**Report To South Area Planning Sub-Committee – List A – Applications For Decision**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application No:</th>
<th>2017/2106</th>
<th>Application Type:</th>
<th>FULL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Case Officer:</td>
<td>Peter Brooks</td>
<td>Ward:</td>
<td>Weybridge St Georges Hill Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location:</td>
<td>Felton Fleet School Byfleet Road Cobham Surrey KT11 1DR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal:</td>
<td>Two-storey detached building (Music Facility) with single storey glazed link and new pedestrian access, conversion of Leighton House to ancillary staff accommodation, internal refurbishment of David Rutherford Centre, two-storey detached building (Digital Technology &amp; Art Hub), single storey building and 4m high brick wall enclosure to provide rifle range, single storey maintenance shed, rearrangement of maintenance yard, single storey detached building to provide new Head's House, cricket nets and replacement boundary wall along Byfleet Road following the demolition of part two/part single storey detached building (Keith Leighton Memorial Hall), single storey store and toilet, attached garage to Leighton House and existing rifle range and open store building</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant:</td>
<td>Feltonfleet School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agent:</td>
<td>Mr Nigel Abbott</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 St John Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC1M 4EH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision Level:</td>
<td>If Permit – Sub Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation:</td>
<td>Refuse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Representations:** None received.

This application has been promoted by Cllr Foale if the officer recommendation is to permit, and promoted by Cllr Donaldson if the officer recommendation is to refuse.

**Report**

**Description**

1. The application site relates to Felton Fleet School, a private school located within the designated Green Belt of the borough. The rear of the site abuts the A3. The main school building is located to the eastern end of the site and is statutory listed.

**Constraints**

2. The relevant planning constraints are:
   - Grade II Listed Buildings
   - Green Belt
   - Biodiversity Opportunity Area
   - 5km buffer Thames Basin Heath Special Protection Area
   - SSSI Impact Risk Zone

**Policy**

3. In addition to the National Planning Policy Framework and the National Planning Practice Guidance, the following local policies and guidance are relevant to the determination of this application:
4. Relevant Planning History

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017/2205</td>
<td>Listed Building Consent: Demolition of a single storey building incorporating store and toilet facility in association with application for planning permission 2017/2106 for erection of multiple buildings following demolition of multiple existing buildings</td>
<td>Pending Consideration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016/1634</td>
<td>Listed Building Consent: Addition of three rooflights to provide accommodation in roofspace</td>
<td>Grant Listed Building Consent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016/0727</td>
<td>Addition of three rooflights to provide accommodation in roof space</td>
<td>Grant permission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/1821</td>
<td>Listed Building Consent for metal fencing following demolition of existing boundary wall in association with planning permission 2015/1752</td>
<td>Grant Listed Building Consent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/1752</td>
<td>Metal fencing to a maximum height of 1.8 m following the demolition of the existing boundary wall</td>
<td>Grant permission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/1129</td>
<td>Confirmation of Compliance with Conditions: 3 (Material Samples) and 4 (Landscaping - Tree Planting) of planning permission 2013/1548</td>
<td>Compliance confirmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/1108</td>
<td>Non-Material Changes to planning permission (2013/1548) to change material of roof flashings, omission</td>
<td>Non material changes accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/0656</td>
<td>Non-material changes to planning permission 2013/1548 for changes in fenestration, change of material for roof flashings, to substitute wrought iron fence for existing brick wall and amendments to landscaping</td>
<td>Non material changes accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014/4714</td>
<td>22 photovoltaic panels on south eastern roof of existing sports hall building</td>
<td>Grant permission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013/1754</td>
<td>Listed Building Consent: Demolition of an external window and surrounding wall and internal alterations to administration building in conjunction with planning permission 2013/1548 for a single storey building for use as performing arts centre with new link to the main school building; a new walled garden to replace the current school entrance following demolition of existing music block</td>
<td>Grant Listed Building Consent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013/1548</td>
<td>Single storey building for use as performing arts centre with new link to the main school building; a new walled garden to replace the current school entrance; and minor alterations to the internal partitions of the listed building following demolition of existing music block</td>
<td>Grant permission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012/0054</td>
<td>Listed Building Consent: Two storey extension, single storey extension, roof level alterations, new main entrance and landscaping works in association with application for planning permission 2011/8433</td>
<td>Grant Listed Building Consent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011/8433</td>
<td>Two storey extension, single storey extension, roof level alterations, new main entrance and landscaping works</td>
<td>Grant permission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010/0268</td>
<td>All weather pitch enclosed with 3 metre high weldmesh fencing and 6 x 10 metre lighting columns</td>
<td>Grant permission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009/1754</td>
<td>Covered enclosure for swimming pool and new plant room including link canopy to existing changing rooms and new access into Byfleet Road following demolition of existing swimming pool enclosure and plant room</td>
<td>Grant permission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008/2289</td>
<td>New swimming pool and changing rooms following demolition of existing swimming pool and squash courts</td>
<td>Grant permission</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Proposal**

