To: Planning & Regulatory Committee **Date:** 8 September 2021

By: Planning Development Manager

District(s) Mole Valley District Council

Electoral Division(s):
Ashtead
Mr Townsend

Case Officer:
Stephanie King

Purpose: For Decision

Grid Ref: 517527 157203

Title: Surrey County Council Proposal MO/2021/1087

Summary Report

St Andrews RC School, Grange Road, Leatherhead Surrey KT22 7JP

Permanent one form of entry expansion comprising two storey extension to the existing Earl Building to provide additional teaching and supporting accommodation; demolition of existing 'Woodlands Building' and erection of a replacement two storey standalone block comprising teaching and supporting accommodation; permanent retention of two demountable classroom units; modification of existing Main Building and Performing Arts Building elevations to provide new external windows and doors to suit altered internal layout and ventilation strategy; and associated external works and landscaping.

The recommendation is PERMIT subject to conditions.

Application details

Applicant
SCC Property

Date application valid
19 May 2021

Period for Determination
20 September 2021

Amending Documents
Acoustic Design Report 20/0474/R1 dated 18 August 2021

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
Need for Community Facilities	Yes	44 - 55

Sustainable Design, Scale and Landscaping	Yes	56 - 82
Ecology, Trees and Archaeology	Yes	83 - 110
Impact on Residential Amenity	Yes	111 - 127
Drainage and Flood Risk	Yes	128 - 139
Impact to Playing Fields	Yes	140 - 149
Highways, Traffic and Access	Yes	150 - 186
Metropolitan Green Belt	Yes	187 - 204

Illustrative material

Site Plan

Site plan 1: Site location plan and application site area

Aerial Photographs

Aerial 1: Site location adjacent to the M25

Aerial 2: Main school site and application red line boundary

Aerial 3: School site including planning fields to the north of the main school site

Application Plans

Plan 1: Drawing number: HBS-00-00-DR-A-1102 Rev P2 Proposed Block Plan dated 5 May 2021 (Proposed development locations within the main school site).

Plan 2: Drawing number: HBS-EB-ZZ-DR-A-1122 Rev P2 Existing and Proposed Elevations Sheet 1 dated 10 May 2021 (Earl Building extension)

Plan 3: Drawing number: HBS-EB-ZZ-DR-A-1121 Rev P1 Existing and Proposed Elevations Sheet 2 dated 5 May 2021 (Woodlands Building and new classroom block)

Plan 4: Drawing number: HBS-ZZ-XX-DR-A-1123 Rev P0 Existing Demountable Elevations

Site Photographs

Figure 1: Woodlands Building

Figure 2: Proposed new classroom block location

Figure 3: View looking north to Earl Building and proposed Earl Building extension location to the left of Earl Building, with the two demountable units on the right side of figure

Figure 4: View looking north along Grange Road with St Andrews School and site entrance on the left side of the figure.

Figure 5: View looking south along Grange Road with north east corner of St Andrews School site on the right side of the figure.

Background

Site Description

1. St Andrew's Roman Catholic (RC) School occupies a 3.22 hectares (ha) site within a largely residential area, north east of Leatherhead and west of Ashtead. The School site

is bordered by the M25 to the west and Public Footpath 52 (Linden Pit Path) to the north. St Andrew's RC School is on the south-western side of Grange Road. The main entrance to the School is sited at the northern end of Grange Road at the corner where the road meets Ottways Lane. St Andrew's RC School is one of three schools in the immediate area with St Peter's Roman Catholic Primary School to the north separated by Linden Pit Path (also within the Green Belt), and Downsend School to the south.

2. St Andrew's RC School is a 7 Form of Entry (7FE) school with a 250 place 6th Form, however due to a number of bulge classes, the school effectively is an 8FE (1200 pupils) with a 250 place 6th Form. The School caters for children aged from 11 to 18 years old.

3. The existing school buildings are predominately two storey with a mixture of pitched, curved and flat roofs. The external walls are typically smooth grey and textured cream brickwork or blockwork with a mixture of white, blue and dark grey external windows and doors. The main school site also has a small playing field adjacent to the south west boundary, however, the school's main playing field is off-site accessed via a short walk to the north west.

4. The School is positioned at the edge of the Green Belt with this encompassing the school and land to the north, south and west, but not Grange Road and land to the east. The site is located within Food Zone 1 and is adjacent to an Area of High Archaeological Potential.

Planning History

5. MO/98/0640 Single story extension following demolition of timber extension (permitted 17 June 1998).

6. MO/01/1493 New garage block (permitted 26 November 2011).

7. MO/02/0240 Erection of two temporary single storey double classroom blocks (permitted 4 July 2002).

8. MO/2003/0447 Erection of new temporary teaching block (part revision of MO/02/0240) (permitted 9 May 2003).

9. MO/2003/0470 Replacement temporary exam hut (permitted 9 May 2003).

10. MO/2005/1285 Detached part single and two storey building to provide classrooms dining room, chapel and other school facilities, and, detached sports hall building with ancillary changing, shower and other facilities and car parking, and, coach and car drop off area following demolition of existing buildings (permitted 24 May 2007).

11. MO/2005/2053 Extension to existing design technologies department (permitted 3 February 2006).

12. MO/2006/0511 Relocation of existing prefabricated modular building and erection of new prefabricated modular building for a temporary period of five years (permitted 19 May 2006).

13. MO/2008/0913 Tree Works (permitted 25 July 2008).

14. MO/2009/0752 Removal of 1 No. Lime tree (T1 on submitted plan (permitted 20 August 2009).

15. MO/2015/0897 Erect first floor extension to provide new classroom and office space (permitted 5 August 2015).

16. MO/2015/0897/1 Non-material amendment to allow all windows to be lower in height (permitted 4 November 2015).

17. MO/2018/2006 Replacement and renewal to existing flat roof areas of Gymnasium Block, and renewal of cladding areas to rear and side. Replacement windows and provision of an extended ramp and risen pathway to rear of block to improve access (permitted 31 January 2019).

18. MO/2020/1250 Erection of two storey extension to provide toilet and archive store facilities (permitted 17 September 2020).

The proposal

19. The proposal is for a permanent 1 Form Of Entry (1FE) expansion from 7FE school (1050 pupils) with a 250 place 6th Form to an 8FE (1200 pupils) with a 250 place 6th Form. The applicant explains that due to a number of bulge classes the school is currently operating as an 8FE school. Pupil forecasts suggest that the demand for school places will be sustained in the long term, therefore the school is seeking to permanently expand to an 8FE and 250 place 6th Form to accommodate the demand. To support the permanent 1FE expansion, the proposal details a permanent, additional 7 full time employees. No additional vehicle parking is proposed.

20. To facilitate the permanent 1FE expansion, the proposal comprises a two storey extension to the existing Earl Building to provide additional teaching and supporting accommodation, demolition of existing 'Woodlands Building' and erection of a replacement two storey standalone block comprising teaching and supporting accommodation, and the permanent retention of two demountable classroom units.

21. The existing Earl Building is proposed to be extended from the south west end of the building. The proposed extension location would occupy approximately 171.8 metres squared (m^2) of the current playing field, therefore the applicant has submitted a Pitch Assessment to accompany the application. The proposed extension will be finished in the same materials as the existing building, flat built-up felt roof, buff and gold facing brickwork, and steel blue windows and doors. The existing 2 metres (m) high welded mesh fence is proposed to be extended to accompany the enlarged building footprint, with new soft and hard landscaping to match the existing Earl building surroundings. 2m high timber hit and miss fencing and gates are also proposed to compound the Earl Building air source heat pump. The proposed extension will provide seven English classrooms to replace those reconfigured into IT classrooms in the main school building, two 6th Form seminar rooms, pupil WC, stores, a History Office to replace one reconfigured into circulation for the Earl building extension, an English Office to replace one reconfigured into a Specialist Science Laboratory in the main school building, and circulation and stairwell including a platform lift.

22. The existing Woodlands Building is proposed to be demolished and replaced with a two storey standalone block. The proposed block will cover a slightly larger area than the existing Woodlands building and will also be taller than the existing Woodlands building. The proposed replacement building will be finished with blue-grey cladding and oatmeal coloured masonry. The windows and doors are proposed to be finished in anthracite grey and the roof is proposed to be pitched and finished with zinc standing seam cladding. The replacement building is proposed to include two Food rooms and associated Food Prep and store rooms, Drama Studio and associated Drama store, Drama Office, three ICT classrooms and associated store, one ICT/business studies classroom, one female, one male and two accessible WCs, and circulation and stairwell including a platform lift.

23. Two demountable classroom units located to the south east of the Earl Building are proposed to be permanently retained as part of this application. Each unit contains two classrooms making a total of 4 classrooms to be retained.

24. In addition, this proposal comprises the modification of the existing Main Building, Performing Arts Building and DT Block to provide new external windows and doors to facilitate level access, local grading, ramps/stairs where required, an altered internal layout to provide additional teaching accommodation, and a new ventilation strategy.

Consultations and publicity

District Council

25.	Mole Valley District Council	No objection and provide advice regarding relevant policies and careful consideration of very special circumstances weighed against the harm to Green Belt.

Consultees (Statutory and Non-Statutory)

26.	County Arboriculturist	No objection, subject to a condition securing the implementation of the details set out in the Arboriculture Method Statement.
27.	County Archaeological Officer	No objection.
28.	County Ecologist	No objection, subject to condition securing the implementation of the proposed enhancements and mitigation measures set out in the Preliminary Ecological Assessment.
29.	County Landscape Officer	No objection, recommends inclusion of standard biosecurity informative.
30.	County Noise Consultant	No objection, subject to condition securing noise limits for the site.
31.	County Highway Authority	No objection, subject to two conditions securing the implementation of the submitted Construction Transport Management Plan and the submission of an updated school travel plan prior to the first occupation of the development. Also recommends inclusion of four highways and school travel plan informatives.
32.	Lead Local Flood Authority	No objection, subject to two conditions requiring the submission and approval of a detailed surface water drainage scheme prior to the commencement of development and of a verification report prior to first occupation of the development.
33.	Sport England	No objection, as proposal meets exception E3 of the Sport England Playing Fields Policy.
34.	Sutton and East Surrey Water	No views received.
35.	Thames Water	No objection, recommends inclusion of surface water, groundwater, public sewer and petrol/oil interceptors informatives.

Parish/Town Council and Amenity Groups

36. No parish councils, town councils or residential amenity groups were identified within the local area of the application site.

Summary of publicity undertaken and key issues raised by public

37. The application was publicised by the posting of 6 site notices and an advert was placed in the Surrey Mirror. A total of 95 of owner/occupiers of neighbouring properties were directly notified by letter.

38. To date, five letters and one petition with twenty signatures was received objecting to the proposed development. The main concerns and reasons for objecting are:

- Grange Road and surrounding roads have long-standing parking and traffic problems which is intensified by the proximity of Downsend and St Peters Schools located adjacent to St Andrews School. These existing highways, traffic and access problems will be exacerbated by the proposed 1FE expansion.

- Existing parking issues include parking on both sides of the road, across double yellow lines, dropped curves and pavements. This poor parking creates one lane for highway traffic leading to a build-up in vehicles, congestion and aggressive driving due to frustration, which will be worsened by an increase in pupils. Existing traffic and parking calming measures including double yellow lines on part of Ottways Lane and Grange Road are not enforced.

- Existing parking issues prevent residential access to driveways and homes every school day at pick up and drop off times and prevents pedestrian use of the pavements. Parking along Grange Road also inhibits sight lines when turning into residential driveways and closes creating a safety risk to highway uses. This will be worsened by an increase in pupils.

- Existing parking and traffic issues present a life threatening safety risk to highway users, pupils, pedestrians and residents. Multiple near misses have been witnesses with students on bicycles pulling out into oncoming traffic. Existing parking and traffic issues inhibits emergency services access through and to nearby residential properties which poses a potentially life threatening safety risk. Appropriate conditions are needed to ensure existing safety issues for children and locals are not worsened but mitigated.

- As the schools along Grange Road do not use distance in their selection criteria of pupils, any expansion in capacity inevitably brings more traffic to an already congested road as pupils from further afield will travel to school by car. However, the proposal does not include any additional parking.

- Travel by car is not a sustainable mode of transport and increases congestion and pollution to the local area which is already impacted by congestion and the M25.

- The Travel plan is based on 2011 census data which is outdated and does not represent a relevant baseline against which the proposed impact of the 1FE expansion should be considered. St Andrews RC School and neighbouring schools have increased their capacity since 2011 and therefore does not reflect the local changes. An up-to-date traffic assessment is required to assess highway impacts and mitigation measures.

- The roads to the south of Ashtead, known as the 'The Lanes' (the old pony and trap roads) are not designed for the current scale of traffic, and therefore cannot accommodate an increase in traffic as a result of the proposed school expansion.

