road, runs along the eastern site boundary. There are residential uses abutting the east side of this footpath as well as to the south and west of the site. The residences to the south and west were built on the site of the former Bishop Fox County Secondary School. A water easement running diagonally from northwest to southeast touches the southwest corner of site. The decommissioned Molesey Reservoirs (a Site of Nature Conservation Importance) are situated about 20m to the north on the opposite side of Hurst Road. The operational Knight and Bessborough Reservoirs (a Ramsar Site and part of the South West London Waterbodies Special Protection Area) are located approximately 360m to the west on the same side of Hurst Road as the school site.
3. The new school is proposed to replace the existing Hurst Park Primary School which is located some 500m east of the current site, in a residential area on the north side of Hurst Road and south of the River Thames, on a site about 0.7ha smaller than the current site. Vehicular access is from Hurst Road and there is a further pedestrian access point from Garrick Gardens on the eastern site boundary. The building and hard play areas are located in the northern half of that site with the remainder occupied mainly by the school's playing field.

Planning History

4. There is no planning history for the former John Nightingale School site but the existing Hurst Park Primary School has a substantial planning history in its own right. The adjacent site formerly occupied by the Bishop Fox School has planning history related to its development for housing.
-

THE PROPOSAL

5. This proposal is for a 2 form of entry (2FE) primary school to replace and double the size of the existing Hurst Park Primary School which is located about 500m to the east. The building is proposed to be located mainly on the slab that supported

the former John Nightingale School and entirely on the plateau made up by the slab and adjoining hardstanding. The building would have a flat roof and walls of facing brickwork, relieved by panels of treated cedar cladding adjoining many windows, a number of large glazed areas (mainly on the front elevation, facing Hurst Road) and a horizontal brick recess running around nearly the entire building.

6. The school would have a capacity of 420 pupils and floorspace of 2279 sq m, with about 59 per cent of the floorspace contained in a single storey portion, approximately 25 per cent of the total contained in an upper storey portion of the building, and the remaining approximately 16 per cent in the 1.5 storey portion containing mainly the hall, kitchen, servery and other accommodation. The school would comprise 14 classrooms, food science room, ICT room, group rooms, library, hall, kitchen and other ancillary accommodation including a school office and reception area, other offices and a staff room. Eight classrooms (two each for Year 3, Year 4, Year 5 and Year 6 pupils), a group room and some toilets would be located on the first floor of the building, served by a lift, the remaining accommodation being on the ground floor. The development includes a nursery classroom for 30 pupils, replacing the one at the existing Hurst Park School. The single and two storey portions would be constructed 'off-site', mainly for savings of cost and in construction time, and the 1.5 storey portion would be built in a more traditional way due to its volume.
7. The school would be served by two vehicular entrances and a main pedestrian entrance from Hurst Road, using existing access points. The eastern entrance would serve the staff car park (25 bays and 2 bays for disabled users) and the other leading to the service area adjoining the kitchen. A secondary pedestrian access is proposed at the eastern end of Freeman Drive, a residential cul-de-sac which abuts the school site to the west.
8. The proposal includes extensive outdoor learning and play areas comprising hard play and learning space (including a courtyard), a fenced play area for the reception and nursery children, twin fenced but unlit multi-use games areas (MUGAs) located to the east and southeast of the building and playing fields (with space for four sports pitches and a running track) in the southern third of the site. There would also be three habitat areas, the largest being between the building and the western site boundary.
9. Various boundary treatments are proposed. Along the Hurst Road frontage there would be a 1.1m high hedge integrated with a post and wire fence. At the two vehicular entrances there would be 2.2m high dark grey metal vertical bar double gates with railings of the same height and materials on either side of the westernmost entrance. Adjoining Freeman Drive there would be a pedestrian gate and railings, again of this height and materials. Elsewhere it is proposed to retain and make good the existing boundary fencing. Internally there would be a combination of 2.2m high railings and matching pedestrian gates; 2.4m high black welded mesh fencing and gates surrounding the MUGAs; fencing of the same height, material and colour separating the service yard from the rest of the site; and 1.1m high 'pencil' fencing around the free flow play space adjacent to the Nursery and Reception classrooms overlooking the courtyard.
10. The submission has been accompanied by the following documents: Design and Access Statement, Transport Assessment, School Travel Plan, Arboricultural

7

Implication Assessment & Method Statement, Landscape Management Plan, Phase 1 Habitat and Protected Species Scoping Survey, Reptile Survey Report, Flood Risk Assessment, Desk Based Archaeological Assessment, Geotechnical and Contamination Assessment Report, Borehole Investigation Findings Report, Design & Procurement BREEAM Preliminary Assessment and Construction Management Plan.

CONSULTATIONS AND PUBLICITY

District Council

11. Elmbridge Borough Council:

No objection subject to:

- (a) Securing through condition(s) the opening of the school's facilities to the wider community through a Community Use Agreement (Officer comment: Community use is not currently proposed and is a decision for the school after it becomes operational)
- (b) having a condition pertaining to hours of community use having due regard to the amenities of neighbouring residents (Officer comment: This is not needed at this time [see above])
- (c) having conditions to ensure the retention/protection of trees and other vegetation and the provision of additional landscaping (Officer comment: Trees and landscape planting are covered by Conditions 7 to 10, one requiring planting details to be the subject of a subsequent planning application)
- (d) development should be carried out in accordance with an approved Construction Management Plan (Officer comment: This is required by Condition 5)
- (e) having conditions ensuring that demolition and construction are carried out in a sustainable manner and use of sustainable urban drainage systems as proposed in the Flood Risk Assessment (Officer comment: See Conditions 12 and 13)
- (f) having a condition requiring submission, approval and implementation of a site specific Flood Warning Evacuation System (Officer comment: This is considered unnecessary since the building would be in a low risk flood zone)

(g) serious consideration be given to providing a pupil drop off and pick up facility within the site and accessed from Hurst Road (Officer comment: There is insufficient space to provide such a facility between the building and Hurst Road)

(h) increasing provision on the site for parking vehicles of staff (Officer comment: Officers consider on-site parking to be sufficient)

(i) the County Council exploring the options for 'park and stride' using local publicly accessible car parks such as those at Mole Hall and Molesey Cemetery (Officer comment: Elmbridge Borough Council have not endorsed the use of Mole Hall for this purpose, mainly for operational reasons. Molesey Cemetery is considered by Officers to be too far from the school to be practicable for such a site)

(j) giving consideration to having no pedestrian access from the Bishop Fox Estate (Officer comment: This access is justified in order to minimise on-street parking on Hurst Road. Implementation of measures in the School Travel Plan would help to reduce on-street parking in the vicinity)

(k) the County Council as Local Education Authority (LEA) give full and proper consideration to carrying out a further round of public consultation prior to submitting any revised plans (Officer comment: a further meeting was held by the LEA; this matter is not under the jurisdiction of planning.

Consultees (Statutory and Non-Statutory)

12. County Highway Authority –

Transportation Development Planning:

Proposal acceptable subject to conditions despite some concern with parking capacity on local residential roads.

13. County Ecologist:

No designated sites will be adversely affected by the development; there will be no impact on bats.

14. County Landscape Architect:

Changes recommended to

- planting scheme and maintenance regime to be addressed in a subsequent application.
15. County Arboricultural Manager: Changes recommended to planting scheme and maintenance regime to be addressed in a subsequent application.
16. County Archaeologist: Assessment is The Archaeological acceptable. A condition is recommended relating to implementation of archaeological work.
17. County Noise Consultant: Noise levels from traffic travelling to and from the site or from classrooms in summer are not considered to be significant. Use of outdoor play areas would potentially cause noise disturbance to local residents.
18. County Flood and Water Services Manager: is The principle of site drainage satisfactory subject to conditions relating to excess water being drained following a flood.
19. Environment Agency: No objection subject to finished floor levels to be set at a minimum of 10.71mAOD in accordance with

approved Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) and to implementation of a SUDs strategy as recommended in the FRA.

20. Thames Water:

No objection on grounds of water supply or sewerage infrastructure. Recommend informatives relating to access to adjacent water mains, no buildings being erected within 5m of the water mains.

21. Natural England:

SPA and Ramsar Site unlikely to be affected significantly if development is carried out strictly in accordance with submitted details. Environmental Assessment not needed.

22. Environmental Assessment Officer:

The proposal would not give rise to likely significant effects on the South

West London Waterbodies SPA and Ramsar Site. Further Assessment is not required in respect of the Habitat Regulations 2010.

Parish/Town Council and Amenity Groups

23. None

Summary of publicity undertaken and key issues raised by public

24. The application was publicised by the posting of 2 site notices. A total of 187 owner/occupiers of neighbouring properties were directly notified by letter and 46

representations were received on the original submission, 2 fully supporting the proposed development.

7

25. A total of 50 representations were received on revised plans and documents. Elmbridge Borough Council forwarded 15 representations that they received on the revised plans, 11 having been already received and 4 not having been received by the County Council. These 4 are all from residents who made representations on the original submission.