5. Permission is sought for numerous elements, which can be summarised as follows:

- Erection of two-storey detached building (Music Facility) with single storey glazed link and new pedestrian access,
- Conversion of Leighton House to ancillary staff accommodation,
• Internal refurbishment of David Rutherford Centre,
• Erection of two-storey detached building (Digital Technology & Art Hub),
• Erection of single storey building and 4m high brick wall enclosure to provide rifle range, single storey maintenance shed, rearrangement of maintenance yard,
• Erection of single storey detached building to provide new Head's House,
• New cricket nets and replacement boundary wall along Byfleet Road all following the demolition of part two/part single storey detached building (Keith Leighton Memorial Hall), single storey store and toilet, attached garage to Leighton House and existing rifle range and open store building.

Consultations

6. Historic England – Consult not required.
7. Lead Local Flood Authority (SUDs) – No objections subject to conditions.
8. Tree Officer – No objections subject to tree conditions.
9. Surrey County Council (Archaeology) – No objections subject to condition.
10. Natural England – Object unless mitigation against Thames Basin Heath SPA can be secured.
11. Surrey County Council (Highways) – No objections subject to informatives.
13. Surrey Bat Group – Submitted reports recommendations sufficient to compensate for loss of roost.
14. Listed Building Officer – No adverse comments in relation to impact upon Grade II Listed Building.
15. Environmental Health (Noise & Pollution) – No objections subject to informative regarding construction times to avoid adverse impact on sensitive premises.
16. Surrey Wildlife Trust – No objections subject to recommendations in ecological report being implemented. Recommend submission of Landscape and Environmental Management Plan due to proximity to Biodiversity Opportunity Area, could be secured by condition.

Positive and Proactive Engagement

17. In assessing this application, officers have worked with the applicant in a positive and proactive manner consistent with the requirements of 186-187 of the NPPF by making available pre-application advice to seek to resolve problems before the application was submitted and to foster the delivery of sustainable development.

18. Formal pre-application advice was sought in relation to the proposal. It was identified that due to the site’s Green Belt location, arguments should focus on ‘limited infilling’ as per paragraph 89 of the NPPF as ‘Very Special Circumstances’ in this location could be difficult to argue. The advice concluded “subject to a suitable Green Belt Case the proposed development may be considered acceptable by Officers”.

Planning Considerations

19. The main planning considerations in the determination of this application are:

- The principle of the proposed development
- The design of the proposal and its impact on the character of the area
- The impact upon Heritage assets
- The impact highway safety and capacity
The impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties
- The impact on flood risk
- The impact on trees
- The impact on ecology
- Financial matters

The principle of the proposed development

Green Belt

a) Background

20. Paragraph 89 of the NPPF states that “A local Planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt, Exceptions to this are” and then goes on to list a number of exceptions, including most relevant to this application:

- **Limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed sites (brownfield land), whether redundant or in continuing use (excluding temporary buildings), which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development.**

21. Policy DM17 refers to development of new buildings in the Green Belt, and c) of this policy states

- Proposals for the limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed sites will be considered in light of the size, height, type, layout and impact of existing buildings, structures and hard standing, together with the degree of dispersal throughout the site or existing and proposed development.