- Double yellow lines need to be extended to and included at the Grangemount T-Junction. Double Yellow lines need to added on Grangemount especially at the junction to prevent parking close to the junction. Cars currently park a couple of metres along the road making entering and exiting impossible.

- An In/Out road should be built at the rear of the School buildings and joined to existing entry and exit gates so all the children can be dropped-off in the site compound.

- The proposal lacks details on construction timeframes and noise and traffic construction impacts on local residents. Further details are required to demonstrate consideration of construction impacts and suitable mitigation measures. Concerned about level of construction impact disturbance.

- Blades Close is being used as an overflow parking area by parents and teachers as evidenced by the same cars parked all day. Blades Close road surface has significantly deteriorated and the main reason for this is the amount of external traffic using it, creating yet more new pot-holes. Previously repaired within the last 2 years.

- The increased traffic will increase air pollution arising from vehicles negatively impacting local residents and the local environment.

- The proposed expansion is likely to increase the number of incidents of anti-social behaviour, including smoking, littering and graffiti outside and on residential fences and hedges.

- The trees on Grangemount need pruning annually, which has not happened for many years.

- Concerned that proposed development will make way for further FE expansions and increase in pupil numbers.

- Lack of responsibility being taken on the ongoing traffic and parking issues.

39. Officers recognise local concerns with the proposed development and have addressed them within the relevant sections of the report.

Planning considerations

Introduction

40. 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.

41. In this case the statutory development plan for consideration of the application consists of the Mole Valley Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2009, the saved policies contained within the Mole Valley Local Plan 2000, and Ashtead Neighbourhood Development Plan 2017.

42. Mole Valley District Council is preparing a new Local Plan, but as this is at an early stage of preparation, the emerging Local Plan policy does not carry any weight in the planning balance and therefore is not a material planning consideration.

43. In considering this application the acceptability of the proposed development will be assessed against relevant development plan policies and material considerations. 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: Need for Community Facilities; Sustainable Design, Scale and Landscaping; Ecology, Trees and Archaeology; Impact on Residential Amenity; Drainage and Flood Risk; Impact on Playing Fields; Highways, Transport and Access; and Metropolitan Green Belt.

NEED FOR COMMUNITY FACILITIES

Mole Valley Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2009 (MVCS 2009)

Policy CS17 - Infrastructure, Services and Community Facilities
Mole Valley Local Plan 2000 Saved Policies (MVLP 2000)
Policy CF2 - Provision of New Community Facilities

7

Policy

44. MVCS 2009 Policy CS17 resists the loss of key services and facilities (including community facilities), unless an appropriate alternative is provided or, evidence is presented that the facility is no longer required and suitable alternative uses have been considered. This will require the developer to provide evidence that they have consulted with an appropriate range of service providers and the community where relevant.

45. MVLP 2000 Policy CF2 supports the development, expansion or change of use of premises for community facilities in the District's built-up areas provided that the development is required to meet the needs of the locality which cannot be met through the use of existing community premises.

Need

46. The applicant has submitted an Education Need Statement contained within the Planning Statement to establish the need for the proposed development. The Educational Need Statement explains that while St Andrews School increased their published admission number (PAN) in 2017 to reflect the increase in Catholic demand for places, the school still has had to repeatedly admit above PAN to meet demands. This has resulted in a rolling increase in total number of pupils from 934 in 2013 to 1457 in 2020.

47. The pupil projections for the Leatherhead secondary place planning area forecast a sustained demand of over 700 pupils. The increase in demand is in part due to an increase in housing in Mole Valley District but mostly due to an increase in cohorts moving from primary to secondary in Leatherhead and beyond the district border, namely in Epsom, Ashtead, Banstead, Dorking, Effingham, Fetcham, Ewell, Leatherhead, Tadworth and more recently Cobham.

48. The Education Need Statement highlights that St Peter's Catholic Primary School had a 1FE expansion in 2014 to meet the increase in Catholic demand for places and that as a direct feeder school to St Andrew's School, the additional pupils from St Peter's School will be expected to feed into St Andrews. There will be no bulge classes from September 2021.

49. Furthermore, the Education Need Statement explains that Surrey County Council's strategy is to expand high quality provision that meets demand, whilst also ensuring that there is a diverse pattern of provision to provide families with some element of choice. St Andrew's Catholic Secondary School is the only Catholic school in the district of Mole Valley and provides Catholic education for the wider Catholic deanery which is part of the Diocese of Arundel and Brighton. The school was rated 'Outstanding' in the last Ofsted inspection in December 2012, and therefore the Education Need Statement explains that a proposed expansion will maintain the diversity of places and balance between faith and non-faith places in the district of Mole Valley.

50. Despite the previous PAN increase, there has been no physical expansion of the school premises. As a result, the Education Need Statement explains that the school was unable to continue to offer additional bulge class in 2020 to meet Catholic demand due to the physical limitations of its current accommodation.

51. In view of the projected long term demand for places, the proposed development has been devised through an assessment of internal and external areas. This assessment has identified the need for additional floor area to provide sufficient teaching and supporting facilities to accommodate a permanent 1FE increase. The additional teaching

space is proposed to be provided by the permanent retention of two demountable classroom units, the demolition of the Woodlands Building and redevelopment of the same area through a new building, extension of the Earl Building and internal refurbishment. The Planning Statement is clear that SCC school undertook a public consultation on the proposal, enabling parents, neighbours and staff to discuss and comment on the proposed development.

52. Mole Valley District Council raises no objection on the need for the proposed development.

53. Officers consider that the Educational Need Statement sufficiently identifies a need for the proposed 1FE expansion as there is an existing and projected demand for Catholic places at the school site and in the wider locality. As the only Catholic secondary school in Mole Valley District, St Andrews School is the only school which can accommodate the long term Catholic demand for places in the locality. Therefore, Officers are satisfied that the proposed development accords Policy CF2 of the MVLP 2000 in this regard.

54. In addition, Officers recognise that the 1FE expansion cannot be reasonably located at another school as the additional 150 pupils are already at the school site due to a number of bulge classes. Furthermore, Officers are satisfied that there is an identified need to expand the school site to provide sufficient space for the increase in pupils numbers and consider that the permanent 1FE expansion cannot be adequately accommodated within the existing infrastructure on site. Officers are therefore satisfied that the proposed development meets the requirements of Policy CF2 of the MVLP 2000.

55. Moreover, Officers are satisfied that the submitted Planning Statement sufficiently demonstrates that the loss of the Woodlands Building will allow for more efficient use of the school land to provide sufficient and updated teaching facilities through the redevelopment of the land with a new building, and therefore accords with Policy CS17 of the MVCS 2009 in this regard. Officers consider that the schools public consultation of the proposed development also meets the requirements of Policy CS17 of the MVCS 2009 to provide evidence that they have consulted with an appropriate range of service providers and the community where relevant.

SUSTAINABLE DESIGN, SCALE AND LANDSCAPING

Mole Valley Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2009 (MVCS 2009)
Policy CS14 - Townscape, Urban Design and the Historic Environment
Policy CS19 - Sustainable Construction, Renewable Energy and Energy Conservation
Mole Valley Local Plan 2000 (MVLP 2000)
Policy ENV4 - Landscape Character
Policy ENV22 - General Development Control Criteria
Policy ENV23 - Respect for Setting
Policy ENV24 - Density of Development and The Space About Buildings
Policy ENV25 - Landscape Design of New Developments
Policy ENV30 - Access for Disabled People to Non-Domestic Buildings and their Sites
Policy CF2 - Provision of New Community Facilities
Ashtead Neighbourhood Development Plan 2017 (ANDP 2017)
Policy AS-En3 - Retaining Character
Policy AS-Inf3 - Valued Community Facilities

Policy

56. MVCS 2009 Policy CS14 resists development of a poor design quality and requires all new development to respect and enhance local character and incorporate appropriate landscaping with particular attention to the use of trees and hedges native to the locality. MVCS 2009 Policy CS19 requires new buildings and the redevelopment and

refurbishment of the existing building stock to minimise energy use through design, layout and orientation while also maximising on-site recycling facilities, and the re-use and recycling of materials used in construction. In addition, new and redeveloped buildings must meet BREEAM 'Very Good' construction standards as a minimum and include a 10% reduction in total carbon emissions through the on-site installation and implementation of decentralised and renewable or low-carbon energy sources. Furthermore, Policy CS19 requires applicants to demonstrate how these requirements have been met unless it can be demonstrated that compliance is not technically or financially achievable having regard to the type of development involved and its design.

57. MVLP 2000 Policy ENV4 seeks to ensure that development proposals do not detract from the character of the local landscape and account should be taken of the visual impact of the proposed development on the landscape with careful consideration of the siting, design, colour and associated planting.

58. MVLP 2000 Policy ENV22 requires the design and layout of development to satisfy several criteria including being appropriate to the site in terms of its scale, form and appearance and external building materials; and respecting the character and appearance of the locality. Respect for the setting of development is also echoed in MVLP 2000 Policies ENV23 and ENV24, which require development proposals to take account of the scale, character, bulk, proportions and materials of the surrounding built environment. Development will not be permitted where it is considered it would constitute over-development of the site by reason of scale, height or bulk or in relation to the boundaries of the site and/or surrounding developments.

59. MVLP 2000 Policy ENV25 requires particular care to been taken in the provision, use and design of spaces between buildings and that the hard and soft landscape design is suitable for the site and form of development. Furthermore, MVLP 2000 Policy CF2 requires that proposals for community facilities should not detract from the character and appearance of the property and surrounding area, and the scale of the development is appropriate to the needs of the local community. MVLP 2000 Policy ENV30 requires educational buildings to provide suitable access for people with disabilities, and where practicable and reasonable, this should apply to the change of use or external alteration to a building.

60. ANDP 2017 Policy AS-En3 requires all developments to be visually integrated with their surroundings and designed with regard to the character of the surrounding area. ANDP 2017 Policy AS-Inf3 is clear that the expansion or improvement of community facilities to meet local demand will be supported, provided their design and scale is compatible with the character and amenities of the location.

Design, scale and layout

61. The submitted Design and Access Statement details that the existing school buildings vary in scale and age. The Sports Hall and Art Building are the tallest buildings on site, the latter of which measures 9.6m in total height. As the existing buildings have been extended over the schools lifetime, each part of the school has a slightly different but harmonious material palette. The majority of the existing school buildings are two storey with a mix of flat felt roofs, pitched zinc roofs and curved standing seam roofs. The external finishings are predominately buff facing brickwork or block in grey with windows and doors in white, blue and dark grey. The existing modular buildings with textured external wall finishings are coloured cream and those with smooth external walls are finished in grey.

62. The Design and Access Statement is clear the existing building scale and finishings were carefully considered as part of the form and design of the proposed development to ensure an enhancing quality and congruous appearance of the existing site and surrounding amenity.

63. The existing and proposed scale and design of the Earl Building and the building extension is illustrated on drawing number: HBS-EB-ZZ-DR-A-1120 Rev P2 Existing and Proposed Elevations Sheet 1 dated 10 May 2021. The existing Earl Building measures 19.1m in length, 18.4m in width and 7m in height, and is located in the North West corner of the main school site. The proposed Earl Building extension will increase the length of the building by 22m (from 19.1m to 41.1m in total length), while the existing width and height would remain the same. The Earl Building extension is proposed to be located off the western end of the existing Earl Building. Officers consider that the proposed dimensions of the Earl building extension and the replacement building have been designed to be of appropriate bulking, mass and scale and therefore is congruent with the scale of the existing school site. Officers also consider that the proposed Earl building extension is appropriately sited at the western end of the existing Earl building and to the rear of the schools property so that it does not result in any adverse visual impact in accordance with development plan policies CF2, ENV4, ENV22, ENV23 and ENV24 of the MVLP 2000 and Policy AS-En3 of the ANDP 2017.

64. As detailed in paragraph 21 above, the two-storey Earl Building extension will be finished in Ibstock Bristol Gold colour buff facing brickwork, and PPC aluminium blue external windows and doors. Similarly, the hoppers and downpipes are proposed to be PPC aluminium coloured Jet Black. The roof will be flat and finished in built-up felt. Officers are satisfied that proposed external material and colour finishings have been selected to match the existing Earl Building and therefore will be in keeping with the existing design and character of the school site in accordance with development plan policies CF2, ENV4, ENV22, ENV23 and ENV24 of the MVLP 2000.

65. The dimensions of the existing Woodlands Building and the proposed design and scale of the replacement building are illustrated on drawing number: HBS-NB-ZZ-DR-A-1121 Rev P1 Existing and Proposed Elevations Sheet 2 dated 5 May 2021. The Woodlands Building is located between the existing single-storey DT Block and double-heights Sports Hall. The Woodlands Building measures 26m in length, 9.7m in width and 2.6m, and had a total floorspace of 252.2m^2. The Woodlands Building is proposed to be demolished to make space for a new classroom block.

