

TO: PLANNING & REGULATORY COMMITTEE**DATE:** 22 March 2017**BY:** PLANNING DEVELOPMENT TEAM MANAGER**DISTRICT(S)** RUNNYMEDE BOROUGH COUNCIL**ELECTORAL DIVISION(S):**Chertsey
Mr NormanFoxhills, Thorpe and Virginia Water
Mr Few**PURPOSE:** FOR DECISION**GRID REF:** 503240 165737**TITLE:** SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL PROPOSAL RU.17/0060**SUMMARY REPORT****Land at Salesian School, Guildford Road, Chertsey, Surrey KT16 9LU**

The erection of a two storey building to provide 12 general teaching classrooms and associated works including the creation of 6 additional car parking spaces and 10 additional cycle parking spaces, extension of internal access road, creation of soakaway, hard landscaping works and works to trees.

The current proposal is for the construction of a two storey building to the south east corner of the site. The building would provide 12 classrooms, 5 on the ground floor and 7 on the first floor as well as a plant room, WCs, staff room and office. The new block would have a flat roof and would be constructed of brick slips with coloured panelling to the elevations. The building would measure a width of 32m, a depth of 18m and a height of 8.7m. In addition 6 further staff parking spaces are proposed as well as additional cycle parking. The building would facilitate the expansion from an 8 Form of Entry (FE) Secondary School to a 9FE secondary school with a Published Admission Number (PAN) of 270.

In this case the main issues are whether the development is or is not inappropriate in the Green Belt and if it is inappropriate development, whether considerations exist which clearly outweigh the harm to Green Belt by way of inappropriateness and any other harm so as to amount to very special circumstances; whether the development is acceptable in terms of flood risk and drainage; whether the highways works, parking and traffic generated by the proposal are acceptable in terms of highway safety and impacts on the amenity of neighbours; whether there would be any other adverse impacts on residential amenity; whether the design of the development meets the required standard; the risk of harm to archaeological resources. The ecological and arboricultural impacts will also be given full consideration.

Officers consider that the proposal would constitute inappropriate development within the Green Belt but that the applicant has demonstrated that there are very special circumstances that would clearly outweigh the harm to the Green Belt and any other harm such that an exception to policy can be made. These are the need for secondary school places and the lack of a suitable alternative site.

The proposal would integrate within the surrounding area and the impact on the street scene has been reduced through the design and location of the building and the use of materials. Officers consider that there would not be an adverse impact on residential amenity in terms of loss of light or overbearance. The highways implications can be controlled by conditions and are

not considered to prejudice highway safety. The proposed drainage strategy is considered acceptable and there would be no adverse impact in regard to flood risk. The proposal would not cause adverse impacts in terms of loss of trees, ecology, landscaping or archaeology (subject to conditions). Therefore, officers recommend that planning permission should be granted.

The recommendation is subject to referral to the Secretary of State as a Departure, to PERMIT subject to conditions.

APPLICATION DETAILS

Applicant

SCC Property

Date application valid

4 January 2017

Period for Determination

5 April 2017

Amending Documents

Written Scheme of Investigation dated December 2016
 Air Quality Assessment dated 30th January 2017
 Arboricultural Impact Assessment dated 3rd October 2016
 Arboricultural Method Statement dated 3rd October 2016
 Noise Assessment dated 21st February 2017
 Robert West Technical Note dated 01.03.17

SUMMARY OF PLANNING ISSUES

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

	Is this aspect of the proposal in accordance with the development plan?	Paragraphs in the report where this has been discussed
Design and Visual Amenity	Yes	19-22
Impact on Residential Amenity	Yes	23-34
Transportation Considerations	Yes	35-49
Flooding and Drainage	Yes	50-57
Impact on Trees	Yes	58-62
Biodiversity	Yes	63-70
Archaeology	Yes	71-74
Inappropriate Development in the Green Belt	No	75-90

ILLUSTRATIVE MATERIAL

Site Plan

Plan

Aerial Photographs

Aerial

Site Photographs

Figure 1: View of the application site facing east

Figure 2: View of the application site facing south east

Figure 3: View of the application site facing north east

Figure 4: View of the footpath and rear of the properties within Willow Close facing south

Figure 5: View of the application site with the footpath and properties in Willow Close in the background facing south

BACKGROUND

Site Description

1. Salesian School is an 8 form entry (FE) Voluntary Aided Catholic Secondary School with a pupil admission number (PAN) of 240. The site comprises of a number of buildings ranging from 1 to 3 storeys of varying designs and have been added over a number of years. The site is located within the Green Belt and a portion of the western boundary of the site falls within Flood Zone 2. There is an Area of High Archaeological Potential to the north of the site and there are a group of trees on the southern boundary which are protected by a Tree Preservation Order (TPO). The site is on a slope which slopes down from the north to the south and levels out towards the south. The surrounding area consists of residential properties to the south of the site, the M25 to the north and open fields to the east and west. Access to the site is in the south west corner of the site from the A320 (Guildford Road).

Planning History

2. Surrey County Council have not previously dealt with any planning applications on this site, however the below table shows the most recent applications determined by Runnymede Borough Council:

RU.03/0276: Two storey extension. Granted.
--

RU.05/0040: New sports facilities and changing rooms. Granted.
--

RU.05/1066: 2 dug out shelters adjacent to existing pitches. Granted.

RU.07/0901: Single storey extension to existing canteen and internal works. Granted

RU.08/0423: New classroom blocks, single storey extension and infill extension. Granted.
--

THE PROPOSAL

3. The current proposal is for the construction of a new two storey building to the south east corner of the site. The building would provide 12 classrooms, 5 on the ground floor and 7 on the first floor as well as a plant room, WCs, staff room and office. The new block would have a flat roof and would be constructed of brick slips with coloured panelling to the elevations. The building would measure a width of 32m, a depth of 18m and a height of 8.7m. In addition 6 further staff parking spaces are proposed as well as more cycle parking. The building would facilitate the expansion from an 8FE Secondary School to a 9FE secondary school with a Published Admission Number (PAN) of 270 and a total of 1350 pupils.
-

CONSULTATIONS AND PUBLICITY

District Council

4. Runnymede Borough Council No objection

Consultees (Statutory and Non-Statutory)

5. Arboriculturalist No objection subject to conditions
6. Ecologist No objection subject to conditions
7. Noise Consultant No objection
8. Air Quality Consultant No objection
9. SuDs & Consenting Team No objection subject to conditions
10. Thames Water No objection
11. The Environment Agency No comment
12. Transportation Development Planning No objection subject to conditions
13. Archaeological Officer No objection subject to conditions

Parish/Town Council and Amenity Groups

14. The Chertsey Society Object to the proposal as it does not include any mitigation measures for relieving the commensurate traffic congestion on the A320 or adjacent local roads near the school which will result with parents dropping off or collecting children.