General

- There is general support for the school in principle, but concerns/objections have been raised about the impacts of traffic and on-street parking, especially in the Bishop Fox Estate immediately west of the site, and inaccurate assessment of parking capacity in this estate. There is considerable opposition to the pedestrian access point between this estate and the school site and to a lesser extent to the provision of a mini-roundabout on Hurst Road the west of the site.

Traffic Impacts

- Widespread concern with danger to pedestrians and other road users in narrow roads of the Bishop Fox Estate particularly in Freeman Drive (the cul-de-sac with the pedestrian gate proposed at the end) and in Lytcott Drive which leads off Freeman Drive.
- Roads in the estate are used as a 'cut through' including by articulated lorries; the proposal will make things worse.
- How will emergency vehicles, Royal Mail vans and refuse lorries access the estate?
- Suggested replacement of pedestrian access from Freeman Drive with one either on the eastern site boundary or at the south west corner of the site enabling the use of the nearby existing car parks at Mole Hall and the recreation ground/tennis courts on Walton Road, both south of the site.
- Further suggestions of deleting the mini-roundabout, providing more on-site parking and a drop off/pick up facility alongside Hurst Road, providing a pedestrian crossing on Walton Road.
- Upgrade and use existing footpath running along the east site boundary.
- Look at traffic calming measures on Hurst Road.
- On-site parking provision is inadequate and should be increased.
- Need full traffic flow impact and road safety assessment, quantification of traffic generation, frequency of arrival of cars dropping pupils, time needed for drop-off
- Place parking restrictions in Freeman Drive.
- Mitigation measures in School Travel Plan are unrealistic.

- What plans have been made for sustainable transport and being less car dependant?

Other Matters

- School Organisation Consultation Document inviting residents to a meeting was not received until after the meeting occurred.
- Notification details of residents of planning application were misleading (not mentioning the proposed pedestrian access point from Freeman Drive).
- Applicant should look at alternative sites including expanding the Chandlers Field Primary School, High Street, West Molesey (larger site than the current one).
- Consideration should be given to retaining the existing Hurst Park Primary School and putting the additional provision on the current site.
- Development will create additional noise and pollution and general nuisance.
- Overlooking of residential properties.
- Noise and dust emanating from the site during the construction process.
- Concern with removal of mature trees near boundaries of site.
- Potential damage to a residential property from pupils using pedestrian access from Freeman Drive (request for compensation to pay for fencing).
- Noise could be an issue if the sports facilities are used on weekends and evenings.

26. Further notification was undertaken in April 2014 following amendments to some plans and receipt of the revised Transport Assessment and Landscape Management Plan. A further 47 representations were received, making the following points:-

- The amendments do not deal with the flawed assessment of parking capacity in the Bishop Fox Estate, which features narrow, winding roads with no pavements, which has narrow and winding roads with no pavements.
- Retaining pedestrian access from Freeman Drive causes safety risk and inconvenience to all road users and pedestrians; this access point should be deleted from the scheme.
- No room to turn vehicles in the narrow roads of the Bishop Fox Estate.
- There is very little roadside parking capacity on Berkeley Drive and Boleyn Drive.
- The worn surface on these two roads will be worsened.
- Damage to residents' cars and to roadside verges.
- Traffic Regulation Orders will be ineffective since they will not be enforced.
- Have an underground car park beneath school building.
- Providing a pupil drop-off and pick-up facility within the school site or along Hurst Road or in front of the existing Hurst Park Primary School would alleviate the traffic/parking problem.

- Inadequate on-site staff parking provision would exacerbate the parking situation on surrounding roads.
- Use the front of the site of the existing Hurst Park Primary School for staff parking.
- Delivery vehicles would cause congestion in the on-site staff car park.
- No consideration given to impact of parking by attendees of evening and weekend events.
- Difficulties for emergency vehicles in accessing the Bishop Fox Estate, Berkeley Drive and Boleyn Drive during drop-off and pick up times at the school.
- Safety issues from articulated lorries using roads in the Bishop Fox Estate; yellow lines are needed on bends.
- Noise including that from the traffic using the Bishop Fox Estate to access the school.
- The plans should be amended to provide pedestrian access from the footpath along the eastern site boundary.
- Improvements suggested to this footpath (more regular maintenance and lighting).
- Extending the footpath from the end of Weldon Drive to Walton Road and adding lighting and a cycling track alongside the path.
- Loss of privacy and peace for residents of this Estate.
- Have a smaller school built with existing one retained for infants or build new school elsewhere.
- More vision and a redesign are needed by the County Council.
- Lack of consultation with the local community.
- New school foisted on local residents.
- Removal of trees prior to planning permission being granted and by the people doing the removal accessing the site via the Bishop Fox Estate [Officers have passed the representations making these points to the applicant for response].
- Compensate residents in the Bishop Fox Estate for the decrease in value of their properties.

27. Subsequent neighbour notification was done in June 2014 following receipt of a further amended version of the Transport Assessment, a revised Parking Beat Survey Plan and a revised School Travel Plan. Three representations were received in response, raising the following issues:-

- The Transport Assessment is still flawed as parked cars on Freeman Drive would prevent entrance and exit to a resident's drive.
- How have the figures for parking capacity on local roads been reduced?
- The narrow and curving roads in the Bishop Fox Estate were not designed to accommodate street parking. Dangerous blind spots will be created.

- The plans have not been amended to provide a drop-off and pick-up facility in front of the school, despite this being recommended by Elmbridge Borough Council.
- There is still inadequate parking provision for staff cars; more than 60% will be parked in surrounding residential roads.
- There remains a disregard for the safety of children and residents.
- There should be no pedestrian access to the school site from Freeman Drive.
- The proposed 'park and stride' use of the car park at the existing Hurst Park Primary School site is not confirmed and is not a long term solution to the parking issue.
- How many parents will use this park and stride facility in the morning? [many parents will prefer to park as near as possible to the school].
- The use of the car parks at Mole Hall and the Grovelands Recreation Ground have also not been confirmed. There should be no reliance placed on the availability of these facilities for park and stride purposes.
- What measures will be implemented to stop vehicles parking indiscriminately?
- The car park at Mole Hall is usually busy throughout the day now that a senior citizens centre is based there.

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

28. 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 Elmbridge Core Strategy 2011 and the saved policies within the Replacement Elmbridge Borough Local Plan 2000.
29. 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.

30. 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 guidance contained in the NPPF is a material consideration 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).
31. In this case the main planning issues are the principle of a new primary school in this location, design and visual amenity, highway and traffic implications and impact on residential amenity. Other issues are impact on trees, ecological and landscape matters, archaeology, flooding and surface water drainage and sustainability.
32. As part of the application process the application was screened to ascertain if the construction of a new primary school would constitute Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) development. It was concluded that the development was not likely to have significant impacts on the environment in terms of the meaning of significant in the EIA regulations and therefore the proposed development would not be classified as 'EIA development'.

PRINCIPLE OF DEVELOPMENT

Elmbridge Core Strategy 2011

Policy CS1 – Spatial Strategy

Policy CS16 – Social and Community Infrastructure

33. Policy CS1 states that new development will be directed towards previously developed land within existing built up areas, taking account of the relative flood risk of available sites. Policy CS16 encourages the provision of accessible and sustainable social and community infrastructure.
34. The site is located in the urban area of West Molesey. Although the site is presently empty, it was formerly occupied by the John Nightingale School. The applicant has provided rationale for the selection of this site compared with expanding the current Hurst Park Primary School on the north side of Hurst Road. That site is considerably smaller than the proposed site (about 1.13ha as opposed to approximately 1.8ha), providing insufficient space for doubling the size of the school from 1 FE to 2FE (a form of entry normally being 30 pupils). In terms of educational requirements there is a growing need for additional school places in East and West Molesey and more generally across Elmbridge Borough. There is a requirement for 30 more Reception age places in this specific area, on the basis of known increases in the birth rate and projected housing completions. The applicant considers it sensible to expand a good school (the existing Hurst Park School received a good rating in the OFSTED inspection carried out last year). The proposed site is large enough to support a 2FE school including sufficient formal and informal outdoor play areas. The proximity to the existing Hurst Park School (about 500m distant) makes the proposed site convenient for families with children attending the existing school.
35. The new building is proposed to be located in the northern part of the site, on the plateau most of which is occupied by a concrete slab that supported the previous school building. The new structure would be completely within Flood Zone 1 (low risk). The site has access to a main road with frequent bus service. The proposed building is expected to achieve a high level of environmental performance and to be sustainable. The floorspace of the building would be larger than that of the

previous school, with most of the increase contained in the upper storey. Consequently although the new building would have a slightly larger footprint than its predecessor, this would be balanced by a central courtyard located in a previously built area.

- 36. Officers consider that the principle of the proposed development is acceptable as it would provide accessible and sustainable community development on previously developed urban land. Consequently the proposal is considered to comply with these Development Plan policies.