66. The new classroom block is proposed to be a two storey building with a pitched roof, located at the site of the to be demolished Woodlands Building. The new classroom block is proposed to be 29.4m in length, 17.2m in width and 8.3m in height and with a floorspace of 505.68m^2. This represents an approximate doubling in floorspace due to the 3.4m increase in length and 7.5m increase in width. The external steel framed escape stair and satin stainless steel steps add an additional 1.3m to the length and width of the replacement building. Officers note that new classroom block is a sizeable increase to the existing Woodlands Building but recognise that there is a need for additional classroom space to accommodate the permanent 1FE and will provide updated and improved teaching facilities that cannot be as efficiently achieved by extending the existing Woodlands Building. Officers consider that the proposed siting of the new classroom block at the same location as the to be demolished Woodlands Building is an efficient use of land and is an appropriate siting for a new building within the existing fabric and main area of the existing school site.

67. In addition, Officers consider that the proposed scale and massing of the new classroom block to be in keeping with the largely two-storey existing school buildings and wider locality. Furthermore, given the position of the new classroom block adjacent to the larger Sports Hall and to the rear of the school site, Officers are satisfied that the proposed building will not result in any significantly adverse impacts on visual amenity and will be in keeping with the existing school site in accordance with development plan policies CF2, ENV4, ENV22, ENV23 and ENV24 of the MVLP 2000 and Policy AS-En3 of the ANDP 2017.

68. The new classroom block is proposed to be externally finished in cream coloured facing masonry at the ground floor and pre-weathered blue-grey vertical angle standing seam zinc cladding at the first floor. External doors and windows are proposed to be anthracite grey PPC aluminium and the roof will be pitched with weatherproof ventilation cowls, a soil vent pipe and a passive ventilation roof terminal. The main entrance will be covered by a canopy. Officers consider that the proposed design and external material and colour finishings to be in keeping with the harmonious material palette of the existing school buildings. Officers consider that the use of similar colours will allow the new buildings to blend into the existing landscape of the school and will not have an adverse impact on visual amenity. Therefore, Officers are satisfied that the new classroom block will be in keeping with the existing school site and will be a neutral contribution to the wider local character in accordance with development plan policies CF2, ENV4, ENV22, ENV23 and ENV24 of the MVLP 2000.

69. The Earl Building extension and new classroom block are proposed to be powered by air source heat pumps (ASHP). Both buildings will have an ASHP contained within a compound. The Earl Building ASHP compound will be located at the western end of the building and measuring approximately 1.9m in length and 3.2m in width. The new classroom block ASHP compound will be located at northern end of the new building and will approximately measure 1.5m in length by 3m in width. Each compound will be surrounded by 2m high Hit and Miss timber fencing. Officers support the include of ASHP as a sustainable energy source and consider the proposed ASHP compounds and fencing to be suitable and in keeping with the wider site, and therefore are satisfied that the ASHP compounds accord with development plan policy CS19 of the MVCS 2009 and policy ENV22 of the MVLP 2000 in this regard.

70. The two modular classroom units are located to rear of the site, to the north of the Sport Hall, east of the soft amenity grass play area, south of the Earl Building, and east of the hard-surfaced play area. One unit is finished in grey colour and the other in an oatmeal colour. Both have flat roofs and external doors and windows finished in white. Both units are the same scale and measure approximately length of 16m. Including the access stairs at either of the unit, the total length is approximately 21m. Each unit is approximately 3.4m in height and has a unit width of 8.7m, 12m total width including stairs. Officers consider that the scale of the classroom units to be in keeping with the wider school site and are satisfied that their location to the rear of the site ensures the units do not have an adverse impact on visual amenity. Officers are satisfied that the finishing colours and design are in keeping with the sites existing material palette. Officers are satisfied that the modular units scale, design and location to be congruous with the wider local character and will not result in any adverse impact on visual amenity, and therefore accord with development plan policies CF2, ENV4, ENV22, ENV23 and ENV24 of the MVLP 2000.

71. Officers note that residents have raised concerns the proposal will possibly increase the anti-social behaviour in the area. Officers do not consider that nature of the development is undesirable or out of keeping with the local environment, nor is the design of the proposal one that encourages or facilities anti-social behaviour. Officers consider that these is no evidence to support that the proposal will result in an increase in anti-social behaviour.

Existing buildings alterations

72. The proposed development also includes modifications to the elevations of the existing Main Building and Arts Building to facilitate the proposed internal reconfiguration, ventilation strategy and provide level thresholds and ramps. Officers consider that the proposed changes to existing buildings' access is appropriate and are satisfied that it will ensure suitable access for people with disabilities to educational buildings as required by development plan policy ENV30 of the MVLP 2000.

Sustainability

73. In addition, a Building Research Establishment Environmental Assessment Method (BREEAM) report has been submitted which sets out that the proposed development could achieve a BREEAM Very Good rating. Officers are satisfied that the BREEAM report includes a robust assessment of the sustainability of the proposed development and that the BREEAM Very Good rating is achievable, and therefore meets the requirements of development plan policy CS19 of the MVCS 2009 in this regard.

74. Furthermore, the Sustainable Design and Construction Statement sets out the sustainable benefits from demolition and new build rather than refurbishment and building extension rather than new build. The Design and Access Statement and Sustainable Design and Construction Statement are also clear that a high standard of energy efficiency and conservation has been incorporated into the design of the proposed developed through external wall glazing, even distribution of natural light, thermally-glazed windows and doors, low-water use scheme and new ventilation scheme. Moreover, the Earl Building extension and new replacement building will be heated by Air Source Heat Pumps (ASHP), which afford a sustainable energy source. Officers consider that the proposed design, layout and orientation of the new building and building extension maximises their energy efficiency in accordance with development plan policy CS19 of the MVCS 2009.

75. In terms of sustainable waste management, the BREEAM report is clear that the development contractor will undertake a pre-demolition audit to identify which material can be re-used or recycled from the existing Woodlands Building prior to demolition. The development contractor will also be responsible for producing a Resource Management plan to ensure construction waste resource efficiency and diversion from landfill. For school derived waste, a suitably sized bin store will be incorporated on site along with a dedicated space for waste segregation and storage. Officers consider that the proposed construction and school derived waste management is sustainable and will maximise on-site recycling facilities and the re-use and recycling of materials used in construction is in accordance with development plan policy CS19 of the MVCS 2009.

Landscaping

76. Drawing number: HBS-00-00-DR-A-1105 Rev P0 Proposed Landscaping Plan illustrates the proposed hard and soft landscaping associated with the proposed development. This includes the extension of existing concrete paving, new fencing and new shrub planting around the Earl Building extension, the combination of concrete paving and tarmacadam around the new replacement building, and tarmacadam for existing building elevation regrading. A hedge is also proposed between the Earl Building extension south eastern paving and the southern site area of amenity grass and an ornamental planting schedule is included on the Proposed Landscaping Plan.

77. County Landscape Officer raises no objection to the proposed development and recommends the inclusion of a standard biosecurity informative.

78. Officers consider the proposed hard and soft landscaping plan to be in keeping with the existing design of the school site and will provide characterful enhancement to the site in accordance with development plan Policy CS14 of the MVCS 2009 and Policy ENV25 of the MVLP 2000.

Conclusion

79. Mole Valley District Council and the County Landscape Officer raise no objection to the sustainable design, scale and landscaping of the proposed development.

80. Officers consider that the proposed development is an appropriate scale, which is in keeping with the existing school site as it will not exceed the existing height of the school site and matches the predominately two-storey built up area of the site. Officers are therefore satisfied that the scale of the proposed development accords with development plan policy CS19 of the MVCS 2009 and policies CF2, ENV4, ENV22, ENV23 and ENV24 of the MVLP 2000 and Policy AS-En3 of the ANDP 2017.

7

81. Officers are satisfied that the proposed development design will be of sustainable, high quality and in keeping with the existing design of the school site as the finishing materials and colours are the same as the buildings finishings of the existing school buildings and the proposed development can achieve a BREEAM Very Good rating. Therefore, Officers consider that the proposed design is congruent with the existing school site and will integrate well with the local character of the site and the surrounding landscape in accordance with development plan policies CF2, ENV4, ENV22, ENV23 and ENV24 of the MVLP 2000.

82. Officers consider that the proposed design of the new development will support the educational use of the site and will therefore be in keeping with the existing school use and will also respect and integrate with the existing local character and surroundings. Officers are satisfied that the proposed hard and soft landscaping scheme will enhance the proposed development on the site in accordance with development plan policies CF2, ENV22 and ENV25 of the MVLP 2000 and Policy AS-En3 of the ANDP 2017.

Ecology, Trees and Archaeology

Mole Valley Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2009 (MVCS 2009)
Policy CS15 - Biodiversity and Geological Conservation
Mole Valley Local Plan 2000 (MVLP 2000)
Policy ENV14 - Enhancement, Management and Creation of Nature Conservation Features
Policy ENV25 - Landscape Design of New Developments
Policy ENV49 - Areas of High Archaeological Potential
Policy ENV53 - Trees in the Built-Up Areas
Ashtead Neighbourhood Development Plan 2017 (ANDP 2017)
Policy AS-En2 - Amenity Space

Policy

83. MVCS 2009 Policy CS15 seeks to protect and enhance biodiversity in accordance with European and National legislation/guidance and seeks to retain all trees within development sites where practicable. Policy CS15 is clear that planting and other schemes that promote biodiversity will be expected as part of all development schemes, focusing on native species from the locality and particularly trees, a key feature of the environment across Surrey.

84. MVLP 2000 Policy ENV14 states that in considering development proposals account will be taken of any measures relevant to the proposals concerned to protect or enhance existing nature conservation features and scope to create and manage new areas of nature conservation value. MVLP 2000 Policy ENV15 is clear that where development will likely result in harm to a protected species or its habitat, a thorough site investigation will be necessary by the applicant and the relevant nature conservation bodies will be consulted. Development that would materially harm a protected species or its habitat will not be permitted.

85. MVLP 2000 Policy ENV49 is clear that where significant development proposals fall within an Area of High Archaeological Potential the developer will be required to provide an initial assessment of the archaeological value of the site preferably before, or otherwise as part of, any planning application.

86. MVLP 2000 Policy ENV25 requires sufficient space should be allowed to enable existing trees of significant public amenity value to be retained. Similarly, MVLP 2000 Policy ENV53 requires the continued preservation and enhancement of existing tree cover in the built-up areas. ANDP 2017 Policy AS-En2 states that areas of amenity grass, grass verges, trees and hedges should be retained to maintain the open character of the village. Development proposals should retain significant trees and hedges with public amenity value wherever possible.

7

Ecology

87. The applicant has submitted a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal dated 19 March 2021 (PEA) for the proposed development which sets out the proposed impacts and mitigation methods.

88. The PEA establishes that no statutory or non-statutory designated sites of nature conservation importance were identified within the zone of influence as part of the desk study. On this basis, the PEA concludes that no adverse impacts are anticipated on statutory and non-statutory designated sites and their qualifying criteria for designation as a result of the proposed development and are therefore not considered an ecological constraint and are not considered further in this report.

89. The PEA identities two parcels of ancient woodland and 44 parcels of habitats of principle importance within the zone of influence as part of the desk study, which the proposed development could indirectly adversely impact through ground pollution and increased surface run-off. Therefore, the PEA recommends a strict pollution prevention protocol be adhered to during the construction phase of the proposed development to ensure that dust and particulate pollution does not indirectly adversely impact the woodland and other surrounding habitats.

90. In addition, the PEA identifies four species whose habitats are supported on the site and could be impacted by the development.

91. Firstly, the site is considered to provide suitable commuting and foraging habitat for bats primarily along the woodland edge and the treelines along the western and southern Site boundaries. While these features are anticipated to be retained as part of the proposed development and therefore the proposed development is unlikely to impact foraging and commuting bats, the PEA recommends mitigation measures in relation to lighting during the construction and operational phase of the proposed development. This includes using minimum light levels, with warm white spectrum lighting and recessed internal luminaries in proximity to windows to minimise glare.

92. Secondly, the PEA highlights that while unlikely, the construction of the proposed development could result in the death or injury to any reptiles on the site. Therefore, the PEA recommends that the clearance of any potentially suitable reptile habitat be undertaken using a sensitive vegetation clearance approach. Details of this are included in the PEA.

93. Thirdly, shrub clearance could also have a direct adverse impact on nesting birds. To mitigate this, the PEA recommends that habitat clearance works be undertaken outside the main nesting bird season (between March and August (inclusive)). Where this is not possible, the PEA also recommends that all suitable nesting habitat must be inspected by an ecologist to determine the presence/absence of any nesting birds prior to clearance and establishes the control process should an active nest be identified.

94. Finally, it is possible that foxes are present underneath Woodlands Building, therefore the PEA is clear that a suitably experienced ecologist should supervise the demolition of the existing Woodlands building and where foxes are found, temporarily pause demolition whilst any foxes are left to move undisturbed and of their own accord.

