

**PLANNING AND REGULATORY COMMITTEE
30 JULY 2014
UPDATE TO AGENDA ITEM 7**

**SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL REGULATION 3 APPLICATION:
LAND AT JOHN NIGHTINGALE SCHOOL SITE (NEW HURST PARK PRIMARY
SCHOOL), 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.**

FURTHER REPRESENTATIONS AND PETITION

Five additional representations have been received since the Officers' report was completed. A petition signed by 6 local residents has also been received. All of these representations and the petition raise concerns relating to traffic and parking, issues which with one exception are noted in paragraphs 25 to 27 of the report. The exception is the point that the amendments to the Transport Assessment do not overturn the fact that the roads in the Bishop Fox Estate are narrow cul-de-sacs which were not designed to accommodate a significant amount of on-street parking.

Paragraphs 37 to 58 in the Officers' report deal with transportation issues. Paragraph 43 concludes that surrounding residential roads could provide sufficient parking capacity to accommodate 142 cars, the maximum number estimated to arrive at peak morning and afternoon times for the school. The matters of the parking of staff vehicles and the influence of the School Travel Plan are discussed in paragraphs 45, 46 and 56. In paragraph 58 Officers conclude that an off-site 'park and stride' facility is considered necessary to mitigate the potential adverse impact on local residential amenity arising from traffic congestion and on-street parking. The conditions require provision of a 'park and stride' facility to take some pressure away from the residential roads in the vicinity of the school.

A last minute representation has been received. The points raised are outlined below, followed by the responses by officers in brackets:

- the need for a drop-off and pick-up facility on the school site or on the verge along Hurst Road, as well as the need for more parking space on the site [The verge provides insufficient space for this facility, leading to vehicles queuing on Hurst Road which is an A-class road. There is insufficient space on the site for the facility since the built element including car parking and space for service vehicles needs to be kept of the area prone to flooding].
- there is sufficient space on the site for this facility and the additional parking provision by sacrificing some of the over generous sports provision [The sports provision meets with requirements and should not be sacrificed to provide additional on site parking. Further parking will be provided at the off-site 'park and stride' facility].
- concerns with on-street parking in the Bishop Fox Estate [Officers accept that parked cars may cause inconvenience and have amenity impacts on residents; however these impacts will be ameliorated by the proposed off-site

'park and stride' provision and otherwise are not considered to amount to significant harm. The roads are of adequate width to allow a vehicle to pass a parked car. There are two vehicular access points to the Estate. Traffic in the Estate will be travelling at slow speeds as a result of on-street parking. Therefore, Officers do not consider that the situation will be dangerous].

- an experiment conducted by residents shows in photographs the issue with on-street parking [The photographs show that there is sufficient width to permit parking on one side of the roads in the Estate, which is in accordance with the findings of the revised parking capacity survey].
- the proposed access to the school site from Freeman Drive is very narrow and there are houses very close by [This access point is for pedestrians only and is to enable children living locally to reach the school without having to walk to the main entrance on Hurst Road].
- attached extract from a report by an independent engineer, questioning the increase in staff numbers compared with the existing school; noting the need to increase on-site parking for staff vehicles in accordance with the Surrey Transport Plan and to avoid staff parking in local residential roads; identifying congestion, chaos, and safety issues in the Bishop Fox Estate at drop-off and pick-up times; questioning the parking capacity figures in the original version of the Transport Assessment (since revised to reduce the capacity figures significantly); and notes a lack of provision for short term parking of coaches [It is not clear who prepared the report. It was based on the on revision 1.0 of the Transport Assessment and not on the latest version dated June 2014. The increase in staff numbers was provided by the applicant. Accidents outside primary schools are very rare. Coaches call infrequently at primary schools. Coaches could either stop on Hurst Road or reverse into the school site. Unless they are taking children to the school (or collecting them) coaches will not conflict with traffic at peak times for the school. The County Highway Authority and the County Planning Authority have actively encouraged the applicant to look at 'park and stride' sites, and this aspect of the scheme has been addressed in the Officers' report. Staff travel and parking will need to be addressed through the School Travel Plan].
- there are inaccuracies in the documentation supporting the application, especially the Transport Assessment and the School Travel Plan [The inaccuracies are acknowledged but as a matter of fact they do not in themselves discredit the analysis].
- the proposal conflicts with a policy in the NPPF [paragraph 35] that calls for 'safe and secure layouts which minimise conflicts between traffic and cyclists or pedestrians; the proposal does not comply with the County Council's Transport Plan and Parking Strategy [Each development proposal is considered on its own merits taking into account site specific issues and constraints. In many cases a drop-off and pick-up facility will not be suitable or able to be accommodated. Thus the lack of provision will not constitute an overriding constraint].
- the decision on the proposal should await completion of the County Council's review of policies on parking provision for school developments [The review is unlikely to make a difference in this case due to the physically constrained nature of this site, as noted above].

SUMMARY OF PUBLICITY UNDERTAKEN AND KEY ISSUES RAISED BY PUBLIC

The text at the end of the first bullet point in paragraph 26 is repetitive.

SUGGESTION FROM ELMBRIDGE BOROUGH COUNCIL ABOUT A 'PARK AND STRIDE' OPTION

The Officers' report [paragraph 11, point (i)] indicates the response of Officers to the suggestion by Elmbridge Borough Council that the car park at the Molesey Cemetery be used for 'park and stride' purposes. Officers consider the existing use to be incompatible with a 'park and stride' use associated with the school.

SUSTAINABILITY – BREEAM ASSESSMENT

Paragraph 119 in the Officers' report notes that the Design and Procurement BREEAM Assessment concludes that a rating of about 84% (exceptional) could be achieved by the new school. However, the outcome is likely to be approximately 60% (very good), a rating which has been achieved for other new schools granted planning permission in the County.

CONDITION RELATING TO THE SCHOOL TRAVEL PLAN

Condition 6 in the Officers' report is confusing and Officers recommend that the wording be revised.

THE NUMBERING OF PLANNING CONDITIONS

In the final formatting of the report the conditions were inadvertently renumbered. The correct numbering is set out in the table below.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Deletion of the words "which has narrow and winding roads with no pavements" at the end of the first bullet point in paragraph 26.
2. Condition 6 be revised to read as follows:

Within 6 months of the occupation of the development hereby permitted, the School Travel Plan dated January 2014 shall be updated and submitted to the County Planning Authority for approval in writing and thereafter shall be implemented, maintained, monitored and further updated to the satisfaction of the County Planning Authority.

3. Condition 12 be amended to read as follows:

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
- (iii) a sectional drawing of the tree pits for the larger trees proposed to be planted along Hurst Road.

4. Condition 13 be deleted.

5. That the remaining conditions be renumbered as follows:

Conditions in Officers' report	Renumbered conditions
4(b)	3(b)
5	4
6	5
7	6
8	7
9	8
10	9
11	10
12	11
14	12
15	13
16	14
17	15
18	16

6. That the reasons remain as in the report.