HIGHWAY AND TRAFFIC IMPLICATIONS

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) March 2012

Chapter 4 – Promoting Sustainable Transport

Elmbridge Core Strategy 2011

Policy CS25 – Travel and Accessibility

Replacement Elmbridge Borough Local Plan 2000

Policy MOV4 – Traffic Impact of Development Proposals

Policy MOV6 – Off-Street Parking

- 37. Paragraph 32 of the NPPF states that all developments which generate significant amounts of movements should be accompanied by a Transport Statement or a Transport Assessment. Decisions should take account of the opportunities for sustainable transport modes, to provide safe and secure access for all people and to identify cost effective improvements that address significant impacts. Paragraph 36 of the NPPF states that the Travel Plan is a key tool to facilitate sustainable modes of travel and that all developments which generate significant amounts of movements should be required to provide a Travel Plan.
- 38. Core Strategy policy CS25 requires new development that generates a high number of trips to be directed to previously developed land in sustainable locations within the urban area. This policy also requires submission of a transport assessment and travel plan for all major development proposals. Local Plan Policy MOV4 states that all development proposals should minimise the impact of vehicle and traffic nuisance, particularly in residential areas and, as far as practicable, comply with current highway design standards. Policy MOV6 requires development proposals to accord with adopted motor vehicle and cycle parking standards.

Transport Assessment

- 39. As the previous buildings were removed from site some years ago and the site is vacant, there are currently no movements generated and all movements resulting from the proposed development would be new to the site. However, some of the movements generated by the nearby existing school would transfer to the current site. The catchment area of the new school is not expected to change greatly from that of the existing school. Officers consider that the methodology contained in the Transport Assessment (TA), which is based on the existing modes of travel and patterns of movement, is robust.
- 40. The TA indicates that 68% of the pupils attending the existing Hurst Park Primary School are siblings and that 68% of the children travel to that school by sustainable modes of travel (walking, cycling or using a scooter). The TA shows that 77% of pupils and 55% of staff members live within walking distance of the existing school. In comparison, the TA estimates that 73% of pupils and 58% of

staff live within walking distance of the new school. This is a small reduction in pupils but a small increase in staff as compared with the current location. It is considered that the net effect is acceptable in transportation terms.

- 7
41. The main vehicular and pedestrian access points to the school site are proposed from Hurst Road. These vehicular entrances would be only for staff, visitors and deliveries. Parents would not be able to drive into the site, insufficient space being available for a facility for parents to park or drop off and collect their children. As an alternative a lay-by on Hurst Road has been suggested in representations but the County Highway Authority consider that this would cause queuing on Hurst Road, which would lead to traffic congestion and conflicting movements, with consequent safety implications. Measures are proposed along Hurst Road, to improve highway safety. These include 'school keep clear' markings and parking restrictions.
 42. A secondary access point, for pedestrians only, is proposed from Freeman Drive where it meets the western site boundary. This road, a residential cul-de-sac within the Bishop Fox Estate, joins Hurst Road to the west of the site. This pedestrian access would increase the accessibility of the school, particularly for children reaching the site on foot. The main pedestrian access is proposed from Hurst Road, including via the existing footpath that runs along the eastern boundary of the site.
 43. The analysis in the TA indicates a capacity for more than 250 cars to park on residential within the wider area (that is, up to 400m from the school). Using the current modes of travel for the relocated and expanded school as with the current school, 32% (142) of the pupils would arrive by car. The actual figure is expected to be less than this, possibly as low as 71, taking account of car sharing and siblings arriving together. The County Highway Authority has advised that even assuming that 142 cars arrive, there would be sufficient parking capacity in residential roads close to the site. Officers endorse this conclusion.
 44. Notwithstanding capacity issues Officers consider that there is the potential for adverse amenity impacts for local residents, especially those living in the Bishop Fox Estate close to the pedestrian access point from Freeman Drive, and other impacts including safety for residents and other road users.

Proposed School Travel Plan

45. The application proposes 25 car parking spaces for staff, this figure being dictated largely by the capacity of the site and the need to keep the building and as much hardstanding as possible on the plateau adjoining Hurst Road, in order to avoid building on land that is at risk of flooding. The TA estimates that there would be 56 members of staff when the school is fully operational. Assuming that the same proportion (88%) of staff members drive as at present, there would be a shortfall of 21 staff parking places in 2021. The County Highway Authority has advised that this situation would need to be actively managed through the School Travel Plan (STP) and that the impact on local roads would require monitoring.
46. The School Travel Plan (STP) identifies issues relating to the proposed school that also apply to the existing Hurst Park Primary School. These issues are parents dropping off and collecting pupils, many staff members travelling to work alone by car and high levels of parents parking their cars on neighbouring roads, and vehicles driving too fast along Hurst Road. The STP recommends potential mitigation measures such as encouraging car sharing, providing storage for 24 bicycles and 48 scooters, raising awareness of sustainable travel modes, providing road safety improvements on Hurst Road including a widened footway.

The County Highway Authority, endorsed by Officers, recommends that the capacity for bicycle storage be increased to 40 spaces. A planning condition is recommended to ensure this provision.

Mitigation Measures

47. A number of transport mitigation measures are proposed in conjunction with the application:-

- Road safety measures on Hurst Road with the aim of reducing traffic speeds including school warning signs, 'SLOW' markings on the carriageway, a vehicle activated sign, school keep clear 'zigzag' markings and double yellow lines.
- Footway widening on Hurst Road between the site access and Boleyn Way to 2m.
- Junction improvements at the junction of Hurst Road and Freeman Drive, specifically for pedestrians (tactile paving, traffic islands on Hurst Road, upgrading the existing pedestrian refuge on Freeman Drive).
- The provision of 48 scooter parking spaces and 24 cycle parking spaces on site [the latter now recommended to be increased to 40 spaces].
- School Travel Plan.

48. The County Highway Authority has requested that the applicant consider the following additional safety measures on Hurst Road:-

- Conversion of one or both of the proposed traffic islands to pedestrian refuge islands.
- Inclusion of 'Wig Wags' on both approaches below the School signs to create a School Zone.
- The proposed vehicle activated sign being dual aspect so that during school times it displayed the School warning triangle and outside these times the speed limit of 30 mph.
- Investigation of the scope for an additional pedestrian refuge island just west of Berkeley Drive, near the vehicle activated sign and carriageway SLOW marking, to create a School Zone and assist children and parents crossing.

49. In view of the anticipated 48 pupils needing to cross from the north side of Hurst Road to the new school (as compared with the 141 pupils who currently live south of that road and cross it to reach the existing school), Officers consider that a pedestrian crossing of Hurst Road is not justified and that having two or three pedestrian refuge islands on Hurst Road would be sufficient. Planning Officers consider that these refuge islands are adequate to provide safe crossing for pupils and their parents.

50. Officers consider that the transportation impacts of the proposed development warrant the installation of all of the mitigation measures outlined in paragraphs 47 and 48, in order to reduce the impacts of traffic.

Drop-off and Pick-up Provision

51. The County Highway Authority considers that the provision of a pupil drop-off and pick-up facility either within the site along or on the verge adjoining Hurst Road is not justified and concludes that such a facility is inappropriate in either of these locations. Officers endorse this view.

Park and Stride Provision

52. Notwithstanding the capacity for parking on local roads, the STP addresses the provision of a 'park and walk' (park and stride) scheme using existing facilities within walking distance of the site. The two sites initially proposed were the car parks at Mole Hall on the north side of Walton Road (with access from Bishop Fox Way) and at the Grovelands Recreation Ground, located on the south side of Walton Road, to the east of the site. Both of these car parks are within walking distance of the new school. The County Highway Authority recommended that both these options be actively pursued in order to reduce the impact of the school on local residents, and that agreement in principle be sought, for a temporary period, from Elmbridge Borough Council, the owner and operator of both Mole Hall and the Recreation Ground. The County Highway Authority also recommended that a safe crossing point on Walton Road would be needed should the Recreation Ground car park be used for park and stride purposes.
53. At the request of the County Planning Authority, supported by the County Highway Authority, the applicant has contacted Elmbridge Borough Council to ascertain whether the use of the car park at Mole Hall (estimated to have 57 parking spaces available) and the car park at Grovelands Recreation Ground (estimated to have 7 spaces available) as 'park and stride' facilities would conflict with existing patterns of use of these facilities and whether the Borough Council would be willing for such use to occur. The applicant has received a negative response to such use from the Borough Council. In the case of the Recreation Ground, the reasons are an insufficient number of parking spaces and a clash with people walking their dogs. In the case of Mole Hall, these same considerations apply, together with potential restriction of any future development at this site, although nothing is being proposed at present. Subsequently, Officers asked the applicant to make a final attempt with Elmbridge Borough Council to secure the use of the car parks at these two locations, on a temporary basis. However, as yet this remains unresolved.
54. The STP further states that should permission for the use of these sites not be agreed, the school car park at the existing Hurst Park Primary School is a further option that can be pursued. The STP requires the 'park and stride' use to be monitored, to determine need for provision in the longer term. The County Highway Authority suggests that the tarmac surfaced playground at the existing Hurst Park Primary School be considered in addition for park and stride use if necessary, to add to the 21 spaces in the car park.
55. Officers consider that using the car park at the existing Hurst Park Primary School would constitute a change of use and therefore would require a separate planning application. This conclusion is based on the judgement that ancillary uses such as parking can only be carried out on the same planning unit (land holding) as the primary use, which in this case is the current site. Where an ancillary use is severed from the primary one, the ancillary use becomes the primary use for the part of the site which it occupies. The primary use (education) of the existing Hurst Park Primary School site will cease once the new school is reconstructed in larger form on the current site.