95. In addition, the PEA sets out a set of ecological enhancements comprising the installation and maintenance of bat brick or bay tubes into any new buildings and installation of bat boxes and artificial bird nest boxes onto existing on-site trees and any new buildings.

7

96. The County Ecologist is satisfied with the surveys and assessments carried out as part of the PEA and considers the proposed ecological enhancements to be appropriate. To secure the enhancements, the County Ecologist recommends securing the proposed ecological enhancements by way of condition. Officers concur with this approach and also consider that the proposed mitigation measures and ecological enhancements should be secured through one condition.

97. Officers consider that the submitted PEA provides a robust assessment of the ecological risks associated with the proposed development and recommends appropriate mitigation measures and ecological enhancements, and therefore accords with development plan Policy CS15 of the MVCS 2009 and Policies ENV14 and ENV15 of the MVLP 2000.

Archaeology

98. The County Archaeologist explains that although the proposed development is adjacent to an Area of High Archaeological Potential defined around the discovery of multi-period archaeological assets, the proposed extension and replacement building are relatively small and fall below the 0.4ha threshold at which archaeological assessment is required under Local Plan policies. They are also located in areas likely to have been subject to recent disturbance. Accordingly, the County Archaeologist raises no objection to the proposal and has no archaeological concerns.

99. In view of the County Archaeologists comments, Officers are satisfied that an assessment of the archaeological value of the site is not required and therefore does not engage the wider requirements with development plan Policy ENV49 of the MVLP 2000.

Trees

100. An Arboricultural Survey was undertaken of the existing trees on site, which assessed the quality and value of trees and identified material constraints. The Arboricultural Survey details the tree categorisation of the 72 individual trees, 11 tree groups and 2 hedgerows surveyed on site, the majority of which fall within tree category B, and recommends prioritising the retention of higher category trees wherever possible. The submitted Arboricultural Survey is clear that the retention of all trees on site was a priority within the design process and the results of the survey were used to inform the design and location of the proposed development.

101. To facilitate the Earl Building extension, some minor pruning of one tree (Turkey Oak T33) is proposed to provide adequate crown clearance in order to construct the extension. Additional crown clearance is also proposed within the northern and southern car parking areas for construction plant and delivery vehicles during the construction phase of the proposed development. The submitted Tree Survey and Arboricultural Implications Assessment (AIA) is clear that this pruning will prevent inadvertent damage to overhanging branches and any identified additional pruning requirements will be discussed with the project arboriculturist and agreed with the County Arboricultural Officer at the pre-commencement meeting.

102. The proposed development will not result in the loss of any existing trees on site. However, the Earl Building extension will result in a small encroachment into the root protection areas (RPA) of two trees (cedar of Lebanon T35 and cider T38). To minimise the impact, the AIA details that the excavation of these RPAs will take place using hand tools under Arboricultural supervision. The AIA explains that given the minimal extent of

the proposed incursions, the impacts will have a negligible impact on the health and longevity of the trees, subject to adherence to the method statement contained within the AIA.

103. The Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS) contained within the AIA sets out the phasing works, including initial tree works, installation of tree protection fencing and ground protection, pre-commencement meeting construction phase and soft landscaping phase.

104. Prior to initial tree works, trees will be checked for protected species in accordance with the PEA and will be carried out by an Arboricultural Association approved contractor. The Tree Protection Plan at Appendix 4 of the AIA illustrates the proposed location for the tree protection fencing which will be metal welded mesh panels in concrete or rubber feet and have signs affixed to it to explain their purpose. The tree protection fencing will be installed before any plant activity, ground works or construction activities commence at the site, and will remain in situ until the soft landscaping phase when all other construction activities in the vicinity are completed.

105. In addition, temporary ground protection shall be installed in the locations shown on the Tree Protection Plan with purple hatching. These areas shall be accessed by large plant machinery and construction traffic, therefore the ground protection specification shall adhere to a cellular confinement system, a heavy-duty proprietary ground protection system, a pre-cast reinforced concrete slabs or a bespoke ground protection system.

106. Precaution will be taken to prevent the storage and handling of harmful chemicals within the root protection areas of retained trees. Harmful chemicals include fuels, oils, bitumen, builder's sand (which has a high salt content) and cement. Provision will also be made to prevent the storage and handling of harmful chemicals in areas proposed for further planting if the existing soil is intended to be retained.

107. Finally, Arboricultural supervision will be required on the CMP plan, on-site routing of new services, pre-commencement meeting, and in the event that significant root growth is disturbed or a tree is inadvertently damaged during construction activities

108. The County Arboriculturist has reviewed the submitted Tree Survey and Arboricultural Implications Assessment (AIA) and is satisfied with the proposed development and therefore does not raise an objection. The County Arboriculturist agrees with the tree grading and is satisfied that the proposed development will have a low Arboricultural impact as no trees are proposed to be removed.

109. While the Earl Building extension will incur into the root protection areas (RPA) of two trees (T35 and T38), the County Arboriculturist considers this to be minor and acceptable provided the Arboricultural method statement details contained within the AIA are adhered. Officers propose to secure the implementation of the details contained within section 2.4 of the AIA and the Arboricultural method statement by way of a condition to ensure existing trees are protected during the construction phase of the development in accordance with development plan Policies ENV25 and ENV25 of the MVLP 2000 and Policy AS-En2 of the ANDP 2017.

110. Officers consider that the proposed development will have a very minor impact on existing trees on site and that the incursion into two RPAs is acceptable provided the construction of the Earl Building extension is appropriately managed in accordance with the details set out in the AIA. Officers are therefore satisfied that the proposal is acceptable in relation to trees and meets the requirements of development plan Policies ENV25 and ENV25 of the MVLP 2000 and Policy AS-En2 of the ANDP 2017.

IMPACT ON RESIDENTIAL AMENITY

7

Mole Valley Local Plan 2000 (MVLP 2000)
Policy ENV22 - General Development Control Criteria
Policy CF2 - Provision of New Community Facilities

Policy

111. MVLP 2000 Policy ENV22 requires development not to significantly harm the amenities of the occupiers of neighbouring properties by reason of overlooking or its overpowering effect in terms of noise, traffic or other adverse environmental impact. MVLP 2000 Policy CF2 requires that development for community facilities satisfies a number of criteria including not detracting from the character and appearance of the property and the surrounding area; no adverse impact on the amenities of the locality, especially those of neighbouring properties; and traffic generated by such development has no adverse effect on local residential amenity.

Impact on Residential Amenity

112. The proposed development encompasses a permanent 1FE increase of the St Andrews School from a 7FE to an 8FE and the expansion of classroom and supporting educational facilities to accommodate the permanent 150 increase in pupil numbers. The extension of the Earl Building, replacement of the Woodlands Building and retention of two modular classrooms will be for educational uses which is in keeping with the wider educational use of the school site in accordance with Policy CF2 of the MVLP 2000. Accordingly, the proposed development will not increase the current open hours of the school and any difference in pupil numbers will not change the level of noise arising from the site. Therefore Officers are satisfied that the proposed development will not change the level of noise arising from the site nor give rise any noise impact on local residents and is therefore in accordance with Policy ENV22 of the MVLP 2000.

113. The proposed development has been designed with strong consideration of the existing design of the school site, using the materials and colours of the existing school buildings. Officers consider that the proposed design is in keeping with the existing site design and therefore will not impact on the wider character and appearance of the surrounding area in accordance with Policy CF2 of the MVLP 2000.

114. Furthermore, the proposed height of the new and retained buildings will not exceed the existing height of the school site, as discussed in the design and visual amenity section above. The proposed development will be located to the rear of the school site and will be screened from local residential properties along Grange Road by the existing school buildings and boundary trees. Existing tree planting along the northern boundary of the school site will also screen views of the proposed Earl Building extension from Public Footpath 52 (Linden Pit Path), with the remaining proposed development screened by the other existing school buildings. Officers consider that the proposed development will be sufficiently screened from the view of neighbouring properties and therefore will not result in any adverse environmental impacts, including visual amenity, on local amenities in accordance with Policy ENV22 of the MVLP 2000.

115. In view of the proposed use, scale and location of the proposed development, Officers are satisfied that the design of the proposed development will not result in any overlooking or loss of outlook to neighbouring residential properties nor detract from the character and appearance of the surrounding environment in accordance with Policies CF2 and ENV22 of the MVLP 2000.

116. The issues surrounding traffic impacts to residents is discussed and considered with the Highways, Traffic and Access section below.

Acoustic Design

117. The applicant submitted an Acoustic Design Report (ADR) 20/0474/R1 dated 4 June 2021, which details a noise survey undertaken at the site to establish the existing noise climate. Based on the results of the survey, advice is given on the control of environmental noise break-in to the proposed new classroom block, Earl Building extension and refurbishment of the existing main school buildings.

118. The ADR also includes recommendations for the constructions of the walls, floors and doors to achieve the internal sound insulation requirements of BB93, and a review of internal material finishes for each space within the proposed areas to ensure they meet the reverberation time requirements of BB93.

119. Having reviewed the ADR, the County Noise Consultant (CNC) raised concerns with whether the noise monitoring had been conducted in accordance with the relevant British Standards and a lack of detailed calculations of the façade attenuation.

120. To address this, the applicant submitted an amended ADR Rev 1 dated 18 August 2021, which included greater detail on the Environmental Noise Survey methodology and the Noise Break-In Calculation Sheets at Appendix B of the amended ADR.

121. Following a review of the amended ADR, the CNC confirmed no objection to the proposal, subject to a condition securing noise limits and a recommended informative on the measurement of noise limits. The CNC raised that wind direction to be a key component of determining how worst-case noise levels on site are likely to be. As the wind direction is not reported in the amended ADR, the CNC advises that the measured background noise levels could not be used in future assessments or that the design standards specified for external elements of the build are sufficient with respect to the worst-case noise from the M25.

122. Officers consider that the amended ADR includes a complete and robust assessment of existing noise conditions and the proposed external and internal finishings. Officers are satisfied that the design of the proposed development will ensure the relevant British Standards on insultation and reverberation are met, and as a result the proposed development will not result in any significant adverse noise impact to internal users and to those external to the buildings. Officers are therefore satisfied that the proposed development accords with development plan Policy ENV22 of the MVLP 2000.

Construction mitigation

123. To minimise the noise, vibration and air quality impact arising from the construction phase of the proposed development, the applicant has submitted a Construction Management Plan (CMP). The CMP sets out that working hours will be limited to 08:00 – 18:00 Monday-Friday and 0800-1300 on Saturdays and no work will take place on site during Sundays and bank holidays. Officers consider that the proposed construction hours will help to minimise the impact on residential amenity and will secure the hours by way of a condition.

124. Where practical, a less noisy process and quiet equipment will be selected, and temporary barriers/enclosures will also be placed around works that may produce significant amounts of noise. Furthermore, construction activities will be located away from the site frontage to minimise the noise, dust and vibration impacts on neighbouring properties. Finally, the CMP is clear that site will comply fully with the 'British Standard 5228-1 2:2009: 'Code of practice for noise and vibration control on construction and open sites'.

125. Officers consider that these proposed noise and vibration mitigation measures will further help to minimise the impact of noise and vibration on local residents, and

therefore the proposed development accords with development plan Policies CF2 and ENV22 of the MVLP 2000.

7

126. The CMP explains that any loose material stored on site will be sheeted to minimise dust emissions into the locality. The CMP is also clear that further mitigation measures relevant to the control of dust and emissions will also be implemented as appropriate to the scale of impact in accordance with the guidance document 'Construction Dust: CIS 36' (published by Government Services 'the Health and Safety Executive', March 2020). Officer consider that the proposed measures will help to minimise the emissions of dust and mitigate the impact on residential amenity and local air quality in accordance with development plan Policies CF2 and ENV22 of the MVLP 2000.

127. Lastly, the CMP is clear that signage will be used to inform all those who may be affected by noise, dust or vibration arising from construction works, of the nature of the works, proposed hours of work and their expected duration. Officers consider that the use of signage to be appropriate and will ensure anyone affected by the development will know what has been permitted.

DRAINAGE AND FLOOD RISK

Mole Valley Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2009 (MVCS 2009)
Policy CS20 – Flood Risk Management
Mole Valley Local Plan 2000 Saved Policies (MVLP 2000)
Policy ENV65 – Drainage

Policy

128. Policy CS20 of the MVCS 2009 expects the use of appropriate sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) as part of any development proposals and requires a Flood Risk Assessment for sites within or adjacent to areas at risk of surface water flooding. To further reduce the risk from surface water flooding, Policy CS20 is clear that all development should work towards mimicking greenfield run-off situations.

129. Policy ENV65 of the MVLP 2000 is clear that development will normally be permitted where foul sewers and sewage treatment works of adequate capacity and design are available or will be provided in time to serve the development.