15. The application was publicised by the posting of 2 site notices and an advert was placed in the local newspaper. A total of 32 owner / occupiers of neighbouring properties were directly notified by letter. To date 9 letters of representation have been received raising the following objections:

- Do not object to the actual extension but the significant, negative effect that expanding the school will have on the already over burdened and dangerous parking situation during drop off and pick up
- Some of the proposed unrestricted parking bays are contrary to the highway code in that they would be located opposite a road junction and would also reduce visibility from Willow Close
- The Transport Assessment states that there is space for two way traffic along Green Lane but this is only based on the averaged sized car and does not take into consideration any larger vehicles. Therefore at peak times it is only possible for one car to pass along this road
- Parents regularly park in or turn their vehicles in Willow Close which is a private road
- Proposed unrestricted parking bays will cause a safety concern for children
- Consider that there are complete failures in the report to address the expected traffic increase
- The additional volume of school traffic that will be created on already unsuitable roads has not been properly assessed
- No proposed drop off or pick up on school site
- Would like clarification that tree T5 and T6 are not being removed
- Had difficulty gaining access to the documents and had queries regarding hard landscaping, works to trees, planting of trees, flooding, ditch clearance and site of new boundaries

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

Introduction

16. The guidance on the determination of planning applications contained in the Preamble/Agenda frontsheet is expressly incorporated into this report and must be read in conjunction with the following paragraphs.

17. In this case the statutory development plan for consideration of the application consists of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan Second Alteration 2001.

18. In assessing the application against development plan policy it will be necessary to determine whether the proposed measures for mitigating any environmental impact of the development are satisfactory. In this case the main planning considerations are the impact on design and visual amenity, impact on residential amenity, transportation considerations, flooding and drainage, impact on trees, biodiversity and archaeology and the impact on the Green Belt.

Design and Visual Amenity

Runnymede Borough Local Plan Second Alteration 2001

Policy BE2 – Townscape Character

19. Local Plan Policy BE2 requires proposals to respect townscape character by reference to, among other things, existing buildings, building lines and topography, street scene, building height and roof treatment, boundary treatment and recreational and amenity open space.
20. The proposal would consist of a two storey detached building located in the south east corner of the site on an area of grass. The building would provide 12 classrooms, 5 on the ground floor and 7 on the first floor as well as a plant room, WCs, staff room and office. The new block would have a flat roof and would be of modular construction, with brick slips and coloured blue panelling to the elevations. The building would measure a maximum width of 32m, a depth of 18m and a height of 8.7m. The proposal would facilitate the expansion from an 8FE Secondary School to a 9FE secondary school with a Published Admission Number (PAN) of 270.
21. The existing school site comprises of a number of individual buildings of varying scales and designs. The proposed development would be in keeping with the general school theme given that there is an array of buildings both with pitched and flat roofs as well as brick built buildings and modular constructions. The use of the blue coloured panelling would tie the building in with the existing buildings on the site. The scale of the proposal would not dominate the school site and would be of a lesser height than that of the adjacent buildings. The proposal would not be visible from the street scene as would be set behind existing school buildings on the site. The proposal would not be overly prominent from within the site and would be located on an underused parcel of land which is surrounded by built form on three boundaries and well screened by vegetation on the remaining boundary.
22. Officers consider that the proposal would be in keeping with the scale and character of the existing site and the surrounding area and would accord with development plan policy in this regard.

Impact on Residential Amenity

No relevant Development Plan policy

23. The NPPF identifies that within the overarching roles that the planning system ought to play, a set of core land use planning principles should underpin both plan-making and decision making. These 12 principles include that planning should seek 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.

Overbearing / overlooking

24. The nearest residential properties impacted by the development are those located in Willow Close who back onto the school site. Their rear boundaries abut a footpath which separates the school boundary from the rear boundaries of these properties. There would be a total separation distance of 34m from the rear of these dwellings to the proposed building and a distance of 12m from the rear boundaries of these properties to the proposed extension. The footpath is approximately 6m wide and is currently overgrown with brambles and vegetation. The school boundary consists of weld mesh fencing and mature trees and the boundaries of the properties in Willow Close consists of 1.8m close board panel fencing as well as trees and vegetation.
25. The proposed building would be 32m wide and 8.7m in height therefore would be visible from the rear of numbers 3 – 8 Willow Close. The building would be of a large scale, however the impact on these properties is reduced by the separation distance of 34m combined with the good boundary screening on both the school boundary and the property boundaries combined with the presence of the footpath in the intervening space. Officers consider that the scale of the building would not result in overbearing or loss of light and the proposal would not result in the loss of privacy. There are no other neighbouring properties within close proximity that will be impacted by the development in this regard.

Noise

26. Officers consider that the proposed development would involve four main forms of noise generation: the increase in the number of pupils at the site (intensity of use); the potential increase in car movements as a result of the expansion; the construction noise; the noise impacts on the occupiers of the new building from the M25. The intensity in use of the site sets an important baseline context i.e. the site is an existing secondary school and any noise would be centred on certain parts of the day namely before and after school and during lunch and break times. As such, given the intermittent noise generation and good boundary treatment in the form of vegetation and fencing, it is considered that the

proposal would not have a detrimental impact on the amenities of neighbouring properties by virtue of the increase in pupils.

27. With regards to noise generation from vehicles, in order to discourage the use of the private vehicle the School Travel Plan submitted with the application suggests measures and targets in order to encourage other modes of transport i.e. walking, cycling, train etc. Officers therefore consider, given the requirements of the School Travel Plan, that any increase in private car usage could be managed so as not to result in a significant reduction in residential amenities by virtue of noise generation by car usage. This is however an area where ambient noise levels are high due to the proximity to the M25 and the proposed development is not considered to make this materially worse.
28. The impact from construction noise would be a short term impact which would be for a temporary period. A condition is recommended to limit the hours of working to reduce the impact on local residents.
29. In terms of the internal acoustics of the new building, the assessments submitted with the application follow the advice in Building Bulletin 93 and the Noise Consultant has no issues with respect to building acoustics given the proximity of the M25.