Staff Parking

- 56. The 25 parking spaces proposed for staff are below the level of one space per member of staff. The application estimates a figure of 37 full time equivalent, comprising 17 full time and 39 part time staff. The TA estimates a trip generation figure of 48 for staff at the new school, but notes that the figure of 34 for the existing Hurst Park School is significantly higher than the 21 parked cars observed on that site on 19th March 2013. While a higher level than the 25 spaces proposed conflicts with the County Council’s policy of encouraging sustainable transport, there is nonetheless the potential to adversely affect residential amenity by staff parking their vehicles on local roads where this is not managed adequately through the STP. Additional provision for staff parking could be made in association with the ‘park and stride’ facilities, subject to the necessary planning permission being granted.

Other Improvements

- 57. Local residents have suggested that improvements be made to the footpath that runs just outside the eastern boundary of the site. Officers consider that the most important such improvement is the provision of lighting to enable the footpath to be used throughout the school year. An informative is recommended to encourage these improvements. Residents have also suggested that there be a pedestrian gate from this footpath. Officers support this idea and a condition is recommended requiring the assessment of the benefits of a gate in this location and requiring it to be installed if the results of the assessment are positive.

Officer Conclusions

- 58. Officers consider that given the amenity and other impacts on local residents, it will be important for the school to manage these impacts as effectively as possible, through implementing and updating the STP. The provision of an off-site facility for ‘park and stride’ and staff parking purposes is considered necessary to mitigate the potential adverse impact on local residential amenity. Overall, Officers consider that the traffic and parking issues discussed above are dealt with satisfactorily by the imposition of conditions including the use of a ‘Grampian’ condition to ensure that the provision of ‘park and stride’ facilities prior to the occupation of the school.

DESIGN AND VISUAL AMENITY

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) March 2012

Paragraph 17 – Core Planning Principles

Chapter 7 – Requiring Good Design (especially paragraphs 56 and 64)

Elmbridge Core Strategy 2011

Policy CS1 – Spatial Strategy

Policy CS17 – Local Character, Density and Design

Replacement Elmbridge Borough Local Plan 2000

Policy ENV2 – Standard of Design

Policy ENV3 – Safe and Secure Environments

Policy RTT2 – Development within or conspicuous from the Thames Policy Area

59. Paragraph 17 of the NPPF contains core land use planning principles that should underpin decision-taking, including always seeking to secure high quality design and a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings. Paragraph 56 states that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, is indivisible from good planning and should contribute positively to making places better for people. Paragraph 64 expands this by noting that permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions.
60. Core Strategy Policy CS1 states that all developments must be high quality, well designed and locally distinctive. They should also be sensitive to the character and quality of the area. Local Plan Policy ENV2 states that new development should achieve a standard of design which is sensitive to the character of the surrounding area; which respects the context in terms of, inter alia, natural features and space about buildings; and forms a convenient, attractive, lively and safe environment for users and passers-by in terms of siting, layout and access arrangements. Policy ENV3 seeks to ensure that the design, use, layout and access to buildings and both public and private spaces creates an attractive environment, that provides for public safety, deters vandalism and discourages crime. Policy RTT2 states that development that is within or conspicuous from the Thames Policy Area will be permitted provided that the development complies with various criteria including having an acceptable impact in terms of design, character, scale and views; protecting, conserving and, where appropriate, enhancing the natural environment of the River; and ensuring the retention of buildings, features and land which make an important contribution to the visual and/or historic character of the River.
61. As noted above, the building would be situated on the plateau close to Hurst Road, with the two storey and 1.5 storey portions overlooking the road and the single storey sections behind (to the south). The building would have a flat roof and the variations in building height would respond to the changes in ground level. The site is large, at more than 1.8ha (more than 18,000 sq m). Considering the relatively modest size of the new building (about 2,280 sq m of floorspace), the size of the site might suggest that the building would appropriately be single storey. However, several factors have resulted in the new building being a mixture of single, 1.5 and two storeys: 1) approximately two thirds of the site is situated in a high or medium risk flood zone, the raised plateau along Hurst Road being at low risk of flooding; 2) the plateau is too small to accommodate a single storey building with the required floorspace, accessible outdoor learning and play space and a staff car park and service area having level access into the building; 3) the external space, including learning and play areas, is maximised; and 4) level access would be provided to all parts of the building (a lift providing easy access to the first floor). Keeping the new building on the plateau would have the fundamental benefit of making funds available for educational facilities that would have been spent on a major amount of groundwork.
62. The building is proposed to form a 'u' with the open end facing east. The resulting courtyard would be used as a playground containing play equipment, as a 'free-flow' play space for pupils in the adjoining two reception classrooms and as teaching space. All of the classrooms are orientated north/south, with those facing south having window louvers to control admission of sunlight and avoid glare. All the classrooms would be 7.2 metres deep, considered by the agent to be the optimum depth to allow for penetration of natural daylight into the room and allow natural ventilation. There would be no ground floor classrooms facing the road although four classrooms (serving Years 3, 4 and 5) on the first floor would do so. The western wing, which connects the two wings with the classrooms, would contain resources such as the library and ICT room. The hall,

kitchen, servery, plant and storage space would be located in the approximately 1.5 storey block forming the northwest part of the building.

63. The walls are proposed to be predominantly of rough textured St Andrews multi brick, with mainly shades of yellow and grey. The windows are arranged horizontally on both floors, with many windows having adjacent contrasting panels of dark stained timber cladding. The windows are inset in the walls, with the aluminium frames projecting from the brickwork and the cladding. A brick recess of a contrasting colour is proposed to run around the building, except for a small area on the west elevation, to relieve the bulk of the building. Further visual relief is provided by areas of ground floor height and double height glazing, allowing more light to enter the main entrance area, stairwells and the hall. There would be a low parapet on the upper storey of the two storey portion of the building and on the single storey elements. The walls of the block containing the hall would have a higher parapet to hide PV cells and plant situated on the roof.
64. The large site area enables the provision of extensive playing fields with enough space for five sports pitches and a linear running track, as well twin MUGAs with 2.4m high welded mesh surround fencing and gates. It is not proposed to hire use of the MUGAs to outside bodies. Three habitat areas are proposed, located along the western and eastern site boundaries, the largest such area being west of the building. On advice from Officers this area, which originally included a pathway connecting several small hard play areas, was amended to have a more natural appearance. Permeable concrete block paving is proposed for the courtyard, the hard play area south of the building and a path parallel to the west side of the building. Officers consider that none of the playing field and play areas, including the MUGAs, would have an adverse impact on the design or on the visual amenity of the site. In fact it is considered that the development would improve existing situation.
65. The Thames Policy Area extends northwards from the opposite side of Hurst Road. This portion of the Policy Area comprises the decommissioned Molesey Reservoirs, with an earth bund with trees and shrubs running along the road frontage. Officers consider that the proposed development would only have an impact on this Policy Area if the school buildings would be visible from it. Officers estimate that only the top portion of the two storey part of the new building and possibly of the hall and kitchen block might be visible in this context. On this basis Officers consider that the proposed development satisfies the requirements of Local Plan Policy RTT2.
66. Officers consider that the development has been carefully designed to fit the site and to provide a pleasing appearance. The building takes account of the constraints of the site and capitalises on the opportunities it provides, whilst limiting harm to the surrounding locality. As such Officers are satisfied that the proposal complies with the Development Plan policies relating to design and visual amenity.

IMPACT ON RESIDENTIAL AMENITY

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) March 2012
Core Planning Principles and Chapter 11 Conserving and Enhancing the Natural Environment

Elmbridge Core Strategy 2011
Policy CS17 – Local character, Density and Design

Replacement Elmbridge Borough Local Plan 2000
Policy COM4 – Provision of Education Facilities

67. The NPPF identifies that within the overarching roles that the planning system ought to play, a set of twelve core land use planning principles should underpin both plan-making and decision making. These principles include seeking to secure a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings. Paragraph 109 of chapter 11 states that the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by, inter alia, preventing both new and existing development from contributing to or being put at an unacceptable risk from, or being adversely affected by unacceptable levels of soil, air, water or noise pollution or land instability.
68. Core Strategy Policy CS17 requires new development to deliver high quality and inclusive sustainable design which maximises efficient use of urban land while responding to the positive features of individual locations and protects the amenities of those within the area. Local Plan Policy COM4 supports the expansion of education facilities subject to several criteria, including that there would not be a significant adverse impact on local residents. Policy HSG23 states that when considering proposals for non-residential development within predominantly residential areas, the council will apply the same criteria as contained in policy HSG16 which states that new development should, inter alia, avoid overlooking and an unreasonable loss of privacy or amenity.