Drainage and Flood Risk

130. The submitted Flood Risk Assessment sets out the hydrology of the local area and that the site has a low flood risk profile. As the proposed development is fully within Flood Zone 1, it is considered 'appropriate' in the Sequential and Exception Tests. Therefore the Flood Risk Assessment focuses on addressing the development's drainage strategy and any impact on downstream properties.

131. The FRA reports that the geology of the site is split east to west. While the majority of the site is dominated by sand, the north west of the site overlies clay, silt and sand. Therefore, there is likely to be a wide discrepancy in the soil's porosity of the site which the FRA explains will be clarified by soil soakage testing.

132. At present, the majority of the school's surface water is routed into a culvert at the south west corner of the site. The replacement Woodlands Building is proposed to use this culvert as the geology likely facilitates infiltration drainage.

133. There is also an existing soakaway, but this is located in the proposed area for the Earl Building extension. Therefore, the FRA proposes a replacement soakaway to the south of the Earl Building extension with capacity for the whole site and sized to hold a 1 in 10

years storm based on a conservative assumed infiltration rate. The FRA is clear that the calculations for this will be revised when the soil's actual soakage rate has been determined through BRE365 testing.

134. The FRA is clear that the offsite flow rate will be restricted to 1.0l/s in the critical 1% + 40% Climate Change event, this being the practical minimum limit of screened orifice plates / vortex devices. As this will be less than that from the existing classroom block, excess water will be stored in an underground cellular attenuation tank.

135. In addition, the foul drainage system will connect to the public foul sewer. This will be subject to an application to Thames Water under Section 106 of the Water Industry Act, following a capacity check.

136. The Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) has reviewed the submitted Flood Risk Assessment and is satisfied that the proposed drainage scheme meets the requirements set out in the relevant development plan policy and is therefore satisfied with the proposed development. Accordingly, the LLFA raise no objection subject to the inclusion of two conditions.

137. The first condition seeks to secure the submission and approval of details of the design of a surface water management scheme prior to the commencement of development to ensure the final drainage design does not increase flood risk on or off site. The second condition seeks to secure the submission and approval of a verification report confirming the surface water drainage system has been constructed in accordance with the approved details prior to the first occupation of the development. The LLFA also recommend an informative on the Environment Agency need for proof of surface water treatment.

138. Thames Water as the sewerage provider for the area raise no objection to the proposal subject to the inclusion of three informatives.

139. Officers consider that the submitted FRA is robust and suitably follows the SuDS Hierarchy when setting out the proposed drainage strategy. Officers are satisfied that the proposed drainage strategy will be able to manage the surface water on site following the proposed development. Officers concur with the LLFA recommendation of a condition to secure the detailed submission and approval of the proposed drainage system following soakage testing and prior to the commencement of development on site. Officers consider that the proposed foul drainage system is acceptable and, in view of Thames Water's consultee response, are satisfied that the local foul sewer has capacity. In view of this, Officers are satisfied that the proposed development accords with Policy CS20 of the MVCS 2009 and Policy ENV65 of the MVLP 2000.

IMPACT ON PLAYING FIELDS

Mole Valley Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2009 (MVCS 2009)
Policy CS16 - Open Space, Sports and Recreation Facilities
Ashtead Neighbourhood Development Plan 2017 (ANDP 2017)
Policy AS-En1 – School Playing Fields

Policy

140. Policy CS16 of the MVCS 2009 encourages the provision of new open space, sports and recreation facilities provided they accord with the principles of the Planning Practice Guidance 17 (PPG17) and the Mole Valley PPG17 Assessment. These documents have been replaced by the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2021[1] which sets out the Government's Planning Policies for England.

[1] National Planning Policy Guidance 2021

7

141. In this respect paragraphs 98 and 99 of the NPPF states that access to a network of high quality open spaces and opportunities for sport and physical activity is important for the health and well-being of communities. Existing open space, sports and recreational buildings and land, including playing fields, should not be built on unless:
    a) an assessment has been undertaken which has clearly shown the open space, buildings or land to be surplus to requirements; or
    b) the loss resulting from the proposed development would be replaced by equivalent or better provision in terms of quantity and quality in a suitable location; or
    c) the development is for alternative sports and recreational provision, the benefits of which clearly outweigh the loss of the current or former use.

142. ANDP 2017 Policy AS-En1 is clear that the expansion of school premises should include the retention of playing field land for the use of the school for sports activities. Planning applications for the expansion of schools and associated facilities should also demonstrate that the retained playing field space has taken account of its potential for wider community use outside school hours.

Impact on Playing Fields

143. As detailed in paragraph 21 above, the proposed extension of the existing Earl Building would occupy approximately 171.8m^2 of the current playing field. To address this, the applicant has submitted a Pitch Assessment.

144. The Pitch Assessment sets out that the main site playing field upon which the Earl Building extension would be partially located is used as an informal and social area for pupils during break-times due to its limited size. This existing soft play area is undersized at 37,188m3 when compared to the BB103 recommended minimum area of 56,750m2. Therefore, the existing soft play area is insufficiently sized to accommodate pitch lines.

145. In addition, the Pitch Assessment explains that the area of the soft playing area which the Earl Building extension would occupy comprises of two concrete strips located at the north end of the existing soft play area. These were previously used for cricket practice wickets with nets but are no longer used as cricket practice is provided on the sports playing fields to the north of the main school site. Given their location within this area of the soft playing field, the Pitch Assessment puts forward that this area is incapable of forming part of a playing pitch.

146. Furthermore, the Pitch Assessment details that the existing welded mesh fencing for the soft play area is at an acute angle, which necessitates any pitch to be located more centrally in the playing field to provide adequate safety margins to the fence lines. Therefore, this forms another reason as to why the area of soft playing field which the Earl Building extension is proposed to occupy is unsuitable for forming part of playing pitch.

147. In view of these factors, the Pitch Assessment concludes that the proposed development meets exemption 3 of the Sport England's Playing Fields Policy. Exemption 3 is clear that development is exempt where it only affects land incapable of forming part of a playing pitch and does not: reduce the size of the playing pitch; result in the inability to use any playing pitch; reduce the sporting capacity of the playing field to accommodate playing pitches or the capability to rotate or reposition playing pitches to maintain their quality; result in the loss of other sporting provision or ancillary facilities on the site; or prejudice the use of any part of a playing field and any of its playing pitches.

148. Sport England recognised that the proposed development would result in a minor encroachment onto the playing field as but having considered the nature of the playing

field and its ability to accommodate a range of pitches, Sport England concur with the applicant's conclusion that there is not considered to be any detrimental impact on the ability to mark out pitches in this location or on the overall sporting capability of the site. Therefore, following a review of the submitted Pitch Assessment and associated proposal details, Sport England consider that the proposal broadly meets exception E3 of the Sport England Playing Fields Policy and therefore raise no objection to this application.

149. Officers concur with the Pitch Assessments application of Exemption 3 of the Sport England's Playing Fields Policy and the views of Sport England. Officers are satisfied with the assessment undertaken as part of this planning application and consider that the assessment adequately demonstrates that the proposal will not reduce the provision of playing fields used for sporting activities in accordance with the requirements set out in paragraph 99 of the NPPF and development plan Policy CS16 of the MVCS 2009 and Policy AS-En1 of the ANDP 2017.

HIGHWAY, TRAFFIC AND ACCESS

Mole Valley Local Plan 2000 (MVLP 2000)
Policy MOV2 - The Movement Implications of Development
Policy MOV5 - Parking Standards
Policy CF2 - Provision of New Community Facilities
Policy ENV22 - General Development Control Criteria
Policy ENV67 - Groundwater Quality

Policy

150. Policy MOV2 of the MVLP 2000 details that development will only be permitted where it can be made compatible with the transport infrastructure and the environmental character in the area and where appropriate developers will be required to contribute to transportation initiatives and highways improvements.

151. Furthermore, Policy MOV2 states that proposal for major development will only be permitted where it can be demonstrated that in order to accommodate the traffic generated by that development appropriate measures are made to obviate the environmental impact, and there is appropriate provision for: (i) off-street vehicular parking; (2) suitable servicing arrangements; (iii) vehicular access and egress and movement within the site: (iv) capacity on the transport network and in the vicinity of the development; (v) access and egress to be obtained, or improved, to and from the primary route and distributor road networks; (vi) public transport services; (vii) pedestrians and cyclists; and (viii) people with disabilities.

152. In addition, MOV2 is clear that where a particular part of the highway network already endures high traffic flows significantly above its operational and environmental capacity, only small-scale development or redevelopment, which leads to little or no new traffic generation, will be permitted. The cumulative effects of existing and committed development on the operational capacity and environmental character of congested areas as a whole will be considered in the determination of development proposals.

153. Policy MOV5 applies the County Council's parking standards as maxima, having regard to the developer's own requirements and subject to road safety or traffic management implications and the accessibility of the location to means of travel other than the private car. The specific criteria applied to development of community facilities under Policy CF2 includes that parking and access requirements can be satisfactorily accommodated and that the amount of traffic generated would not adversely affect the highway or safety of residential amenities in the locality. In addition, Policy CF2 requires that the location of the proposed development is accessible to the population being

served including by public transport. Similarly, the relevant parts of Policy ENV22 requires a design and layout which provides safe access to the site and adequate parking in accordance with adopted standards. Policy ENV67 of the MVLP 2000 states that where development may have an adverse impact on the quality of groundwater, development will not be permitted.

7

Traffic

154. The applicant has submitted a Transport Statement which sets out that the permanent increase of pupils from 1,050 to 1,200 will result in peak hour trips on an average weekday of approximately 35 two-way vehicles trips in the morning peak hour (0800-0900) and approximately 18 two-way vehicle trips in the evening peak hour (1500-1600).

155. As detailed in paragraph 19 above, the proposed permanent 1FE expansion will not result in an increase in pupils at the school as the school currently operates as an 8FE school due to a number of bulge classes. Accordingly, the proposed 1FE expansion seeks to permanently accommodate the existing number of pupils at the site. As a result, the proposed development will not result in an increased impact on traffic from the existing impact.

156. The main issues raised by representations objecting to the proposal focus on existing traffic and parking issues along Grange Road and the surrounding highway in part as a result of the proximity of a number of schools and due to limited capacity on the ground. There are also concerns that the impact will increase with the proposed increase in pupil numbers. Local residents further raised highway safety issues associated with poor parent parking along both sides of the carriageway and in front of property accesses.

157. In responses to representations the CHA states that the vehicle parking issue on Grange Road and Ottways is exacerbated by the proximity of several schools within a relative location. However, there are parking restrictions in form of yellow lines and when assessed on its merits the proposed development is not considered severe compared to the existing situation. The Highway Authority must assess the planning application in accordance with the NPPF (2021) and can only refuse a planning application if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe.

158. The CHA has also confirmed that there are good walking/cycling routes to this school, especially along the A24, which has a shared footway/cycleway along it, and there are 2 recent accidents recorded as slight on Grange Road in 2016 and 2018. In addition, there are some highway improvements planned in the area, namely traffic calming measures and the introduction of a 20mph speed limit along Grange Road outside the school.

159. Therefore, the CHA has taken the view that an additional 20 vehicles for the pupils and staff (an additional 13.3% compared to the existing), will not have an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or severe residual cumulative impacts on the road network. The increase is low as secondary school pupils are more likely to travel by alternative modes of transport other than cars in comparison to primary school pupils. Furthermore, the increase in trips is not enough for further investigation of the road network or junction modelling. Conditions to mitigate the raised road safety concerns can only be imposed by the County Highway Authority if there is a significant concern on highway safety or residual cumulative impacts on the road network. In this instance the proposed development is not deemed detrimental to the public highway safety. In view of these comments, the CHA raises no objection to the proposal development on traffic grounds.

160. Officers have reviewed the submitted documentation, representations from local residents and the CHA comments and are satisfied that the proposed permanent 1FE increase in pupil numbers is small in scale and does not require further investigations. Officers consider that the existing highway has sufficient capacity for the existing and proposed expansion. Officers also consider that the planned highway improvements will support highway users safety through reduced traffic speed. Officers recognise residents' concerns and frustrations with the existing traffic during peak times but note that this is only for a temporary period of time during peak hours on week days during term times. Therefore, Officers are satisfied that the proposed permanent increase in pupil numbers will not result in any significantly adverse impacts by way of traffic and therefore accords with development plan policies MOV2, MOV5 and CF2 of the MVLP 2000.

Highways

161. The applicant has submitted a Construction Management Plan (CMP) which details how the construction phase of the proposed development will be managed to ensure safety and minimise impacts to site users and neighbouring properties.

162. The CMP sets out that the site working hours will be between 08:00 – 18:00 Monday-Friday and 0800-1300 on Saturdays. No work will take place on site during Sundays and bank holidays. No deliveries to or from the site will occur between the hours of 0800 - 0900, 1500 - 1600 and 1700 – 1800 thereby avoiding peak access and egress hours and ensuring highway user safety and minimise traffic impact. The deliveries of material as part of the proposed development will be carried out over a temporary period of 12 months. Officers consider that the proposed site working hours to be acceptable and will help to minimise the impact of construction activities on neighbouring properties in accordance with development plan Policies MOV2 and ENV67 of the MVLP 2000.