Air quality

30. The northern section of the development site is located in an area experiencing elevated pollutant concentrations given its proximity to the M25. As such, there are concerns that the proposals could expose future site users to poor air quality. Additionally, the development has the potential to cause air quality impacts at sensitive receptor locations as a result of emissions associated with the construction and operational phases. An Air Quality Assessment was therefore required in order to identify baseline conditions across the site, determine location suitability for the proposed end-use and quantify potential impacts associated with the proposals.
31. Potential construction phase air quality impacts from dust emissions were assessed as a result of earthworks, construction and track-out activities. It is considered that the use of good practice control measures would provide suitable mitigation for a development of this size and nature and reduce potential impacts to an acceptable level.
32. Dispersion modelling was undertaken in order to quantify existing pollutant concentrations at the site and predict air quality impacts as a result of road vehicle exhaust emissions associated with traffic generated by the development.

The dispersion modelling indicated that pollutant levels across the proposed new build site would be below the relevant air quality standards at sensitive locations and as such, the location is considered suitable for the proposed use without the inclusion of mitigation methods. Additionally, the assessment concluded that impacts on pollutant levels as a result of operational phase vehicle exhaust emissions were not predicted to be significant at any sensitive location in the vicinity of the site.

33. The Air Quality Consultant was notified and advised that they are in agreement with the scope, baseline conditions, assessment methodology and conclusions and as such have no objections to the proposal.
34. Officers consider that the proposal would not adversely impact upon air quality or result in adverse impacts to the future occupiers of the proposed building and as such would accord with development plan policy in this regard.

Transportation Considerations

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2012

Chapter 4 – Promoting Sustainable Transport

Runnymede Borough Local Plan Second Alteration 2001

Policy MV4 – Access and Circulation Arrangements

Policy MV9 – Parking Standards

35. Local Plan Policy MV4 seeks to ensure that development proposals provide for access and circulation appropriate to the type of development proposed and the area in which it is located so as not to aggravate congestion, accident potential or environmental or amenity considerations. Policy MV9 requires development to comply with relevant parking standards. Paragraph 72 of the NPPF states that planning authorities should give great weight to the need to create, expand or alter schools.
36. The application was accompanied by a Transport Assessment, a Framework Travel Plan and a Construction Traffic Management Plan. Transport Development Planning (TDP) were consulted on the application and advise the following. The proposal would facilitate an extension to increase the school by an extra form of entry. This will result in an increase from 8 forms of entry (maximum of 1200 pupils) to 9 forms of entry (maximum of 1350 pupils). The sixth form will remain on a separate site. The school currently employs a total of 188 staff. Following the expansion, there will be an additional 5 staff taking the total staff to across both sites to 193. 173 of these will be at the Guildford Road site.
37. As a Catholic secondary school, drawing from a wide area, the majority of the school's current pupils (80%) live in excess of 2km from the school and are therefore beyond walking distance. Currently 12.5% of pupils walk to school, 3% cycle, 37% come by rail, 6% come by public bus, 6.5% come by school bus and 35% come by car. 76% of staff arrive by car with 24% arriving on foot, bike, public bus or by train. The school bus service has been withdrawn since the pupil travel survey was undertaken and therefore 6.5% of pupils will need to find an alternative mode of travel to school. This is likely to be public bus, train or car.
38. There are four public bus services that stop directly outside the school and Chertsey railway station is 1 km (13 minutes walk) from the school. As these are secondary age pupils, this is not considered too far to walk. The school has recently liaised with South

West Trains to facilitate a timetable adjustment to give those pupils joining connecting trains at Weybridge more time to change trains. There is a shared cycleway/footway along the site frontage that links Chertsey with St Peters hospital. There are therefore good non-car options for access to this site. This is reflected in the comparatively low car modal share when compared with the distance pupils live from the school.

39. A parking survey undertaken in support of the application concluded that there are between 92 and 106 legal on-street parking spaces in the vicinity of the school, dependent upon the time of day. The parking survey covered the school drop off and pick up periods and includes all parked vehicles not necessarily those associated with the school. The on-street parking turn-over was observed to be high with spaces utilised several times during drop off and pick up. The number of spaces required therefore does not equate to the number of pupils travelling by car, with spaces being used around 3 times.
40. On the basis of the current mode share, and taking no account of any mode shift or car sharing that may occur as a result of the successful implementation of travel plan measures, but reallocating the school bus pupils between public bus (6%), car (47%) and train (47%), the proposed expansion of the school could result in an increase of 92 children coming to school by car. This is considered to be a worst case scenario. It may be that once the school is at full capacity, a school bus will be reinstated but there is no certainty that this will happen so no account is taken of it at this stage. Were it to be reinstated, the additional number of children travelling by car would be around 53.
41. The additional parking demand of 92 cars can be met at school drop off in the a.m. period but demand is likely to exceed supply in the p.m. pick up peak. This will result in short term parking stress on Green Lane. There is no suitable mitigation for this other than the school strongly advocating the travel plan and encouraging pupils to use non-car modes and/or car sharing to access the school. The school's existing good accessibility by non-car modes makes this a realistic option.
42. A School Travel Plan has been submitted with the application. This will need to be updated prior to the occupation of the extension and actively promoted by the school.
43. The impact of the school buses has previously been discussed at the Runnymede Local Committee. Members highlighted concerns about the congestion caused along the A320 Guildford Road at school drop off/pick up times and suggested officers should explore the option of buses dropping off and picking up from within the school grounds. There is no scope for buses/coaches to enter the school to wait due to the capacity and constraints of the site and, as there are now no longer any school coaches, this is a rather hypothetical issue. Additionally, removing the buses from the road would not resolve the congestion problem because parents' vehicles also contribute to the issue. There is a need to ensure that the public buses that stop on St Peter's Way are not prevented from doing so by parents' cars. The applicant is proposing a marked bus cage for 2 buses and a bus clearway. The County Council originally received a request for a clearway from the Borough Council and school because buses are often unable to stop due to parents parking. As such, they are sometimes forced to park on the school 'keep clear'. Given the increase in children attending the school and the potential for

worsening an already poor situation, it is considered reasonable for the applicant to fund and introduce the bus clearway.