Visual Amenity and Privacy/Overlooking

69. Development of an open site will inevitably change the outlook of the occupants of adjoining dwellings. In this case the site was previously developed for educational use. Officers consider that there is no right to an undeveloped outlook and it is accepted that there will always be a change of character when an open site is developed. The proposed location, height and orientation of the school buildings, and the retention and enhancement of vegetation, all seek to minimise possible overlooking of adjacent properties. The site adjoins two storey dwellings on the west, south and east, with the closest houses being positioned side on to the site. The block containing the hall and kitchen would be about 15m from the dwelling near the northwest corner of the site. The west elevation of this block would have high level windows and three doors (serving the kitchen, the plant room and the Caretaker's store). Other houses along the western boundary would be a minimum of 23m from this part of the building and more than 40m from the main part of the building. The closest dwelling to the east would be more than 45m from the building and the nearest house to the south would be approximately 75m from the building. The separation distance between these dwellings and the building, as well as the orientation of the houses and the nature of the facade of the hall and kitchen block, would ensure that there would be no loss of privacy or issues of overlooking. Officers consider that any odour or noise from a kitchen extractor would not be sufficient to cause amenity concerns to residents because of the distance between the kitchen and the nearest dwellings.
70. The dwelling near the northeast corner of the site would be about 8m from the northeast corner of the MUGAs. Although they would be visible from the first floor windows in the rear elevation of this house, the MUGAs would not be floodlit and therefore would only be used in daylight hours during term time. Consequently, the MUGAs are considered to have no impact on visual amenity.
71. Officers consider that there is adequate separation distance between building and residential properties. Taking this into account, together with the presence of intervening vegetation, Officers consider that the proposed development has an

acceptable impact on residential amenity arising from the location and scale of new buildings and from overlooking or loss of privacy.

Noise

72. One representation raises the matter of possible noise affecting neighbours, if the sports facilities (the playing fields and the MUGAs) are used at weekends and evenings. Elmbridge Borough Council have recommended that the new school and its facilities be made available for use by the wider community when not required for educational purposes, such use being secured through a Community Use Agreement. There is no mention in the supporting documentation of such use is intended. Officers consider that this decision rests with the school once it is operational.
73. Another representation claims that the new school would have a detrimental impact on the amenity of neighbours by virtue of overlooking, noise from pupils and staff, and noise and dust during the construction phase. Officers consider that noise from normal usage of the school would not be obtrusive because of the existing ambient noise particularly from traffic using Hurst Road. Noise and dust during construction are not considered to be a problem due to the separation distances between residential properties and the northern part of the site, where the buildings are proposed and the temporary period when construction will occur.
74. The County Noise Consultant has identified four possible sources of noise from the new school:-
- Noise arising from formal and informal outdoor activities
 - Noise within and arising from the building
 - Noise from pupils and staff when accessing the site
 - Noise from community use of the facilities outside normal school hours
 - There is no methodology, nor standards nor guidance for measuring and assessing the impact on local communities of noise emanating from existing or new schools. A degree of noise disturbance from schools is considered acceptable.
75. The outdoor activities at the school would cause the most significant noise disturbance to residents. The County Noise Consultant noted the noise from traffic on Hurst Road when calculating a background noise level of 48 LA90 to the east and west of the site. He anticipates a noise level of 60 LAeq being generated when the hard play areas are in use. Noise from the use of the MUGAs is expected to be slightly higher, at about 62 LAeq. These levels are significantly above the background noise level. The Noise Consultant considers that most residents will find this level of noise very noticeable and quite different to the present situation. Officers consider that this level could cause annoyance, although many people would be unlikely to find it objectionable.
76. Noise from traffic will be noticeable in the classrooms on the north side of the building facing Hurst Road. The Noise Consultant estimates that this level of noise would be above the level recommended for schools.
77. Noise emanating from the classrooms is likely to be audible, particularly in the summer when windows are open. This noise may sometimes be audible but with pupils being properly supervised, it is not considered significant and is not expected to be objectionable to residents.

78. Noise from staff cars and from pupils arriving from Hurst Road would have little impact because of the background noise. It is difficult to predict noise from the additional traffic expected to use roads in the Bishop Fox estate and from pupils using the pedestrian gate on Freeman Drive, but a certain amount of noise disturbance is inevitable. Although some residents may well find this annoying, the duration would be limited. Consequently, Officers find this situation acceptable.
79. Community use of facilities at the school, including the playing fields and the MUGAs is not being proposed, although it could be contemplated in the future. In that case the impacts of such use would have to be considered carefully in order to limit disturbance to a reasonable level.

Overall Assessment of Impact on Residential Amenity

80. Given the above, Officers consider that while the proposed school would give rise to harm to residential amenity from traffic and noise, the harm is not beyond that considered acceptable in a school context. Furthermore Officers do not consider the use to be unacceptable in a residential area, in this case particularly since the site was formerly in educational use. The proposal accords with the above noted Development Plan policy.

ECOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) March 2012
Chapter 11 – Conserving and enhancing the natural environment

Elmbridge Core Strategy 2011
Policy CS15 – Biodiversity

81. Paragraph 118 of the NPPF states that when determining planning applications, planning authorities should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity by applying various principles. These include the following:-
- If significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided (through locating on an alternative site with less harmful impacts), adequately mitigated, or, as a last resort, compensated for, then planning permission should be refused.
 - Proposed development on land within or outside a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) likely to have an adverse effect on an SSSI (either individually or in combination with other developments) should not normally be permitted. Where an adverse effect on the site's notified special interest features is likely, an exception should only be made where the benefits of the development at this site clearly outweigh both the impacts that it is likely to have on the features of the site that make it of special scientific interest and on any broader impacts on the national network of SSSIs.
 - Development proposals where the primary objective is to conserve or enhance biodiversity should be permitted.
 - Opportunities to incorporate biodiversity in and around developments should be encouraged.
 - The following wildlife sites should be given the same protection as European sites; potential Special Protection Areas and possible Special Areas of Conservation; listed or proposed Ramsar sites; and sites identified, or required, as compensatory measures for adverse effects on European sites, potential Special Protection Areas, possible Special Areas of Conservation, and listed or proposed Ramsar sites.

- 82. Core Strategy Policy CS15 seeks to ensure that new development does not result in a net loss of biodiversity and where feasible contributes to a net gain through the incorporation of biodiversity features.
- 83. The site is located approximately 340 metres east of the Knight and Bessborough Reservoirs Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), which is a component of the South West London Waterbodies Special Protection Area (SPA) and Ramsar Site. On this basis the County Environmental Assessment Officer carried out a Habitats Assessment Regulations Screening to ascertain whether the development would compromise the integrity of the SPA/Ramsar Site.
- 84. The Environmental Assessment Officer has concluded that the proposed relocation and expansion of the Hurst Park Primary School is considered to be unlikely to give rise to significant environmental effects (including impacts on the integrity of the SPA/Ramsar Site), based on the scale and type of development involved and the nature of the receiving environment. Further Assessment is therefore not required in respect of the provisions of the Habitat Regulations 2010 (as amended).
- 85. Natural England have been consulted and have advised that if the development is undertaken in strict accordance with the details submitted, it is not likely to have significant effect on the interest features for which the South West London Waterbodies SPA and Ramsar Site has been classified. Natural England therefore advised that an Environmental Assessment was not required.
- 86. In terms of the ecological impacts on the application site, a Phase 1 Habitat and Protected Species Scoping Survey (ecological report) has been carried out, comprising a desktop study and a field survey to identify existing habitats within and around the site and to obtain baseline ecological information. The study reveals the statutory designated sites, the SPA/Ramsar Site and SSSI as noted above as well as the Kempton Park Reservoirs SSSI (1.6 km northwest of the site) and the Molesey Heath Local Nature Reserve (1.1 km southeast of the site). The desk study also lists Sites of Nature Conservation Importance situated within 2km of the site. The scoping survey concluded that the grassland, trees, scrub, hedge and deadwood piles on the site are considered to have no particular ecological value in themselves, but that nevertheless the site may support protected or otherwise notable species.
- 87. The ecological report recommends that removal of trees, the hedge and scrub take place outside of the bird breeding season (generally from March to August inclusive). If this is not possible, then such vegetation should be checked for the presence of nesting birds by an experienced ecologist prior to removal. Any nests found are to be left undisturbed until the chicks have fledged. Further recommendations are that a series of bird boxes be incorporated in the development, sited by a qualified ecologist, and that as many flowering plant species as possible be incorporated in the scheme in order to increase the invertebrate interest of the site, which in turn would provide foraging opportunities for reptiles and birds.
- 88. An additional recommendation in the ecological report is the placement of 0.5m by 0.5m squares of roofing felt around the site in order to determine the presence of reptiles, these squares being allowed to bed down for two weeks and then checked for reptiles seven times during suitable weather conditions. A reptile survey report submitted as part of the application noted that this procedure, followed in Spring 2013, found no reptiles.