163. There will be approximately 8-12 lorry movements (4-6 deliveries) to and from the site per day during weekdays and 4-6 total construction staff vehicles accessing the site per day. The CMP explains that as the site will only generate around 4-6 vehicle deliveries per day and 4-6 staff per day, it is considered the vehicle impact of the development will have no effect on the local highway network and can be easily accommodated.

164. To minimise the noise, vibration and air quality impact arising from construction traffic, the CMP details a clear freight deliveries routing strategy which prioritises primary highways including the M25, A3, A24 and A243. Furthermore, noisy construction activities, including deliveries, will be undertaken off the highway and access to the site to mitigate noise pollution. The CMP is also clear that delivery vehicles will turn left off Grange Road to access the site and turn right onto Grange Road to egress the site thereby avoiding delivery traffic along Ottways Lane.

165. Officers consider that the proposed number of vehicle movements to be small and will not result in an adverse increase to the number of movements on the highway. Officers are satisfied that the existing site infrastructure will be able to accommodate the additional, temporary movements to and from the site. Officers are also satisfied that the proposed location of construction activities, including deliveries, off Grange Road and away from the school frontage will help to minimise the impact of noise and vibrations arising from proposed development on neighbouring properties and highway users in accordance with development plan Policy MOV2 of the MVLP 2000. Officers also consider that the proposed routing strategy will encourage the use of primary routes, thereby minimising the impact on smaller roads in accordance with development plan Policy MOV2.

166. Any loose material being transported to site will be sheeted to minimise dust emissions and debris on the highway. A wheel wash facility will also be provided onsite to ensure

no material is tracked onto the highway. Further mitigation measures relevant to the control of dust and emissions will be implemented as appropriate to the scale of impact in accordance with the guidance document 'Construction Dust: CIS 36' (published by Government Services 'the Health and Safety Executive', March 2020).

7

167. Officers are satisfied that the proposed wheel wash and sheeting of loose material will minimise the emission of dust into the local surroundings, thereby mitigating the adverse impact of the proposed development on air quality and highway safety in accordance with development plan Policies MOV2 and ENV22 of the MVLP 2000. Officers are also satisfied that the control of dust will minimise the pollution of local groundwater in accordance with development plan Policy ENV67 of the MVLP 2000.

168. To ensure highway user safety during the construction phase of the development, appropriate advanced signage will be provided to ensure drivers are aware of the site's location and alert passing motorists of the likelihood of emerging HGV's. A site operator will be required at the access point of the site to direct delivery vehicles and to supervise and ensure the safe movement of plant and vehicles. The site operator will also be required to supervise vehicles egressing the site to minimise impact and ensure safety of pedestrians and cyclists. A collision reporting system will be mandated to ensure all collisions and accidents involving the projects' vehicle and drivers are reported to the site operator and any relevant parties. If vehicles are required to stop to enable plant and construction vehicles to enter/exit the site, a double-sided, reflective 'stop works sign' (Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions 7031) will be used for maximum of 2 minutes. Finally, everyone working on site will complete an induction on the details contained within the CMP including hours of operation, details of the local area, health and safety information, methods of working and a site map.

169. Officers consider that the proposed highway access and safety arrangements detailed within the CMP will ensure the safety of all highway users in accordance with development plan Policies MOV2 and ENV22 of the MVLP 2000. Furthermore, Officers are satisfied that the site can adequately accommodate the proposed development construction vehicles and deliveries in accordance with development plan Policies MOV2 and ENV22 of the MVLP 2000.

170. The County Highway Authority (CHA) has assessed the proposed development on safety, capacity and policy grounds and raises no objection on highways or construction impact grounds. The CHA is satisfied with the submitted CMP and recommends the CMP's approval subject to a condition securing the submission and approval of a plan showing parking for vehicles of site personnel, operatives and visitors; loading and unloading of plant and materials; storage of plant and materials; and HGV turning area, prior to the commencement of development. In addition, the CHA has recommended informatives on the monitoring, maintenance and cleanliness of the highway to ensure highway safety. Officers concur with the CHA's comments and recommendations and will secure the approval of the submitted CMP and the submission and approval of a CMP plan by way of conditions.

Parking

171. The Transport Statement also sets out the existing and proposed parking for the site. At present, the school currently has provisions for 112 cycle parking spaces for pupils. Based on the modal split for pupils set out in the submitted St Andrews Catholic School Travel Plan, the cycle parking demand generated by the additional 150 pupils is only 6 cycle parking spaces and an overall cycle parking demand of 50 spaces for the 1,200 students. Therefore, the Transport Statement is clear that the 112 existing cycle parking spaces provided is appropriate for the cycle parking demand generated by the 1,200 pupils.

172. With regards to staff, the school employs 128 full time members of staff and 12 part time members of staff. The part time figure is halved to 6 to produce a total full-time equivalent figure of 134 staff. The Transport Statement explains that as a result of the 1FE expansion, there will only be an increase of 7 full time members of staff in association. Furthermore, as the baseline modal split for staff set out in the submitted Travel Plan has demonstrated, 65% of people in the Mole Valley District drive to work which is equivalent to 87 staff. Therefore, in accordance with SCC Vehicular and Cycle Parking Guidance dated 2018[2] car parking standards, the existing parking provision is considered to be appropriate for the proposed development. The existing parking provision includes visitor parking spaces at the front of the school and staff parking to the rear. In addition, in accordance with SCC Vehicular and Cycle Parking Guidance[2], the provision of on-site parent/visitor parking spaces will encourage less sustainable forms of travel and so no additional parent/visitor parking spaces are being provided as part of the proposed development.

173. Based on the information provided, a site visit during term time hours and the advice given to the applicant at pre-planning stage, the CHA has assessed the proposed development and concluded that the proposal will not have any significant adverse impact on the local highway network. The proposed development can be accommodated on-site and based on the SCC Vehicular and Cycle Parking Guidance (2018)[2] no provision for parent or pupils parking should be provided by the school. Furthermore, parent parking, pupil parking and drop off/pick up areas should not be provided as this is a disincentive to travelling by sustainable modes.

174. Officers consider that the assessment of existing parking facilities is robust and is clear that additional cycle, staff and visitor/parent parking is not required as part of the proposed small increase in pupil numbers. Officers are therefore satisfied that the existing parking facilities are sufficient to accommodate the small proposed increase in pupil numbers and accordingly meets the requirements of development plan policies MOV2, MOV5 and CF2 of the MVLP 2000.

School Travel Plan

175. The applicant has submitted a School Travel Plan (STP) based on 2011 Nomis Census data which sets out the existing transport facilities and modal split of daily staff and pupils trips. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, a baseline survey was unable to be conducted during the production of the submitted STP. The STP aims to enhance the awareness and use of sustainable transport options and establishes indicative staff and pupil modal targets over a five year period. To manage the implementation of the STP, a Travel Plan Co-ordinator is proposed to be appointed who will also be responsible for the delivery of the STP Action Plan. The STP is proposed to be updated as new survey data is made available.

176. Having reviewed the STP, the CHA has raised concerns with the lack of a baseline survey and the use of 2011 Census data. The CHA considers that the use of this data as the basis for the STP targets to be unacceptable as the data is no longer accurate. In addition, the STP lacks detail on specific issues facing the school and targeted actions for the site, and on the Travel Plan Co-ordinator. Therefore, the CHA does not recommend the approval of the submitted STP and requires the submission and an approval of an up-to-date STP prior to the first occupation of the proposed development. The CHA also recommends the use of the Modeshift STARS system as a user-friendly and effective way of producing and managing a STP, which Officers will include as an informative.

[2] SCC Vehicular and Cycle Parking Guidance (2018)

177. Officers concur with the CHA comments that the STP is based on outdated information, rendering the STP inaccurate and lacking targeted actions. Officers recognise that these concerns have also been expressed in representations against the proposal. Officers consider that it is unfortunate that an updated STP was not provided with this planning application but are satisfied in agreement with the CHA that the proposed development is acceptable. Therefore, Officers will secure an updated STP by way of a condition to ensure that the development does not prejudice highway safety nor cause inconvenience to other highway users in accordance with development plan Policies MOV2, MOV5 and CF2 of the MVLP 2000.

Access

178. St Andrews Schools is accessed off the southern side of Grange Road, a two-way 30 mile per hour (mph) speed limit road. Officers note that the proposed Highway Improvement Plans for the area include reducing this speed to 20mph. Grange Road has pavements on both sides of the road, but no dedicated cycle routes. There are two separate gated pedestrian access points at either end of the site's frontage onto Grange Road. The main access roadway is one-way, with separate entrance and exit gates off Grange Road and there is a separate access point for staff and deliveries at the northern end of the site frontage. The existing access arrangements ensure vehicles have sufficient space to turn and leave in a forward gear.

179. Officers consider that the existing access is sufficient to accommodate the proposed additional 150 pupils and are satisfied that the separated access and egress points will ensure the safety of all highway users, including pedestrian, cyclists and vehicular, accessing the site off Grange Road, and accommodates servicing and delivery access in accordance with development plan Policies MOV2 and ENV22 of the MVLP 2000.

180. The submitted Transport Statement establishes that in regard to public transport there are four public school bus services (617, 618, 619 and 668) that serve the school twice a day, Monday to Friday and the nearest railway station is Leatherhead Railway Station, located approximately 1.9km (24-minute walk or 10-minute cycle) west of the site. The Transport Statement is clear that there will be no changes to the existing school bus stop location and buses will continue to set down on Grange Road as per to the existing access arrangements, which are considered to be effective. School mini buses will continue to be parked in the staff car park as per the existing school mini bus parking arrangements. There will be no changes to the existing access or internal access road layout and refuse and emergency vehicle access arrangements will remain as existing.

181. Officers consider that the wider highway and public transport facilities ensure that the school is in a sustainable and accessible location in accordance with development plan Policy CF2 of the MVLP 2000.

182. In terms of construction access, the submitted Construction Management Plan (CMP) states that the existing surfacing is suitable for all construction purposes and there will be an on-site speed restriction of 5mph, which will be monitored by site operatives. Furthermore, the onsite access roads will be used by vehicles to make direct deliveries to the designated area of the new development and the CMP is clear that vehicles have sufficient space to turn and leave in a forward gear. At all times access will be maintained for emergency vehicles including during the working day, and if emergency vehicles need to gain access to the site, all unloading/ collections will stop and the works vehicle will clear the area with drivers staying with their vehicles at all times.

183. Moreover, during the construction phase there will be a maximum of about 4-6 deliveries to the site daily during the height of construction. To avoid morning and evening peak hours when staff and pupils are entering and egressing the site, no

deliveries to or from the site will occur between the hours of 0800 - 0900, 1500 - 1600 and 1700 - 1800.

184. Officers are satisfied that the existing access arrangements can adequately accommodate the proposed development construction vehicles and deliveries without impeding emergency vehicle access and ensuring the safety of other highway users in accordance with development plan Policies MOV2 and ENV22 of the MVLP 2000.

185. Mole Valley District Council and the CHA raise no objection in regard to access arrangements and safety for the proposed development. Officers are satisfied that the existing access arrangements are acceptable to accommodate the proposed permanent 1FE increase and will not result in any adverse safety risk to highway users and those accessing and egressing the site. Officers consider that the proposed access arrangements during the construction phase are also appropriate in terms of safety. Accordingly, Officers are satisfied that the proposed development accords with the development plan Policies MOV2, CF2 and ENV22 of the MVLP 2000 on access.

Conclusion on Highways, Traffic and Access

186. Officers are satisfied that the proposed 1FE expansion will not result in any significantly adverse impacts by way of traffic and consider that the existing highway has sufficient capacity for the existing and proposed expansion. Officers are satisfied that the existing access and parking provisions at the school site are sufficient to accommodate the 1FE expansion and construction deliveries and staff during the temporary construction phase of the development. Officers consider that the submitted CTP proposed appropriate mitigation measures to ensure the proposed development will not result in any significantly adverse impacts from the construction traffic and activities. Officers consider that there is a need for an updated School Travel Plan and that this will be secured by way of a planning condition. Officers are therefore satisfied that the proposed development will not result in any significant adverse impacts by way of highways, traffic, parking or access and therefore accords with the development plan Policies MOV2, MOV5, CF2, ENV22 and ENV67 of the MVLP 2000.

METROPOLITAN GREEN BELT

Mole Valley Local Plan 2000 (MVLP 2000)
Policy ENV23 - Respect for Setting

Policy

187. Paragraph 147 of the NPPF states that inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. Paragraph 148 of the NPPF is clear 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 resulting from the proposal, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.