44. There are currently 131 car parking spaces on site and the applicants are proposing an additional 6 spaces for the additional 5 staff. This is considered acceptable. The school is well located in terms of bus and rail access so there are other options for travel.
45. On the basis of current mode share, after adjustment for the loss of the school bus, the expansion could result in an additional 92 pupil trips twice a day and an additional 5 staff trips. Traffic modelling has indicated that the Green Lane/Guildford Road and Guildford Road/Holloway Hill junctions are already operating at the limit of capacity in the a.m peak. They are operating satisfactorily in the school p.m. peak. By 2021, when it is proposed that the school expansion is fully occupied, the junctions will worsen to be above capacity due to traffic growth in the area. This will result in longer queues, which will be worsened slightly by the expanded school. It needs to be borne in mind however that this expansion is driven by the need for additional school places. If they were not to be provided here, they would need to be provided elsewhere. It is likely that some of the additional traffic generated by the school expansion would therefore still be on the network irrespective of where the additional places are provided. Additionally, the successful implementation of measures to encourage the use of sustainable modes to travel to and from school can be expected to have some impact on the increase in car journeys associated with the school and thus reduce the increase in delays. The p.m. school peak remains below capacity in 2021.
46. The school currently has 40 cycle parking spaces and the applicant is proposing an additional 10 as part of the proposal - making a total of 50. There are already an additional 12 separate spaces for staff, and these will remain, making the total on site 62.
47. A Construction Transport Management Plan has been submitted in support of the application. It appears that HGVs will have to reverse into the site off the highway. If this is the case, there will need to be a banksman in attendance at all times when delivery vehicles enter or exit the site and there should be no deliveries during school drop off and pick up times or during the network peaks. This should ensure that there is no conflict with pupils and that there is no disruption to other road users when this area is at its busiest and most congested. These measures, provided they are implemented, should ensure that the impact of the traffic associated with construction is minimised.
48. Letters of objection have been received in terms of the highways impact of the development and the conclusions within the Transport Assessment. Further information was sought from the Applicant's Transport Consultant to address the questions raised by the residents. A Technical Note was provided to address the comments in the letter of representation. This advises that an the wrong parking beat survey was originally submitted, this has been updated to reflect the parking beat data used in the Transport Assessment which confirms the actual spaces used within the survey. They also confirm that the parking beat survey considered the appropriate widths of Green Lane within the study area. In regard to the issue with parking behaviour in Willow Close, the school travel plan, travel plan co-ordinators and communication with parents will aim to

minimise such instances. As Willow Close is a private road it is beyond the applicants or Highway Authority's powers to take direct steps in relation to this road.

49. In summary, as with any school, there are reported instances of poor parking, poor parent behaviour and localised congestion. This is likely to be exacerbated by the increase in pupils at the school. The bus measures and implementation of the school travel plan should go some way to mitigating this. In view of this, Officers consider that the proposal would be acceptable subject to conditions.

Flooding and Drainage

Runnymede Borough Local Plan Second Alteration 2001

Policy SV2 – Flooding

50. Local Plan Policy SV2 resists new residential and non-residential development, including extensions, in areas identified as being liable to flood unless it is demonstrated that the development does not impede the flow of flood water, reduce the capacity of the flood plain to store flood water or increase the number of people or properties at risk of flooding.
51. The proposed development is located within Flood Zone 1 whilst the western part of the site is within Flood Zone 2. Given the scale of the development a Flood Risk Assessment and Sustainable Drainage Strategy have been submitted.
52. It is proposed that surface water will be managed as close to the source as possible. The proposed development will increase the impermeable surface cover on the site by 1160.34m². Due to the nature of the geology underlying the site and following the hierarchy line, it is proposed that runoff from the site is to be discharged via infiltration systems to the surrounding subsoil.
53. The drainage strategy proposes the following SuDS devices to deal with the surface water runoff from the proposed impervious zones. It is proposed to use attenuation, Permeable Paving, and a Soakaway. It is proposed to use a Geocellular System as sub-base of the proposed Permeable Pavement. The permeable pavement will be formed by these 3 layers: Permeable tarmac at the top, laying Course Material and finally a sub-base: geocellular system. A throttle device such as a hydrobrake is proposed to be set up at the Geocellular System to control the flow rates piped to the soakaway located at the south east of the site.
54. Water runoff from the access roads and hardstanding will be collected and piped to the sub-base of the Permeable Pavement to be stored and gradually discharged to the Soakaway, to be infiltrated into the ground. Flow controls are proposed to be set up in the pipes that collect runoff from these hardstanding areas to ensure runoff is discharged at a controlled rate. Water runoff from the proposed development roof will be collected and conveyed to the Soakaway, where it will be infiltrated into the surrounding subsoil.

55. The above devices will be designed for a Critical Duration Storm, 100 year rainfall event plus 30% climate change allowance. Hence, they meet with the minimum standards to avoid the flood risk within the development in a 1 in 100 year rainfall event. In the event of drainage system failure under extreme rainfall events or blockage, flooding may occur within the site. In the event of the extension's drainage system failure, the runoff flow will be dictated by topography on site. This will not impact on the site or nearby dwellings. It is recommended that the ground floor of the proposed building is raised 300mm above floor level to mitigate against any extreme surface water flows.
56. The Environment Agency (EA) were consulted on the proposal and have no comments to make. The Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) were also consulted on the proposed development and do not raise objection to the proposal subject to a number of conditions relating to the applicant undertaking infiltration tests of the proposed soakaways to determine the infiltration rates and ground water levels, confirmation of the actual contributing impermeable area (from existing buildings and proposed extension building) that will drain into proposed soakaway. The soakaway shall be designed using actual contributing impermeable area and assurance that silted drains on the site are cleared to ensure conveyance of surface water through the drainage network to prevent flooding/ponding of the site. Further details are also required in terms of drainage design, how the drainage system will cater for system failure as well as management and maintenance of the sustainable drainage system.
57. Officers consider that subject to the above conditions the proposal would be acceptable and would accord with development plan policy in this regard.