89. The County Ecologist was consulted on the application. He concurred with the view that no designated sites would be adversely affected by the proposed development. He was concerned, however, that the ecological report did not assess potential harm to bat roosts or flight paths, despite nine species of bat being recorded within two kilometres of the site. The County Ecologist has requested information in the presence of bat roosts (if any), their status if they are found, and the species of bat(s) affected. The presence of roosts in trees proposed to be felled needs to be determined.
90. In response the Agent has noted the following: 1) the trees on the site were checked during the scoping survey and none of them were considered suitable as bat roosts; 2) in terms of bat foraging and commuting, the site was considered to be sub-optimal as the grassland was species-poor and therefore not likely to support a substantial invertebrate population; 3) in view of the urban setting of the site and the Hurst Road frontage being lit by street lights, it is likely that any bat species using the site would be already accustomed to foraging within artificially lit environments; and 4) the opportunity to provide new roosting features within the site would provide a substantial enhancement over the current situation.
91. The County Ecologist has advised that the above details regarding bats are sufficient to address the impact of the proposal on bats. He therefore considers that nothing further needs to be done regarding bat surveys or assessment.
92. Based on the ecological details provided by the applicant, Officers consider that the development would result in no loss in biodiversity but instead, a net gain. A condition is recommended concerning the removal of vegetation including trees during the bird nesting season.
93. Officers consider that the proposed development complies with the Development Plan policies relating to ecology.

TREES AND LANDSCAPE MATTERS

Elmbridge Core Strategy 2011
Policy CS14 – Green Infrastructure

Replacement Elmbridge Borough Local Plan 2000
Policy ENV11 – Landscape Considerations in the Development Process
Policy ENV12 – Retention of Trees on Development Sites

94. Local Plan Policy ENV12 resists development which results in loss of trees which make, or are capable of making, a significant contribution to character or amenity of the area. Conditions should be imposed where appropriate to protect retained trees during construction. Policy CS14 seeks to strengthen and enhance the network of green infrastructure will be enhanced by securing soft landscaping measures in new development, focusing on the use of native species. Local Plan Policy ENV11 states that new development, where possible, will incorporate a landscape scheme or design commensurate with the character and scale of the development and the locality.
95. The applicant has submitted an Arboricultural Implication Assessment & Method Statement which recommends the removal of trees including a number of groups of trees, and the planting of replacement trees and measures to protect those to be retained. The report notes that few of the trees to be felled are classed as Grade A (high quality with a life expectancy of at least 20 years), the majority being classed as Grade B (moderate quality with at least a 20 year life expectancy) or Grade 'C' or below (low quality or young trees with a stem diameter of less than 150mm). The remaining few trees are classed as U (trees in

a condition militating against their retention beyond 10 years). The groups of trees are graded B or C. the reasons for the removal of the A and B grade trees are either where the building is proposed to be located or where extensive groundworks would compromise the structural stability of the trees. In fact the area where the majority of the development is proposed has few trees, except along the Hurst Road frontage. The removal of poorer quality trees is considered to provide opportunity to improve the overall quality of the tree population by landscape planting, including shrubs, hedging and meadow planting to supplement the new trees.

- 96. The arboricultural report recommends the installation of tree protective fencing around retained trees, precautions to minimise damage to retained trees (within Root Protection Areas), involvement of the Arboricultural Consultant who prepared the report (attending a pre-commencement meeting, supervising various aspects of the works and inspection at key stages of the process).
- 97. The County Arboricultural Manager was concerned with the original scheme because it showed no evidence of considering the value of and contribution made by the existing trees on the site, notably on the frontage on Hurst Road. He considered that the desire to locate the new building entirely on the plateau occupied by the former one was given too much weight in the design process, limiting the arboricultural input, rather than treating such input as an integral part of the planning process from the outset. He expressed concern that there would be insufficient space between the building and Hurst Road to ensure the survival of new planting. His other issue was with the loss of notable trees along the road frontage, especially two semi-mature Lime trees on either side of the westernmost vehicular entrance which served the previous school. He recommended moving the building to the south.
- 98. In terms of landscape, the application includes a Landscape Site Plan and two Soft Landscape Plans, which show the form and composition of the various landscape elements. The applicant has also submitted a report titled Landscape Management Plan, which includes a maintenance regime for each landscape element (trees, hedging, woodland boundary planting, shrubs, amenity grass, wild flower meadows, walls, fences, hard surfacing etc.) for fifteen years following completion of the development.
- 99. In commenting on the initial scheme, the County Landscape Architect expressed concern with the following: 1) higher quality existing trees not being identified as a constraint to inform the design process, noting that removal and replacement seem to have been considered too soon in the process; 2) the majority of trees along Hurst Road, including two significant Lime trees, being slated for removal; 3) discrepancies between various plans and between different parts of the Arboricultural Report; 4) the habitat area between the building and the western site boundary not being sufficiently natural, having too much paving and poorly positioned trees; 5) insufficient information being provided on the implementation of the Landscape Management Plan (especially the involvement of qualified people in the review of progress, annual reporting and yearly inspections). She recommended moving the pedestrian access from Hurst Road to the east to avoid a Lime tree, so that it could be retained; looking at pushing the hall and kitchen block slightly to the south to provide more space for planting between this part of the building and Hurst Road; re-designing the habitat areas, especially the one between the building and the western site boundary; considering moving semi-mature trees using a tree spade (that is, relocating such trees on the site rather than destroying them); amending the plans and documents to agree with each other; and providing more details of the implementation of the landscape management regime.

100. Following a meeting with the Applicant and the Agents to consider the issues raised by the County Arboricultural Manager and the County Landscape Architect, an amended design was submitted which moved the car park (and the MUGAs) 5m further south to give a larger area for planting along Hurst Road, reconfigured the main pedestrian entrance to retain a Lime tree, reconfigured the service area to provide more space for the planting along the Hurst Road frontage and softening the proposed habitat area west of the building. A revised Landscape Management Plan has also been submitted, which contains a maintenance operations matrix and a landscape specification, and amends the details of implementation of the maintenance regime.
101. Although the amended plans and documents are an improvement on those originally provided, Officers are not yet fully satisfied with the details of the landscape and tree planting proposals submitted. In particular it is recommended that further improvements are needed to the mix of planting, retention of more existing planting especially in the habitat areas, planting groups or clumps of trees rather than individual species along the eastern, southern and western boundaries of the site adjoining the playing pitches and the running track. In addition more specific information is needed in the Landscape Management Plan document and a sectional drawing is required of the tree pits for the larger trees proposed to be planted along the Hurst Road frontage.
102. Officers consider that the removal of trees is acceptable and that the proposed planting is satisfactory in principle, but a condition is needed requiring the submission of a subsequent application addressing the above noted changes and providing additional details of planting and tree maintenance.

ARCHAEOLOGY

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) March 2012
Chapter 12 Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

Elmbridge Core Strategy 2011
Policy CS1 – Spatial Strategy

103. Paragraph 128 of the NPPF states that In determining applications, local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting; furthermore, where a site on which development is proposed includes or has the potential to include heritage assets with archaeological interest, local planning authorities should require developers to submit an appropriate desk-based assessment and, where necessary, a field evaluation.
104. Policy CS1 of the Core Strategy states that all new developments should be sensitive to the character and quality of the area, respecting environmental and historic assets.
105. The site is more than 0.4ha in size, so the application was accompanied by a Desk-based Archaeological Assessment. This report assumes that the northern half of the site would be archaeologically at risk during the development but that there would be no significant disturbance in the southern portion. The Assessment concludes, based on evidence from the Surrey Historic Environment Record, that the archaeological potential of the site might be considered poor. However, it is noted that although little archaeological intervention has occurred in the vicinity, a number of sites (including the important example of Hurst Park) have yielded a wide range of archaeological material from various periods. It is unclear the extent to which the installation of the concrete foundation slab that supported the previous buildings has affected the archaeological potential of this

part of the site. Beyond this area, where previous development has had less impact, archaeological potential is deemed to be higher.

106. The Assessment concludes that the proposed development would be likely to destroy most, if not all, potential archaeological deposits through activities such as the excavation of trenches for foundations and services, levelling and landscaping. The Assessment recommends that, in view of the character of the site and the nature of the proposed development, further evaluation be carried out in the form of trial trenching.
107. The County Archaeologist finds the Assessment basically acceptable and concurs with the recommendations that further archaeological work is required. On his advice, the strategy for evaluation was extended further south to encompass the entire area of earthwork operations and amending the evaluation trench layout based on the findings of the Geotechnical and Contamination Assessment Report. The Assessment was amended on the basis of this additional information. The County Archaeologist has agreed the specification and methodology for the evaluation. He has advised that this now proceed and has recommended a condition.
108. Officers consider that it is necessary to attach a condition to any permission, specifying that the required archaeological work be carried in accordance with an approved Written Scheme of Investigation. Subject to such a condition Officers consider that the proposal is acceptable in terms of archaeology and complies with this Development Plan policy.