188. Paragraph 149 of the NPPF explains that a local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in the Green Belt. Exceptions to this are:

a) buildings for agriculture and forestry;
b) the provision of appropriate facilities (in connection with the existing use of land or a change of use) for outdoor sport, outdoor recreation, cemeteries and burial grounds and allotments; as long as the facilities preserve the openness of the Green Belt and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it;

c) the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building;
d) the replacement of a building, provided the new building is in the same use and not materially larger than the one it replaces;
e) limited infilling in villages;
f) limited affordable housing for local community needs under policies set out in the development plan (including policies for rural exception sites); and
g) limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed land, whether redundant or in continuing use (excluding temporary buildings), which would: – not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt than the existing development; or – not cause substantial harm to the openness of the Green Belt, where the development would re-use previously developed land and contribute to meeting an identified affordable housing need within the area of the local planning authority.

189. Paragraph 150 of the NPPF states that certain other forms of development are also not inappropriate in the Green Belt provided they preserve its openness and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it. These are:
a) mineral extraction;
b) engineering operations;
c) local transport infrastructure which can demonstrate a requirement for a Green Belt location;
d) the re-use of buildings provided that the buildings are of permanent and substantial construction;
e) material changes in the use of land (such as changes of use for outdoor sport or recreation, or for cemeteries and burial grounds); and
f) development, including buildings, brought forward under a Community Right to Build Order or Neighbourhood Development Order The proposed development comprises of a two-storey extension to the existing Earl Building, construction of a new two-storey classroom block to replace the existing single storey Woodlands Building, permanent retention of two modular classroom units and minor external works to existing building access levels.

190. Paragraph 95 of the NPPF identifies the importance of there being a sufficient choice of school places to meet the needs of existing and new communities. Local planning authorities should take a proactive, positive and collaborative approach to meeting this requirement, and to development that will widen choice in education. They should:
a) give great weight to the need to create, expand or alter schools through the preparation of plans and decisions on applications; and
b) work with school promoters, delivery partners and statutory bodies to identify and resolve key planning issues before applications are submitted.

191. In addition, MVLP 2000 Policy ENV23 states that development will normally be permitted where it respects its setting taking account of the impact of the development within or conspicuous from the Green Belt on the rural amenities of the Green Belt by reason of its siting, materials or design.

Harm to Green Belt and Very Special Circumstances

192. In view of paragraphs 149 and 150, it is clear that the proposed development is not an exception and therefore constitutes inappropriate development in the Metropolitan Green Belt. The applicant has submitted a Green Belt Statement which puts forward very special circumstances which are considered to outweigh the harm to the Green Belt.

193. These very special circumstances include the necessity of the proposed development. Surrey County Council has a statutory duty to provide sufficient school places for pupils in the district and St Andrews School has a long established use as a school located

wholly in the Green Belt. As the purpose of the proposed development is effectively to provide sufficient accommodation for the existing pupil number at St Andrews School, as the pupil number has gradually increased through bulge classes and this application is seeking to make the increase permanent, it has not been relevant to consider options for accommodating a 1FE expansion at other schools outside the Green Belt.

194. Officers consider that there is a clearly identified need for the 1FE expansion at St Andrews School to permanently accommodate an additional 150 pupils already at the school due to a number of bulge classes. The place projections for the school site are clear that the demand for places currently accommodated by bulge classes will be sustained and therefore there is a need to make the change in FE permanently. Officers recognise that the 1FE expansion cannot be responsibly located at another school outside of the Green Belt as the pupils are already at the school site.

195. Furthermore, St Andrews School is the only Catholic secondary school in Mole Valley District and therefore the only school which can accommodate the long term Catholic demand for places in the locality. Officers note the details of paragraph 95 of the NPPF and therefore places great weight to the identified need to expand and alter St Andrews School and to ensure sufficient choice of school places to meet the needs of existing and new communities.

196. In addition, Officers consider that there is a need for additional classrooms to accommodate the permanent 1FE expansion and that the proposed Earl Building extension, new block classroom and permanent retention of two modular classrooms are an appropriate solution by way of their design, scale and location within the school site.

197. The Green Belt Statement goes on to explain that the proposed extensions, new building and associated external works will be constructed on previously developed land or areas of low-value grass. The chosen sites within school grounds are the most suitable option for school operational reasons. The scale, positioning and design of proposed development has been carefully considered to minimise the impact on the Green Belt.

198. It is clear to Officers that the proposed development has sought to minimise impact on the openness of the Green Belt by virtue of the proposals design and location within the school site. Officers are satisfied that the proposed design and scale of the development is in keeping with the existing site school use, existing school buildings and the surrounding environment. Officers consider that the proposed development will support and enhance the existing local character and will not result in any harm by way of visual and residential amenity. Furthermore, Officers consider that the screened locations for the proposed development on previously developed land and areas of low-value grass are also appropriate and will support the existing school use and scale.

199. The Green Belt Statement provides further detail on the proposed Earl Building extension, including that the extension is situated in the North West corner of the site, adjacent to dense mature trees. The proposed new build classroom block will be situated between the existing single-storey DT Block and double-heights Sports Hall. The positions of the proposed new building classroom block and Earl Building extension mean they will be screened by existing buildings and trees to views from residential properties to the North East. The remaining boundaries of St Andrews School are bordered by other schools and the M25. It is suggested that the proposed new build and extension will not harm the visual amenities or openness of the Green Belt.

200. The height of the extension has been carefully considered to align with the existing Earl Building and will comprise the same materiality and architectural features. The new build classroom block will be a storey taller than the existing Woodlands Building to be

demolished. However, the height of the new build will comprise the same materiality and architectural features of the existing buildings. The existing Sports Hall is a taller more dominant feature adjacent to the proposed new build classroom block.

7

201. In view of the Green Belt Statement, Mole Valley District Council (MVDC) highlights that the site lies within the Metropolitan Green Belt where there is a presumption against inappropriate development within the Green Belt. The proposed development represents inappropriate development and does not fall within any of the specifically identified exceptions outlined in paragraph 149 – 150 of the NPPF. It is noted that a case for Very Special Circumstances (VSC) has been put forward and MVDC advise that careful consideration is given to the content. However, by definition, VSC tend to be unique to the circumstances of each specific proposal and the application needs to be considered on its own merits. The benefit of meeting the need would need to be very carefully weighed against the harm to the Green Belt, to which the national guidance attaches significant importance.

202. Officers recognise that the proposed development is inappropriate and due to the expansion of the physical massing of buildings on the school site, will have some impact on the openness of the Green Belt. However, in considering the location of the proposed development within a long standing school site in the Green Belt, the identified need for the development and the sensitive design of the proposed development, Officers consider that the impact on openness will be moderate.

203. Officers note that the statutory consultees have raised no objection on the proposed development and the proposed development accords with the relevant development plan policy on Need for Community Facilities; Sustainable Design, Scale and Landscaping; Ecology, Trees and Archaeology; Impact on Residential Amenity; Drainage and Flood Risk; Impact on Playing Fields; and Highways, Transport and Access. Officers recognise that there will be some other impacts during the construction of the proposed development, but that these will be temporary and the applicant has proposed appropriate mitigation measures to minimise the impacts on local residents and highway users. Therefore, Officers considers the other impacts to be temporary, and therefore of minor harm in respect of Green Belt.

Conclusion on Green Belt

204. The proposal represents inappropriate development in the Green Belt where very special circumstances have to exist to warrant planning approval. Those very special circumstances must outweigh the harm cause by reason of the inappropriate nature of the proposal but also any other harm arising. Officers conclude that the proposed development will result in a moderate harm on the openness of the Green Belt by virtue of the developments physical massing within the Green Belt, including a further temporary impact during construction activities. However Officers consider that the applicant has sufficiently demonstrated an essential need for the proposed development which represents very special circumstances and which outweighs the harm caused. Officers consider it is appropriate having regard to the advice contained in paragraph 95 of the NPPF to place great weight on the need to expand St Andrews School site to provide sufficient choice of school places and to meet existing, local, Catholic and projected demand and therefore accords with the requirements of the NPPF and Policy ENV23 of the MVLP 2000.

Human Rights Implications

205. 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.

206. It is Officer's view that the scale of any potential impacts are not considered sufficient to engage Article 8 or Article 1 and that potential impacts can be mitigated by planning

conditions. As such, this proposal is not considered to interfere with any Convention right.

Conclusion

207. The proposal is for the permanent one form of entry expansion comprising two storey extension to the existing Earl Building to provide additional teaching and supporting accommodation; demolition of existing 'Woodlands Building' and erection of a replacement two storey standalone block comprising teaching and supporting accommodation; permanent retention of two demountable classroom units; modification of existing Main Building and Performing Arts Building elevations to provide new external windows and doors to suit altered internal layout and ventilation strategy; and associated external works and landscaping.

208. Officers consider that there is an identified need for the proposed development at St Andrews School, and Officers are satisfied that the proposed design, scale and location of development within the site is in keeping with the existing sites material palette and use as an educational facility and the wider local character, and will facilitate the site to accommodate the additional 150 pupils as a result of the permanent 1FE expansion.

209. Officers are satisfied that the proposed development can achieve a BREEAM Very Good rating, and Officers consider that the proposed design, layout and orientation of the new classroom block and building extension maximises their energy efficiency. Officers consider that the proposed construction and school derived waste management is sustainable and will maximise on-site recycling facilities and the re-use and recycling of materials used in construction, and Officers are satisfied that the proposed hard and soft landscaping plan will be in keeping with the existing design of the school site and will provide landscaping enhancements to the site.

210. In view of the proposed use, scale and location of the proposed development, Officers are satisfied that the design of the proposed development will not result in any overlooking or loss of outlook to neighbouring residential properties nor detract from the character and appearance of the surrounding environment. Officers also consider that the proposed mitigation measures will minimise the impact of noise, vibration and dust emissions on local residential amenity. Furthermore, Officers are satisfied that the proposed drainage strategy will manage the additional surface water arising from the proposed development, and that the proposed foul drainage system is acceptable.

211. Officers are satisfied that highway has sufficient capacity for the 1FE expansion and construction traffic, and that the proposed mitigation measures will minimise the impact of noise, dust, vibrations and traffic on local residential amenity and will ensure the safety of highway users. Officers consider that the existing access and parking provisions at the school site are sufficient to accommodate the 1FE expansion and construction deliveries and staff during the temporary construction phase of the development. Officers consider that there is a need for an updated School Travel Plan and that this will be secured by way of a planning condition.

212. Officers consider that the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness and impact on openness, and the minimal, temporary other harm resulting from the proposed development, is clearly outweighed by the need for the development in view of paragraph 95 of the NPPF. Officers consider that the need for the development constitutes very special circumstances and outweighs the potential harm to the Green Belt.

213. Of the consultees that have responded, none have raised an objection to the proposal, including Mole Valley District Council, the County Arboriculturist, the County Ecologist, the County Landscape Officer, the County Noise Consultant, the County Highway Authority, the Lead Local Flood Authority, and Sport England. A few conditions and informatives have been proposed by consultees for the provision of further details.

214. Five letters of representation and one petition with twenty signatures have been received as part of the proposal raising concerns with traffic, parking, air pollution, and anti-social behaviour which Officers have addressed in the report where appropriate.

7

215. In view of the details in paragraphs 40 to 214 above, Officers are satisfied that the proposal accords with the relevant development plan policy and therefore should be approved.

Recommendation

216. That, pursuant to Regulation 3 of the Town and County Planning General Regulations 1992, planning application ref: **MO/2021/1087** be **PERMITTED** subject to the following conditions:

Conditions:

IMPORTANT - CONDITION NO(S) 3 AND 7 MUST BE DISCHARGED PRIOR TO THE COMMENCEMENT OF THE DEVELOPMENT.

Approved Plans

1. The development hereby approved shall be carried out in all respects in accordance with the following plans/drawings:

Drawing number: HBS-00-00-DR-A-1100 Rev P0 Site Location Plan

Drawing number: HBS-00-00-DR-A-1101 Rev P0 Existing Block Plan

Drawing number: HBS-00-00-DR-A-1102 Rev P2 Proposed Block Plan dated 5 May 2021

Drawing number: HBS-00-00-DR-A-1103 Rev P0 Existing Roof Plan

Drawing number: HBS-00-00-DR-A-1104 Rev P0 Proposed Roof Plan

Drawing number: HBS-00-00-DR-A-1105 Rev P0 Proposed Landscaping Plan

Drawing number: HBS-00-00-DR-A-1110 Rev P0 Existing Ground Floor Plan

Drawing number: HBS-00-00-DR-A-1111 Rev P0 Existing First Floor Plan

Drawing number: HBS-00-00-DR-A-1112 Rev P2 Proposed Ground Flood Plan dated 5 May 2021

Drawing number: HBS-00-00-DR-A-1113 Rev P2 Proposed First Floor Plan dated 5 May 2021

Drawing number: HBS-EB-ZZ-DR-A-1122 Rev P2 Existing and Proposed Elevations Sheet 1 dated 10 May 2021

Drawing number: HBS-EB-ZZ-DR-A-1121 Rev P1 Existing and Proposed Elevations Sheet 2 dated 5 May 2021

Drawing number: HBS-ZZ-XX-DR-A-1122 Rev P0 Existing and Proposed Elevations Sheet 3

Drawing number: HBS-ZZ-XX-DR-A-1123 Rev P0 Existing Demountable Elevations

Drawing number: 14922-20 Rev A Survey Job No. 11674 dated 7 May 2021

Hours of Construction

2. In carrying out the development hereby permitted, no construction activities shall take place except between the hours of 08.00 to 18.00 Monday to Friday and 08.00 to 13.00 on Saturdays. There shall be no deliveries to or from the site between the hours of 08.00 to 09.00, 15.00 to 16.00 and 17.00 and 18.00 on any day. There shall be no working on Sundays, Bank, National or Public Holidays.