Impact on Trees

Runnymede Borough Local Plan Second Alteration 2001

Policy NE12 – Protection of Trees

Policy NE14 – Trees and Development Proposals

58. Local Plan Policy NE12 seeks to protect significant trees and make provision for new planting. Policy NE14 states that where trees form a major feature of a development site, wherever practical, new development will be expected to allow for the retention of existing suitable trees. Appropriate conditions are to be applied to ensure that retained trees are adequately protected during development.
59. As a result of the development 1 category 'U' Goat Willow tree (T25) is proposed to be removed. It is also proposed to undertake some tree works in the form of pruning trees T5 (Goat Willow) and T6 (Willow) whose trunks are within the adjoining footpath to the south of the site but some branches overhang the school site. These trees are covered by a group Tree Preservation Order. Tree works are also proposed to T20 – T24 also in the form of pruning.
60. The location of the building would be within the root protection zones of a number of trees on the southern boundary of the site therefore supervised excavation will be required when constructing the building. The trees affected will be T2 (Oak), T5, T6 and T8 (Leyland Cypress).

61. The County Arboricultural Manager was consulted on the proposal and raises no objection to the proposal subject to a number of conditions to ensure the development is carried out in accordance with the arboricultural information submitted.
62. Officers consider that subject to conditions, the proposal would not adversely impact upon trees and the loss of one tree is acceptable in this instance. No further planting is required. The proposal would therefore accord with development plan policy in this regard.

Biodiversity

Runnymede Borough Local Plan Second Alteration 2001

Policy NE20 - SPECIES PROTECTION

63. Policy NE20 states that development proposals will only be permitted where it does not cause demonstrable harm to species of animal and plant or its habitat protected by legislation.
64. The application was accompanied by a Phase 1 Habitat Survey. The site is not covered by any designations nor are there any within a 1km radius of the site. Three Sites of Nature Conservation Importance are located further afield, Pannells Farm, Fan Grove and Hardwick Court Farm, however, the development will be confined within the site boundary and will therefore have no direct impact on the designated sites.
65. The majority of habitats within the site are of low ecological value, however, the scrub and scattered trees have intrinsic ecological value for their potential to support nesting birds, roosting bats and reptiles. No protected species records exist for the site itself nor do those records submitted for the surrounding area directly indicate that the site will support a protected species.

Bats

66. The bat roost assessment of three mature oak trees along the eastern perimeter found them to offer medium potential to support roosting bats. The current proposals seek to retain these trees and thus there will be no impact on any potential roosts. However, should future management works be required on these trees then an aerial inspection of each tree should be undertaken by a suitably qualified ecologist who will inspect all cavities, cracks and fissures for the presence of (or indicators of) bats. A condition is recommended to ensure the development is carried out in accordance with the recommendations within the Phase 1 Habitat Survey which includes the installation of a bat box.

Birds

67. The site supports vegetation in the form of scattered trees and scrub, which have potential to support nesting birds. The proposals seek to retain such vegetation, however, should vegetation removal be required to facilitate development, it should be undertaken outside of the bird-nesting season (March to August inclusive for most British

bird species) so to avoid potentially disturbing a nest. If the clearance works are to be undertaken from March to August than an ecologist should undertake a check for nesting birds immediately prior to any vegetation being removed. Enhancement in the form of bird boxes is proposed to mitigate for the loss of bird nesting habitat on the site.

Badgers

68. The site does support suitable foraging habitat in the form of amenity grassland. To ensure that foraging badgers are not harmed during construction all trenches left open overnight will have a means of escape either via a rough wood plank and a sloped end. All harmful chemicals will also be stored within a fenced compound and made inaccessible to badgers.

Reptiles

69. The site offers suitable reptile habitat in the form of the earth bank and scrub present in the north-eastern corner of the site, however these fall outside of the construction footprint. The proposed building will be constructed on an area of well-maintained amenity grassland, which is considered to be unsuitable for reptiles. To ensure that the suitable reptile habitat isn't encroached by construction vehicles or used for storage of materials, it should be clearly demarcated with appropriate signage. Construction personnel should be made aware of its presence and the potential repercussions of its damage/removal.
70. The County Ecologist was consulted on the proposal and raises no objection subject to the assurance that recommendations are implemented. Officers suggest conditions to ensure this and subject to these conditions, the proposal would accord with development plan policy in this regard.

Archaeology

Runnymede Borough Local Plan Second Alteration 2001

Policy BE15 - Areas of High Archaeological Potential

Policy BE16 – Preservation and Recording of Archaeological Remains

71. Policy BE15 states that where development is proposed within areas of high archaeological potential the Council will require the prospective developer to undertake an archaeological assessment, and where appropriate a site evaluation before the planning application is determined. Where finds are made they should be treated in accordance with Policy BE16 which states that adequate excavation and accurate record to be made of any archaeological remains which will be destroyed.
72. The application is supported by the results of a trial trench evaluation and a written scheme of investigation for the conduct of a strip, map and sample excavation. The evaluation consisted of the excavation of two trial trenches that revealed a post hole dated to the late Bronze Age or early Iron age together with significant quantities of

worked and burnt flint of a similar date that strongly suggest that evidence of Late Bronze Age settlement activity is present within the footprint of the new build.

73. In order to mitigate the threat that the development poses to these newly discovered heritage assets further archaeological work is required in order to identify and record any further archaeological remains that may be present. This should take the form of an area strip, map and record excavation of the footprint of the new build. The Written Scheme of Investigation was submitted with the application which advises that the strip, map and record excavation will ensure that any archaeological deposits on this area of the site are recorded in an appropriate manner.
74. As the worked carried out so far has identified that archaeological remains are present and that preservation by record would be the appropriate mitigation response, a condition is recommended to ensure that any remains found and preserved and recorded. The County Archaeologist agrees with the above approach and raises no objection subject to a condition securing the implementation of the strip, map and record excavation. Officers consider that subject to the above suggested condition, the proposal would be acceptable in this regard.