FLOODING AND SURFACE WATER DRAINAGE

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) March 2012
Chapter 10 – Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change

Elmbridge Core Strategy 2011
Policy CS26 – Flooding

109. Core Strategy Policy CS26 requires that development be located and designed to minimise the risk of flooding while not increasing such risk elsewhere. Planning permission should only be granted where a sequential test has demonstrated that the development is located in the lowest appropriate flood risk zone in accordance with PPS25 and the Elmbridge Strategic Flood Risk Assessment. Development in Flood Zones 2 or 3 should incorporate flood resistance and resilience measures in line with Environment Agency advice. New developments are required to use sustainable urban drainage systems (SUDS) to control surface water runoff.
110. PPS25 has been replaced by Chapter 10 of the NPPF and its accompanying Technical Guidance, which follows the same approach as PPS25 in relation to flood risk. Paragraph 103 of the NPPF states that when determining planning applications, local planning authorities should ensure that flood risk is not increased elsewhere and should only consider development appropriate in areas at a risk of flooding where informed by a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment (FRA). A site-specific FRA is required for all proposals in Flood Zones 2 and 3, and for proposals of 1ha or greater in Flood Zone 1.
111. Portions of the site are within all three flood zones, with the proposed buildings being located in Flood Zone 1, with parts of the MUGAs, the hard play area south of the buildings and the habitat area west of the buildings being in Flood Zone 2. The southern section of the site, including the most of the playing fields, is in Flood Zone 3.

112. The applicant has submitted a site specific FRA which states that locating the buildings in the low risk Flood Zone 1 means that no flood resilience or flood resistance measures are required. The report also concludes that since no construction would take place within the flood plain (that is, on land within Flood Zones 2 and 3), flood flows would not be impeded by the development and flood storage volumes would not be reduced.
113. In terms of surface water drainage the FRA notes that SUDS are an integral part of the drainage strategy for the new development, with surface water run-off generally proposed to be controlled at source (except in trafficked areas) and infiltrated into the ground. Measures such as permeable paving (for the hard play area and courtyard, the MUGAs and the pathways), soakaways and surface water attenuation have been incorporated into the design as part of the drainage strategy. The applicant has submitted the following plans relating to the drainage of the site, both during the construction phase and following completion of the development: Drainage Layout, Drainage Construction Details, Impermeable Areas Layout, and Proposed Levels Layout and Road Construction Details. SUDS / Main Drainage Maintenance Strategy and documents detailing micro drainage calculations for the proposed soakaways.
114. A further report titled Preliminary Soakaway / Permeable Paving Calculations, which is appended to the FRA, states that the surface water drainage systems for the site have been designed to ensure there would be no surcharging of water during a critical storm event of 1 in 2 years and no flooding during a critical storm event of 1 in 30 years. This appended report also assesses the flows and volumes produced during the latter storm event, up to 1 in 100 years, plus a 30 per cent allowance for climate change. This report concludes that these flows and volumes could be stored temporarily above ground without flowing from the site, noting that this approach is in accordance with the requirements of the Environment Agency.
115. The Environment Agency were consulted and indicated no objection subject to compliance with a required floor level and the implementation of a SUDs strategy. The County Flood and Water Services Manager considers the principle of the drainage proposal submitted by the applicant to be acceptable. On his request the applicant has submitted a revised version of the Drainage Layout drawing as well a document titled SUDs / Main Drainage Maintenance Strategy. He recommends a condition to ensure the effective management and maintenance of the drainage infrastructure.
116. Officers consider that subject to a condition requiring compliance with the plans and documents relating to drainage and adherence to the drainage management and maintenance regime, the development minimises the risk of flooding on the site and elsewhere, including on adjoining residential properties, and that the drainage strategy is acceptable. Consequently, Officers consider that the proposal complies with the above noted Development Plan policy.

SUSTAINABILITY

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) March 2012
Chapter 10 – Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change

Elmbridge Core Strategy 2011
CS27- Sustainable Buildings

117. Paragraph 93 of the NPPF states that planning plays a key role in helping shape places to secure radical reductions in greenhouse gas emissions, minimising

vulnerability and providing resilience to the impacts of climate change, and supporting the delivery of renewable and low carbon energy and associated infrastructure. This is central to the economic, social and environmental dimensions of sustainable development. Paragraph 95 states that to support the move to a low carbon future, local planning authorities should, inter alia; plan for new development in locations and ways which reduce greenhouse gas emissions, and which actively support energy efficiency improvements to existing buildings.

- 118. Core Strategy Policy CS27 states that all developments should consider the use of sustainable construction techniques that promote the reuse and recycling of building materials. All applications for new development should include a completed copy of the Council’s Climate Neutral Checklist.
- 119. A Design and Procurement BREEAM Assessment has been submitted as part of this application. This report provides a preliminary assessment of the environmental performance of the proposed building, demonstrating that the proposed school could achieve a BREEAM rating of 83.63%, which falls within the BREEAM ‘excellent’ category (that is, above the recommended ‘very good’ category). The pre-assessment covers the following areas: management, health and wellbeing, energy, transport, water, materials, waste, land use and ecology, pollution and innovation. In addition the building would have high levels of insulation and would feature natural ventilation. The classrooms would face north or south, the former experiencing more uniform daylight and no direct sunlight whilst the latter would have horizontal louvers as part of the fenestration to admit daylight whilst avoiding glare and limiting solar gain.
- 120. Officers are satisfied that the proposed development is capable of achieving at least a BREEAM ‘very good’ rating and that sustainable methods will be used where possible. The level of sustainability will be secured by a planning condition. Therefore the proposal is considered to accord with the Development Plan policy in this regard.

HUMAN RIGHTS IMPLICATIONS

- 121. 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.
- 122. In this case, the Officers’ view is that while potential impacts on amenity caused by traffic and noise are acknowledged, the scale of such impacts is not considered sufficient to engage Article 8 or Article 1 of Protocol 1. Their impact can be mitigated by conditions. As such, this proposal is not considered to interfere with any Convention right.

CONCLUSION

- 123. The proposed new school is acceptable in principle. The layout and design of the school are considered acceptable. The separation distances between the school building and the nearest houses are considered sufficient to avoid impacts from loss of privacy or overlooking. From an ecological point of view there would be no direct impacts on protected species. The development would result in the loss of trees, shrubs and scrub vegetation, but new planting would improve and enhance the site and the area both ecologically and in terms of landscape character. A condition is recommended requiring the submission of details of tree planting and maintenance. It is considered that there would be no detrimental effects on archaeology or in terms of flooding and surface water drainage.

124. The main impact will be on local residential amenity. Residents living in the immediate vicinity, especially in the Bishop Fox Estate adjoining the site on the west and from which a secondary pedestrian access is proposed, would experience the impacts of on-street parking and traffic congestion from school generated traffic at the start and end of the school day. These impacts are addressed by measures in the School Travel Plan, particularly by the requirement for a facility providing off-site parking for the purposes of 'park and stride' and staff vehicle parking. Officers consider that these impacts will be mitigated sufficiently by requirements covered in planning conditions.
125. Officers consider that the development accords with all relevant Development Plan policies.

RECOMMENDATION

That pursuant to Regulation 3 of the Town and County Planning General Regulations 1992, application no. EL/2014/0363 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.
2. The development hereby approved shall be carried out in all respects strictly in accordance with the following plans/drawings:

Drawing No. 12261.05 / L(PA)107, Rev. P2, Existing Site Plan, dated 17 December 2013

Drawing No. 12261.05 / L(PA)100, Rev. P4, Location Plan, dated 27 March 2014

Drawing No. 12261.05 / L(PA)101, Rev. P3, Landscape Site Plan, dated 27 March 2014

Drawing No. 12261.05 / L(PA)001, Rev. P2, Proposed Ground Floor GA Plan, dated 27 March 2014

Drawing No. 12261.05 / L(PA)002, Rev. P2, Proposed First Floor GA Plan, dated 17 December 2013

Drawing No. 12261.05 / L(PA)104, Rev. P3, Existing Trees Retention & Removal Plan, dated 27 March 2014

Drawing No. 12261.05 / L(PA)105, Rev. P2, Soft Landscape Plan - Sheet 1, dated 17 December 2013

Drawing No. 12261.05 / L(PA)106, Rev. P2, Soft Landscape Plan - Sheet 2, dated 17 December 2013

Drawing No. 12261.05 / L(PA)102, Rev. P3, Site Sections - Sheet 1, dated 9 January 2014

Drawing No. 12261.05 / L(PA)102, Rev. P3, Site Sections - Sheet 2, dated 9 January 2014

Drawing No. 12261.05 / E(PA)001, Rev. P3, Proposed Elevations Sheet 1, dated 17 January 2014
Drawing No. 12261.05 / E(PA)002, Rev. P3, Proposed Elevations Sheet 2, dated 17 January 2014
Drawing No. 12261.05 / E(PA)003, Rev. P3, Proposed Elevations Sheet 3, dated 17 January 2014
Drawing No. 12261.05 / L(PA)003, Rev. P3, Proposed Roof Plan, dated 17 January 2014
Drawing No. CS-064160-400, Rev. C1, Drainage Layout, dated 1 April 2014
Drawing No. CS-064160-401, Rev. C1, Drainage Construction Details, dated 24 June 2014
Drawing No. CS-064160-402, Rev. C1, Impermeable Areas Layout, dated 24 June 2014
Drawing No. CS-064160-403, Rev. C1, Proposed Levels Layout, dated 24 June 2014
Drawing No. CS-064160-404, Rev. C1, Road Construction Details, dated 24 June 2014
Drawing No. CS-064160-450, Rev. T1, Earthworks Analysis, dated 20 January 2014
Drawing No. CS-064160-002, Rev. T1, Proposed Foundation Plan - Option 2, dated 21 January 2014,
Drawing No. CS-064160-010, Rev. T1, Proposed Foundation Details, dated 2 December 2013.