Construction Traffic Management Plan

3. Prior to the commencement of development hereby permitted, a Construction Management Plan (CMP) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority to illustrate the following:

(a) parking for vehicles of site personnel, operatives and visitors;

(b) loading and unloading of plant and materials;

(c) storage of plant and materials;

(d) programme of works (including measures for traffic management);

(e) HGV deliveries and hours of operation;

(f) measures to prevent the deposit of materials on the highway;

(g) no HGV movements to or from the site shall take place between the hours of 08.00 and 09.00, 15.00 and 16.00 and 17.00 and 18.00 on any day, nor shall the contractor permit any HGV's associated with the development at the site to be laid up, waiting, in Grange Road during these times;

(h) on-site turning for construction vehicles;

(i) site plan illustrating parking for vehicles of school staff, site personnel, operatives and visitors; loading and unloading of plant and materials; storage of plant and materials; and on-site turning for construction vehicles.

The approved CMP shall be adhered to and implemented throughout the construction period strictly in accordance with the approved details.

School Travel Plan

4. Prior to the first occupation of the development hereby permitted, an updated School Travel Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority.

The submitted School Travel Plan shall include the following:

(a) measures to promote sustainable modes of transport;

(b) provisions for the maintenance, monitoring and review of the impact of the Plan and its further development; and

(c) contact details for the School Travel Plan Co-ordinator.

The approved School Travel Plan shall be adhered to and implemented in all respects.

Tree Protection

5. The development hereby permitted shall be carried in accordance with the approved Arboricultural Impact Assessment, Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan dated 4 May 2021 submitted with the application.

7

The development shall be implemented and managed strictly in accordance with the approved scheme.

Ecology

6. The development hereby permitted shall be carried in accordance with the approved Preliminary Ecological Appraisal dated 17 March 2021 submitted with the application.

The development shall be implemented and managed strictly in accordance with the approved scheme.

Drainage

7. Prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted, details of the design of a surface water drainage scheme (SuDS) shall be submitted and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority.

The design must satisfy the SuDS Hierarchy and be compliant with the national Non-Statutory Technical Standards for SuDS, NPPF and Ministerial Statement on SuDS. The required drainage details shall include:

(a) The results of infiltration testing completed in accordance with BRE Digest: 365 and confirmation of groundwater levels;

(b) Evidence that the proposed final solution will effectively manage the 1 in 30 & 1 in 100 (+20% allowance for climate change) storm events, during all stages of the development. The final solution should follow the principles set out in the approved drainage strategy. If infiltration is deemed unfeasible, associated discharge rates and storage volumes shall be provided using a maximum discharge rate of 1 l/s;

(c) Detailed drainage design drawings and calculations to include: a finalised drainage layout detailing the location of drainage elements, pipe diameters, levels, and long and cross sections of each element including details of any flow restrictions and maintenance/risk reducing features (silt traps, inspection chambers etc.). Confirmation is required of a 1m unsaturated zone from the base of any proposed soakaway to the seasonal high groundwater level and confirmation of half-drain times;

(d) A plan showing exceedance flows (i.e. during rainfall greater than design events or during blockage) and how property on and off site will be protected from increased flood risk;

(e) Details of drainage management responsibilities and maintenance regimes for the drainage system; and

(f) Details of how the drainage system will be protected during construction and how runoff (including any pollutants) from the development site will be managed before the drainage system is operational.

The approved SuDS shall be adhered to and implemented strictly in accordance with the approved details.

8. Prior to the first occupation of the development hereby permitted, a verification report carried out by a qualified drainage engineer shall be submitted to and approved in writing

by the County Planning Authority. The verification report shall demonstrate that the surface water drainage system has been constructed as per the agreed scheme, provide the details of any management company and state the national grid reference of any key drainage elements (surface water attenuation devices/areas, flow restriction devices and outfalls), and confirm any defects have been rectified.

Noise

9. The Rating Level, LAr,Tr, of the noise emitted from all plant, associated with the application site shall not exceed the existing representative LA90 background sound level at any time by more than +5 dB(A) at the nearest noise sensitive receptor (NSR). The assessment shall be carried out in accordance with British Standard (BS) 4142:2014+A1:2019 'Methods for rating and assessing industrial and commercial sound'.

Reasons:

1. For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

2. In order that the development does not prejudice highway safety, nor cause inconvenience to other highway users, nor adversely impact residential amenity, in accordance with Policies MOV2, MOV5, CF2, ENV22 of the Mole Valley Local Plan 2000.

3. In order that the development does not prejudice highway safety, nor cause inconvenience to other highway users, nor adversely impact residential amenity, in accordance with Policies MOV2, MOV5, CF2, ENV22 of the Mole Valley Local Plan 2000.

4. In order that the development does not prejudice highway safety, nor cause inconvenience to other highway users, nor adversely impact residential amenity, in accordance with Policies MOV2, MOV5, CF2, ENV22 of the Mole Valley Local Plan 2000.

5. To secure the implementation of the details contained within section 2.4 and 3.0 of the approved Arboricultural Impact Assessment, Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan and the Arboricultural method statement by way of a condition to ensure existing trees are protected during the construction phase of the development in accordance with Policies ENV25 and ENV25 of the Mole Valley Local Plan 2000 and Policy AS-En2 of the Ashtead Neighbourhood Development Plan 2017.

6. To ensure native species are safeguarded during the construction phase of the development hereby permitted and to ensure the implementation of the ecological enhancements in accordance with Policy CS15 of the Mole Valley Core Strategy 2009 and Policies ENV14 and ENV15 of the Mole Valley Local Plan 2000.

7. To ensure the design meets the national Non-Statutory Technical Standards for SuDS and the final drainage design does not increase flood risk on or off site in accordance with Policy CS20 of the Mole Valley Core Strategy 2009 and Policy ENV65 of the Mole Valley Local Plan 2000.

8. To ensure the Drainage System is constructed to the National Non-Statutory Technical Standards for SuDS, and in accordance with Policy CS20 of the Mole Valley Core Strategy 2009 and Policy ENV65 of the Mole Valley Local Plan 2000.

9. To protect the amenity of noise sensitive receptors during the operation of the development hereby permitted in accordance with Policies ENV22, MOV2 and ENV22 of the Mole Valley Local Plan 2000

Informatives:

1. 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 Department for Children, Schools and Families Building Bulletin 102 'Designing for disabled children and children with Special Educational Needs' published in 2008 and Department of Education Building Bulletin 104 'Area guidelines for SEND and alternative provision' December 2015, or any prescribed document replacing these notes.

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. Biosecurity is very important to minimise the risks of pests and diseases being imported into the UK and introduced into the environment. It is recommended that all trees grown abroad, but purchased for transplanting, shall spend at least one full growing season on a UK nursery and be subjected to a pest and disease control programme. Evidence of this control programme, together with an audit trail of when imported trees entered the UK, their origin and the length of time they have been in the nursery should be requested before the commencement of any tree planting. If this information is not available, alternative trees sources should be used. You are advised to consult the relevant UK Government agencies such as the Animal and Plant Health Agency (APHA) and the Forestry Commission for current guidance, Plant Passport requirements and plant movement restrictions. Quality Assurance Schemes followed by nurseries should also be investigated when researching suppliers. For larger planting schemes, you may wish to consider engaging a suitably qualified professional to oversee tree / plant specification and planting.

4. The existing representative LA90 background sound level shall be determined by measurement that shall be sufficient to characterise the environment. The representative level should be justified following guidance contained within BS 4142:2014+A1:2019 and agreed with the County Planning Authority (CPA).

5. If proposed works result in infiltration of surface water to ground within a Source Protection Zone the Environment Agency will require proof of surface water treatment to achieve water quality standards.

   If there are any further queries please contact the Flood Risk Asset, Planning, and Programming team via SUDS@surreycc.gov.uk. Please use our reference number in any future correspondence.

6. In relation to Condition 3, the developers attention is brought to the fact that the details contained within the submitted Construction Management Plan dated April 2021 are acceptable but require the addition of a plan illustrating parking for vehicles of school staff, site personnel, operatives and visitors; loading and unloading of plant and materials; storage of plant and materials; and on-site turning for construction vehicles.

7. Section 59 of the Highways Act permits the Highway Authority to charge developers for damage caused by excessive weight and movements of vehicles to and from a site. The Highway Authority will pass on the cost of any excess repairs compared to normal maintenance costs to the applicant/organisation responsible for the damage

8. The developer is reminded that it is an offence to allow materials to be carried from the site and deposited on or damage the highway from uncleaned wheels or badly loaded vehicles. The Highway Authority will seek, wherever possible, to recover any expenses incurred in clearing, cleaning or repairing highway surfaces and prosecutes persistent offenders. (Highways Act 1980 Sections 131, 148, 149).

9. The developer would be expected to instruct an independent transportation data collection company to undertake the monitoring survey. This survey should conform to a TRICS Multi-Modal Survey format consistent with the UK Standard for Measuring Travel Plan Impacts as approved by the Highway Authority. To ensure that the survey represents typical travel patterns, the organisation taking ownership of the travel plan will need to agree to being surveyed only within a specified annual quarter period but with no further notice of the precise survey dates. The Developer would be expected to fund the survey validation and data entry costs.

10. The County Highway Authority encourages the use of the Modeshift STARS online system for the production and maintenance of future School Travel Plans. The STARS system facilitates the collection of travel data from both students and staff.

11. Management of surface water from new developments should follow Policy SI 13 Sustainable drainage of the London Plan 2021. Where the developer proposes to discharge to a public sewer, prior approval from Thames Water Developer Services will be required. Should you require further information please refer to our website https://developers.thameswater.co.uk/Developing-a-large-site/Apply-and-pay-for-services/Wastewater-services

12. A Groundwater Risk Management Permit from Thames Water will be required for discharging groundwater into a public sewer. Any discharge made without a permit is deemed illegal and may result in prosecution under the provisions of the Water Industry Act 1991. Thames Water would expect the developer to demonstrate what measures they will undertake to minimise groundwater discharges into the public sewer. Permit enquiries should be directed to Thames Water's Risk Management Team by telephoning 020 3577 9483 or by emailing trade.effluent@thameswater.co.uk . Application forms should be completed on line via www.thameswater.co.uk. Please refer to the Wholesale; Business customers; Groundwater discharges section.

13. Thames Water will need to check that the development doesn't limit repair or maintenance activities, or inhibit the services they provide in any other way. The applicant is advised to read our guide working near or diverting our pipes https://developers.thameswater.co.uk/Developing-a-large-site/Planning-your-development/Working-near-or-diverting-our-pipes.

14. Thames Water would recommend that petrol / oil interceptors be fitted in all car parking/washing/repair facilities. Failure to enforce the effective use of petrol / oil interceptors could result in oil-polluted discharges entering local watercourses.

15. In determining this application the County Planning Authority has worked positively and proactively with the applicant by: entering into pre-application discussions; assessing the proposals against relevant Development Plan policies and the National Planning Policy Framework including its associated planning practice guidance and European Regulations, providing feedback to the applicant where appropriate. Further, the County Planning Authority has: identified all material considerations; forwarded consultation responses to the applicant; considered representations from interested parties; liaised with consultees and the applicant to resolve identified issues and determined the application within the timeframe agreed with the applicant. The applicant has also been given advance sight of the draft planning conditions. This approach has been in accordance with the requirements of paragraph 38 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2021.

Contact Stephanie King

Tel. no. 020 8541 9525

7

Background papers

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

For this application, the deposited application documents and plans, and response to consultations, are available to view on our online register. The representations received are publicly available to view on the district/borough planning register. The Mole Valley District Council planning register entry for this application can be found under:

• MO/2021/1087

Other documents

The following were also referred to in the preparation of this report:

Government Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework

Planning Practice Guidance

The Development Plan

Mole Valley Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2009

Mole Valley Local Plan 2000

Ashtead Neighbourhood Development Plan 2017

Other Documents

SCC Vehicular and Cycle Parking Guidance (2018)