Inappropriate Development in the Green Belt

Runnymede Borough Local Plan Second Alteration 2001

Policy GB1 - Development within the Green Belt

75. Policy GB1 states that within the Green Belt except for the area within the settlement of Thorpe, there will be a strong presumption against development that would conflict with the purposes of the green belt or adversely affect its open character. The presumption is that within the green belt only agricultural, forestry and certain other limited uses, including the change of use of rural buildings, will be acceptable. There will continue to be a presumption against new buildings and "infilling" will not normally be allowed. NPPF para 87 states that development which is inappropriate should not be approved except in very special circumstances. Para 88 states that very special circumstances will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness and any other harm is clearly outweighed by other considerations. Paragraph 89 states that planning authorities should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate development unless listed within the exceptions. This proposal does fall within any of the exceptions and therefore would be inappropriate.
76. The proposal would be considered as inappropriate development within the Green Belt as it would not be replacing an existing building and would not be classed as a limited extension or alteration of a building. In these circumstances it is for the applicant to demonstrate that very special circumstances exist in order to justify the inappropriate development. The NPPF states that *'When considering any planning application, local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt. 'Very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations'* (para 88).

Harm to the Green Belt and Other Harm

77. In accordance with paragraph 88 of the NPPF the impact of the development needs to be assessed in terms of any other harm to the Green Belt in addition to the

inappropriateness of the proposal. The extent of harm to the Green Belt, and in particular the impact the proposal has on the purposes of including land in Green Belts through its impact on openness is influenced by the scale and location of the proposed development. The prevention of towns merging into one another remains a key purpose of the Green Belt as stated in the NPPF and is relevant in this case given the location of the development.

78. In this case the proposal is for a new detached classroom block and associated works. Having regard to openness, the school complex occupies a large curtilage which borders the M25 to the north, open countryside to the east and west and residential properties to the south. The residential area is within the urban area therefore the proposal would be infilling an area between existing built development. The proposed development would be located to the south east of the site on an area used for soft play (grass). The site is well screened on its boundaries. The proposed building has been designed to be sympathetic to the style and scale of the existing school buildings. The location of the development when taken in the context of the wider school site, would obscure some of the building from public views and would be read against the existing buildings. In view of the scale and location of the proposal officers consider that it will not give rise to a significant loss of openness and it would therefore cause moderate harm to the Green Belt in this location and that any potential harm in this respect has been minimised.

79. There are other sources of non Green Belt harm through impacts on the highway. The adverse impacts on highway safety in terms of additional traffic have been fully assessed by the County Highway Authority who recommends a number of conditions to ensure that the amenity impacts are limited. As such officers consider that any 'other harm' caused by the development can be ameliorated through the imposition of conditions.

Need for the Development

80. The proposal would allow the school to expand from a 8 Form Entry Secondary School to a 9 FE Secondary School with a total of 1350 pupils. Between 2011 and 2015, Surrey will have provided an additional 13,000 primary and secondary school places, with the focus of this programme having been on the primary sector. Between 2016 and 2021, Surrey is anticipating the need to provide an additional 11,000 primary and secondary school places, with the focus of the capital programme shifting to the secondary sector, as the larger cohorts accommodated in the primary sector now transfer into secondary education. The provision of additional secondary school places is vital in order to ensure that the Local Authority fulfils its statutory duty of providing sufficient school places and meet the demands of a rising population. The provision of additional places at Catholic Schools is also essential in providing specific faith based school places that retain and enhance a diversity of provision in the School estate and to meet the specific demands of a rising catholic population.

81. In an effort to meet this specific demand there are extensions of at least 1 FE planned for the following Catholic Secondary Schools within Surrey County:

- St Andrews Catholic School, Leatherhead (14.8 miles from Salesian);
- St John the Baptist Catholic Comprehensive School, Woking (6.4 miles from Salesian);

- St Peters Catholic Comprehensive School, Guildford (12.3 miles from Salesian); and
- St Bede's, Redhill (21 miles from Salesian).

82. In 2016, all of the schools listed above received more preference applications than they have places available. For Catholic education, schools serve specific deaneries within the Diocese in which they are located. Although it does not have a defined catchment area, Salesian primarily serves the catholic community of the Weybridge Deanery the coverage of Salesian is the only Catholic secondary school in Runnymede Borough Council while there is no Catholic secondary school provision in Elmbridge. Salesian's catchment extends beyond the Weybridge deanery.

83. The Weybridge Catholic deanery primary schools are the primary feeder schools for Salesian, with pupils attending these primary school given priority in this secondary school when it comes to places available. These primary schools are listed below:

- Cardinal Newman Catholic Primary School, Hersham;
- Holy Family Catholic Primary School, Addlestone;
- St Albans Catholic Primary School, Molesey;
- St Anne's Catholic Primary School, Chertsey;
- St Charles Borromeo Catholic Primary School, Weybridge;
- St Cuthbert's Catholic Primary School, Englefield Green; and
- St Paul's Catholic Primary School, Thames Ditton.

84. These Catholic primary schools, feeding directly into Salesian have a combined annual published admissions number (PAN) of 330 pupils, following the expansion of St Albans School by 30 places per year. Salesian has a PAN of 240 per annum. Therefore, there are approximately 90 more pupils per year from the priority feeder schools than there are spaces available at Salesian. Currently, Salesian's published admissions number (PAN) is 240, however there is a shortfall of educational accommodation for that number of pupils. There is also a requirement to address this shortfall. Additionally, Salesian is a consistently oversubscribed school, routinely receiving many more applications than it has places available:

- In 2015, Salesian received 617 applications for 220 places. Of these 617 applications, 256 were received from pupils attending deanery Catholic primary schools, while the remaining 361 applications were received from outside the deanery or pupils not attending the feeder schools within the deanery; and
- In 2016, Salesian received 583 applications for 240 places. Of these 583 applications, 220 were received from pupils attending deanery Catholic primary schools, while the remaining 343 applications were received from pupils from outside the deanery or pupils not attending the feeder schools within the deanery.

85. It is therefore clear that there is an immediate need to extend Salesian due to the significant shortage of school places compared to demand. The school is currently operating over capacity and there is an extremely large unmet annual demand for school places at Salesian, with demand for places consistently surpassing available pupil places to the extent where there are almost 3 times more pupil applications than spaces available each year.