3. (a) Within 6 months of the date of the planning permission hereby granted, a scheme for park and stride and additional parking for staff vehicles at the existing Hurst Park Primary School site or a suitable alternative location, including the creation of any crossing points should they be required, shall be submitted to the County Planning Authority for approval in writing.

4. (b) The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied until the scheme for park and stride and staff vehicle parking facilities has been fully implemented in accordance with the details approved pursuant to Condition 3(a). Thereafter the approved scheme shall be fully maintained for the benefit of the development hereby permitted.

5. The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied until a scheme for speed management measures, parking restrictions and pedestrian improvements on Hurst Road and at the Hurst Road/Freeman Drive junction has been submitted to the County Planning Authority for approval in writing, and thereafter implemented in full accordance with the approved details.

6. The School Travel Plan dated January 2014 submitted with the application shall be updated prior to the occupation of the development hereby permitted and shall be fully implemented upon first occupation on the development. The Travel Plan shall thereafter be maintained, monitored, and developed to the satisfaction of the County Planning Authority. Only the approved details shall be implemented.

7. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in all respects strictly in accordance with the Construction Management Plan - version 1 received on 23 January 2014.
8. Prior to occupation of the development hereby permitted, an additional 16 bicycle parking spaces shall be provided within the site.
9. Within 3 months of the commencement of construction of the development hereby permitted, the applicant shall assess the benefits of providing a pedestrian gate from the footpath that adjoins the eastern boundary of the site and providing lighting along this footpath. Subject to the outcome of this assessment, no gate and no lighting shall be installed until details are submitted to the County Planning Authority for approval in writing.
10. No tree felling or vegetation clearance shall take place between 1 March and 31 August in any year unless the tree or habitat has first been inspected by a qualified ecologist who has established that the clearance will not result in disturbance or destruction of an active bird's nest. If an active nest is identified as being so affected, no further works of clearance or felling shall take place until all nesting activity has concluded.
11. (a) Before any equipment, machinery or materials are brought onto the site for purposes of carrying out the development thereby permitted, protective fencing, in accordance with the details shown on the Hurst Park Tree Protection Plan as contained in the Arboricultural Implication Assessment & Method Statement dated September 2013 submitted with the application, shall be installed and 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 area.

(b) The development shall be carried out in all respects in accordance with all other measures to protect trees during construction, as set out in the Arboricultural Implication Assessment & Method Statement dated September 2013 submitted with the application.
12. No later than six months after the commencement of the development hereby permitted, further details of the landscape planting and habitat creation schemes submitted with the application shall be submitted to the County Planning Authority for approval in writing. Such details shall include:-
 - i. Soft Landscape Plans
 - ii. Landscape Management Plan
13. a sectional drawing of the tree pits for the larger trees proposed to be planted along Hurst Road.
14. The approved landscape planting scheme shall be carried out no later than the first planting season after the first occupation of any part of the development or in accordance with a programme which has first been agreed in writing by the County Planning Authority. Thereafter the landscape planting shall be maintained for a period of five years. Such maintenance shall include the replacement of any tree or shrub which is removed, uprooted, destroyed, dies or becomes in the opinion of the County Planning

Authority seriously damaged or defective. The replacement shall be of the same species and size and in the same location as that originally planted.

15. The development hereby permitted shall not commence until all elements of the archaeological written scheme of investigation, which has been submitted to the County Planning Authority for approval in writing, have been carried out in full.
16. Prior to occupation of the development hereby permitted, the applicant shall provide and secure the approval in writing of the County Planning Authority, of the drainage maintenance management plan and requirements for the drainage solution. The management plan shall indicate who shall be responsible for its undertaking.
17. No later than 12 months of the first occupation of the building hereby permitted, an assessment shall be carried out by an accredited person confirming that the development has achieved a standard of sustainable construction that would have achieved a BREEAM rating 'very good' and that assessment has been submitted to and receipt of which acknowledged by the County Planning Authority.
18. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following details of external materials, as contained in an email dated 2 May 2014:-
 - iii. Facing Brickwork - Engels Baksteen The Tatra (26155011)
 - iv. Cladding - arborClad Thermo-D Redwood (stain covering all surfaces).

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. In the interest of the amenities of the locality pursuant to Policy MOV4 of the Replacement Elmbridge Borough Local Plan 2000 and to manage and mitigate the transportation implications of the development, thereby not prejudicing highway safety nor causing inconvenience to other highway users, pursuant to Policy CS25 of the Elmbridge Core Strategy 2011 and Policies COM4 and MOV6 of the Replacement Elmbridge Borough Local Plan 2000.
4. To manage and mitigate the transportation implications of the development, thereby not prejudicing highway safety nor causing inconvenience to other highway users, pursuant to Policy CS25 of the Elmbridge Core Strategy 2011 and Policies COM4 and MOV6 of the Replacement Elmbridge Borough Local Plan 2000.
5. To manage and mitigate the transportation implications of the development, thereby not prejudicing highway safety nor causing inconvenience to other highway users, pursuant to Policy CS25 of the Elmbridge Core Strategy 2011 and Policies COM4 and MOV6 of the Replacement Elmbridge Borough Local Plan 2000.
6. To manage and mitigate the transportation implications of the development, thereby not prejudicing highway safety nor causing inconvenience to other highway users, pursuant to Policy CS25 of the Elmbridge Core Strategy 2011 and Policies COM4 and MOV6 of the Replacement Elmbridge Borough Local Plan 2000.

7. To manage and mitigate the transportation implications of the development, thereby not prejudicing highway safety nor causing inconvenience to other highway users, pursuant to Policy CS25 of the Elmbridge Core Strategy 2011 and Policies COM4 and MOV6 of the Replacement Elmbridge Borough Local Plan 2000.
8. To manage and mitigate the transportation implications of the development, thereby not prejudicing highway safety nor causing inconvenience to other highway users, pursuant to Policy CS25 of the Elmbridge Core Strategy 2011 and Policies COM4 and MOV6 of the Replacement Elmbridge Borough Local Plan 2000.
9. To ensure that the risk of harm to protected species is minimised, pursuant to Policy CS15 of the Elmbridge Core Strategy 2011.
10. To ensure that all reasonable measures are taken to protect during construction works the trees on the site which are proposed to be retained, pursuant to Policies CS14 of the Elmbridge Core Strategy 2011 and Policy ENV12 of the Replacement Elmbridge Borough Local Plan 2000.
11. To maintain landscape character and biodiversity and to secure appropriate mitigation for loss of trees and other vegetation, pursuant to Policies CS14 and CS15 of the Elmbridge Core Strategy 2011 and Policy ENV12 of the Replacement Elmbridge Borough Local Plan 2000.
12. To maintain landscape character and biodiversity and to secure appropriate mitigation for loss of trees and other vegetation, pursuant to Policies CS14 and CS15 of the Elmbridge Core Strategy 2011 and Policy ENV12 of the Replacement Elmbridge Borough Local Plan 2000.
13. To ensure that an opportunity is afforded to examine any remains of archaeological interest which are potentially affected by the development and to ensure that adequate steps are taken for the preservation or recording of such remains pursuant to Policy CS1 of the Elmbridge Core Strategy 2011.
14. To ensure that the drainage infrastructure is effectively managed throughout its lifetime and to prevent any increased risk of flooding on and off the site, pursuant to Chapter 10 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012 and Policy CS26 of the Elmbridge Core Strategy 2011.
15. To ensure that the development achieves a high standard of sustainability and makes efficient use of resources pursuant to Chapter 10 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012 and Policy CS27 of the Elmbridge Core Strategy 2011.
16. In the interest of the amenities of the locality pursuant to Policy COM4 of the Replacement Elmbridge Borough Local Plan 2000.

Informatives:-

1. The applicant is advised that the County Planning Authority expects to see either a formal arrangement with Elmbridge Borough Council for the use of the car parks at Mole Hall and the Grovelands Recreation Ground or the formalisation of use of the car park at the existing Hurst Park Primary School on the north side of Hurst Road or at an alternative suitable site, for park and stride purposes, prior to the occupation of the development.

2. The Hurst Road improvements are as generally shown on Drawings 5119468/100/001, 5119468/100/002 and 5119468/100/003 - Preliminary Design General Arrangement Sheets 1, 2 & 3 as contained in Appendix D of the Transport Assessment, Version 2.0, dated March 2014, plus the incorporation of the amendments and additions recommended by the County Highway Authority in its email dated 17 June 2014.

3. The applicant is advised that the details of the highway requirements necessary for inclusion in any application seeking approval of reserved matters may be obtained from the County Highway Authority (Transportation Development Planning Team) of the County Council.

4. 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.

5. 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.

6. 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: National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) March 2012

7

The Development Plan: The Elmbridge Core Strategy 2011 and the Replacement Elmbridge Borough Local Plan 2000