Alternative Sites

86. There are 6 other Catholic secondary schools within Surrey County. Of these 6 schools, the following have been discounted as options capable of being extended to facilitate the identified educational need at Salesian, for the reasons set out below:

- All Hallows Catholic School, Farnham is located approximately 21 miles from Salesian and serves a different catchment area than Salesian;
- St Bede's, Redhill is also located 21 miles from Salesian and serves a different catchment;
- St Andrews Catholic School, Leatherhead is located within the Green Belt in Mole Valley District Council. Additionally, it is located approximately 15 miles from Salesian and serves a different catchment;
- St John the Baptist Catholic Comprehensive School, Woking is located within the Green Belt in Woking Borough Council;
- St Peters Catholic Comprehensive School, Guildford is approximately 12 miles from Salesian and serves a different catchment. It is also currently being extended by 1 FE to address demand within its own catchment and the planning application is under consideration;
- St Paul's Catholic College is located within relatively close proximity to Salesian (approx. 6.6 miles), it is unable to facilitate an extension which would address the demand for places at Salesian given its more constrained site, priority to the Upper Thames deanery and the fact that it serves a different catchment.

87. Given the above, there are no other suitable alternative sites that could accommodate the need for pupils within this area or which serve the same catchment area.

Whether need for additional school places constitutes very special circumstances

88. Officers consider that a robust case has been made by the applicant demonstrating a need to increase the school from a 8FE to a 9FE Secondary School and there are no alternatives available. Officers consider that the need set out above coupled with the lack of suitable alternative sites constitutes very special circumstances.

Conclusions on Green Belt

89. The proposed development constitutes inappropriate development in the Green Belt. Officers consider that the proposal would not cause significant harm to the Green Belt by virtue of its inappropriateness or cause significant harm to the open character of the Green Belt in this location or any other harm. Officers are satisfied that the applicant has demonstrated that there is a need to increase the school by one form of entry and it has been demonstrated that this is the most suitable site within the local area. The lack of alternative sites demonstrates that the proposal cannot be located elsewhere.
90. Officers consider that the very special circumstances of need for the additional school places which cannot be accommodated on another site clearly outweighs the harm caused to the Green Belt by virtue of inappropriateness and any other harm in terms of loss of openness which has been minimised. Officers therefore consider that the proposal can be supported as an exception to Green Belt policy.
-

HUMAN RIGHTS IMPLICATIONS

91. 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.
92. In this case, the Officer's view is that while impacts on amenity caused by traffic movements at the start and end of the school day and noise from construction and intensification of school site are acknowledged, the scale of such impacts are not considered sufficient to engage Article 8 or Article 1 of Protocol 1. Their impacts can be mitigated by conditions. As such, this proposal is not considered to interfere with any Convention right.
-

CONCLUSION

93. The scale, design and location of the proposed building would not adversely impact on the design or visual amenity of the existing site and would integrate well within the surrounding area. The proposal would complement the existing school buildings and integrate the old with the new. The proposal would be of a large scale but can be comfortably accommodated on this site. The proposal would not be visible from the street scene given its location set behind other buildings.
94. Given the reasonable separation distances between the building and the neighbouring dwellings, there would be no adverse impact on the neighbouring properties as a result of the proposed development. Planning and highways officers are satisfied that the submitted transport information is robust and that the proposed package of mitigation measures is a suitable and proportionate response to the potential traffic impacts identified.

95. The loss of trees one 'U' grade tree is considered acceptable. The drainage, ecological and archaeological impacts would to be controlled by condition.
96. The proposal would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt however officers consider that very special circumstances exist, namely the need for secondary school places and lack of suitable alternatives, that would clearly outweigh the harm to the Green Belt and any other harm such that an exception to policy can be made. The impact on openness has been minimised.
97. Given the above, Officers considers that the proposal would be acceptable and would accord with the NPPF and policies in the Runnymede Borough Local Plan Second Alteration 2001. As such it is officers view that the proposal should be granted subject to relevant conditions.

RECOMMENDATION

1. Pursuant to the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (Consultation) (England) Direction 2009, application no. **RU.17/0060** be forwarded to the Secretary of State and
2. in the absence of any direction by him and pursuant to Regulation 3 of the Town and Country Planning General Regulations 1992, the application be PERMITTED subject to the following conditions

Conditions:

IMPORTANT - CONDITION NO(S) [10] MUST BE DISCHARGED PRIOR TO THE COMMENCEMENT OF THE DEVELOPMENT.

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 in accordance with the following plans/drawings:
 - DWG No: 1001, Site Location Plan dated Nov 2016
 - DWG No: 1002, Existing Site Plan dated Nov 2016
 - DWG No: 1003, Proposed Site Plan dated Nov 2016
 - DWG No: 0001, Ground Floor Plan dated 22/11/16
 - DWG No: 0002, First Floor Plan dated 22/11/16
 - DWG No: 0003, Elevations Sheet 1 dated 22/11/16
 - DWG No: 0004, Elevations Sheet 2 dated 22/11/16
 - DWG No: 0006, Sections Sheet 1 dated 22/11/16
 - DWG No: 0007, Sections Sheet 2 dated Nov 2016
 - DWG No: 0015, Roof Plan dated 22/11/16
 - DWG No: 48588/2, Location of Underground Services and Drains dated February 2016
3. In carrying out the development hereby permitted, no construction activities shall take place except between the hours of 07.30 and 18.00 between Mondays and Fridays and

between 8.00 and 13.30 on Saturdays. There shall be no working on Sundays or bank and public national holidays.

4. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the Construction Traffic Management Plan submitted with the application.
5. During school term time, there shall be no HGV movements to or from the site between the hours of 08.00 and 09.00, 15.15 and 16.00 or 17.00 and 18.00.
6. Prior to the occupation of the development hereby permitted, the Travel Plan shall be updated and thereafter be implemented, maintained, monitored and updated in accordance with details which have been submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority.
7. The development shall not be occupied unless and until the car parking provision has been provided in accordance with the approved plans and shall thereafter be retained for its designated use.
8. The development shall not be occupied unless and 10 cycle spaces have been provided in accordance with the approved plans and shall thereafter be retained for their designated use.
9. The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied unless and until the proposed bus clearway and bus cages have been implemented.
10. Prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted the following details shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority:
 1. Infiltration tests carried out in accordance with BRE 364 at the locations of the proposed soakaways to determine the infiltration rates and ground water levels and submit the results to the County Planning Authority. The soakaways shall be designed and implemented using the actual infiltration rates.
 2. Confirmation of the actual contributing impermeable area from the existing buildings and proposed extension building that will drain into the proposed soakaway. The soakaway shall be designed using the actual contributing impermeable area.
 3. Evidence that the proposed drainage solution(s) will effectively manage the 1 in 30 and 1 in 100 (+Climate change allowance) for storm events.
 4. Details of how the Sustainable Drainage System will cater for system failure or exceedance events, both on and offsite shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority. Details shall include finished flow levels of the site.
 5. Details of how the Sustainable Drainage System will be protected and maintained during the construction of the development
 6. Details of maintenance regimes and responsibilities of the drainage and suds elements during the operation and lifetime of the systems shall be submitted.

The approved details shall be implemented and maintained throughout the lifetime of the development.
11. Prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted, the applicant shall ensure that the silted drains are cleared to ensure conveyance of surface water through the drainage network to prevent flooding/ponding of the site.

12. Prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted, the ecological enhancements as set out in paragraph 5.12 of the Extended Phase 1 Habitat Survey submitted with the application shall be implemented.
13. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in all respects in accordance with the Arboricultural Method Statement shown within table 3, clause 5.1 contained within the Arboricultural Impact Assessment AIA 01 REV B dated 03.10.2016.
14. Before any equipment, machinery or materials are brought onto the site for the purposes of carrying out the development hereby permitted, the tree protective fencing shall be erected in accordance with drawing titled Tree Protection Plan (DWG No: TPP-01 Rev B dated 03.02.17). The tree protective fencing shall remain in situ for the duration of the construction of the development hereby permitted. For the duration of works on the site no materials, plant or equipment shall be placed or stored within the protected area.
15. The excavations of the foundation within the easterly side of the building shall be carried out in accordance with paragraph 11 of the Arboricultural Method Statement AIA 01 REV B dated 03.10.2016.
16. The proposed development shall be carried out in strict accordance with the Written Scheme of Investigation for an Archaeological Strip, Map and Sample dated December 2016 and any further requirements of the County Archaeologist as a result of the above works.

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 interests of residential amenity in accordance with paragraph 123 of the NPPF.
4. To ensure that the development should not prejudice highway safety not cause inconvenience to other highway users, to prevent conflict between pupils, parents and staff with construction vehicles and to protect the residential amenity of local residents in accordance with Policy MV4 and MV9 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan Second Alteration 2001.
5. To ensure that the development should not prejudice highway safety not cause inconvenience to other highway users, to prevent conflict between pupils, parents and staff with construction vehicles and to protect the residential amenity of local residents in accordance with Policy MV4 and MV9 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan Second Alteration 2001.
6. To ensure that the development should not prejudice highway safety not cause inconvenience to other highway users, to prevent conflict between pupils, parents and staff with construction vehicles and to protect the residential amenity of local residents in accordance with Policy MV4 and MV9 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan Second Alteration 2001.
7. To ensure that the development should not prejudice highway safety not cause inconvenience to other highway users, to prevent conflict between pupils, parents and staff with construction vehicles and to protect the residential amenity of local residents in accordance with Policy MV4 and MV9 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan Second Alteration 2001.

8. To ensure that the development should not prejudice highway safety not cause inconvenience to other highway users, to prevent conflict between pupils, parents and staff with construction vehicles and to protect the residential amenity of local residents in accordance with Policy MV4 and MV9 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan Second Alteration 2001.
9. To ensure that the development should not prejudice highway safety not cause inconvenience to other highway users, to prevent conflict between pupils, parents and staff with construction vehicles and to protect the residential amenity of local residents in accordance with Policy MV4 and MV9 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan Second Alteration 2001.
10. To ensure the design meets the technical stands for SuDs and the final drainage design does not increase flood risk on or off site in accordance with Policy SV2 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan Second Alteration 2001.
11. To ensure the design meets the technical stands for SuDs and the final drainage design does not increase flood risk on or off site in accordance with Policy SV2 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan Second Alteration 2001.
12. In the interests of biodiversity is accordance with Policy NE20 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan Second Alteration 2001.
13. To ensure protection of the trees in accordance with Policies NE12 and NE14 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan Second Alteration 2001.
14. To ensure protection of the trees in accordance with Policies NE12 and NE14 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan Second Alteration 2001.
15. To ensure protection of the trees in accordance with Policies NE12 and NE14 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan Second Alteration 2001.
16. To ensure that any archaeological remains are preserved in accordance with Policy BE15 and BE16 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan Second Alteration 2001.

Informatives:

1. 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.
2. 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.
3. 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.
4. The applicant is reminded that, under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981, as amended (Section 1), it is an offence to remove, damage or destroy the nest of any wild bird while that nest is in use or is being built. Planning consent for a development does not provide a defence against prosecution under this Act.

Trees and scrub are likely to contain nesting birds between 1 March and 31 August inclusive. Trees and scrub are present on the application site and are assumed to contain nesting birds between the above dates, unless a recent survey has been undertaken by a competent ecologist to assess the nesting bird activity during this period and shown it is absolutely certain that nesting birds are not present

5. All necessary tree works shall be undertaken in accordance with BS 3998:2010 Tree work, recommendations.
6. Details of the highway requirements necessary for inclusion in any application seeking approval of reserved matters may be obtained from the Transportation Development Planning Division of Surrey County Council.
7. The applicant is advised that as part of the detailed design of the highway works required by the above condition, the County Highway Authority may require necessary accommodation works to street lights, road signs, road markings, highway drainage, surface covers, street trees, highway verges, highway surfaces, surface edge restraints and any other street furniture/equipment
8. The permission hereby granted shall not be construed as authority to carry out any works on the highway or any works that may affect a drainage channel/culvert or water course. The applicant is advised that a permit and, potentially, a Section 278 agreement must be obtained from the Highway Authority before any works are carried out on any footway, footpath, carriageway, verge or other land forming part of the highway. All works on the highway will require a permit and an application will need to be submitted to the County Council's Street Works Team up to 3 months in advance of the intended start date, depending on the scale of the works proposed and the classification of the road. Please see <http://www.surreycc.gov.uk/roads-and-transport/road-permits-and-licences/the-traffic-management-permit-scheme>. The applicant is also advised that Consent may be required under Section 23 of the Land Drainage Act 1991. Please see www.surreycc.gov.uk/people-and-community/emergency-planning-and-community-safety/flooding-advice.

CONTACT

Alex Sanders

TEL. NO.

020 8541 9462

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 2012](#)

[Planning Practice Guidance](#)

The Development Plan

The Runnymede Borough Local Plan Second Alteration 2001

This page is intentionally left blank