22. The applicant has within their Planning Statement sought to argue that the various elements of the proposal would either constitute limited infilling or replacement/re-use of existing buildings, neither of which would conflict with Green Belt Policy. The applicant considers the proposal would therefore not be considered inappropriate development in the Green Belt, and as such would not be required to demonstrate any ‘Very Special Circumstances’ (VSC).

b) Preservation of openness and purposes of the Green Belt

23. Paragraph 79 of the NPPF lists the fundamental aims of Green Belt policy, which is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open. The essential characteristics of the Green Belt are their openness and their permanence.

24. The five purposes of the Green Belt are set out in Paragraph 80 of the NPPF:

- To check unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;
- To prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another;
- To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment;
- To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and
- To assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.

c) Analysis of each element

25. **Replacement Music Facility** – the music building would be located abutting the northern boundary of the site, fronting Byfleet Road. The building would replace the existing music building in a similar position, and would be located between the Main House and the swimming pool building. Whilst the replacement building would have a flat roof over and would be flush on the boundary, it would be more prominent than the existing building which has a pitched roof over and set away from the boundary. It is nevertheless considered this element could be reasonably described as limited infilling of an area already occupied by built form and
so this element would have no greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt, and so would be considered acceptable and not inappropriate development.

26. Art, DT and Science hub – This part of the site is located adjoining the southern boundary, close to the tennis courts. This element of the proposal would involve the conversion of the existing David Rutherford Centre into teaching space, conversion of the existing Leighton House into ancillary space and the erection of a new building on the southern boundary of the site, abutting the A3 slip road.

27. The conversion of the David Rutherford Centre would provide teaching and ancillary accommodation. It is considered these works would be considered to fall within the fourth exception listed at Paragraph 90 of the NPPF (re-use of buildings providing that the buildings are of permanent and substantial construction) and so would not constitute inappropriate development within the Green Belt.

28. The new building would be located in an area currently unoccupied by development and which currently forms part of the rear garden of the existing head’s house (Leighton House). The applicant in their planning statement considers the new building would constitute limited infilling on a previously developed site. Having regard to the wording of DM17 c) (see Para. 22) it is considered that whilst the new building would be located between existing buildings, its size and height in conjunction with its location adjoining the site boundary would see the creation of a built form which would have an adverse impact upon the openness of this part of the Green Belt. The building due to its height (37.7 AOD) and bulk (25.7m long by 9.35m wide), would be visible from the adjoining A3 road to the south east, where currently views of the school site are screened through mature boundary planting and tree cover. It is therefore considered this element would conflict with the 6th bullet point of Para. 89 of the NPPF as the building would have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and would conflict with the purposes of including land within it, and DM17 c) in that the building would by virtue of its size, height and layout and position on the site boundary would result in unacceptable harm to the openness of the Green Belt.

29. Conversion of Leighton House to staff facilities – Leighton House comprises the existing head’s house, located close to the southern boundary of the site. Para. 90 of the NPPF identifies that the re-use of buildings providing they are of a permanent and substantial construction would not constitute inappropriate development within the Green Belt. This is also supported by DM18 a) which offers support to proposals that do not have a materially greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt.

30. Replacement Head’s House – the existing head’s house (Leighton House) is located close to the southern boundary of the site, close to the A3, which the applicant claims this causes disturbance to the occupiers of the dwelling by virtue of road noise, which the Council would not dispute. The existing head’s house is proposed to be converted (see Para. 30 of this report) and a new one erected abutting the northern boundary of the site (fronting Byfleet Road).

31. The school considers that it is essential that the Head lives on site and thus a head’s house must be provided on site for the following reasoning 1) The Head supervises boarding pupils and should be present to deal with issues that arise overnight 2) There is an expectation from parents that the Head would live on site, which is common for preparatory schools with a boarding element 3) The head would be expected to attend evening events which it would be unreasonable for them to travel home afterwards is considered unreasonable and 4) It is part of the schools ethos that it is a family school, which would be reinforced by the head and their family living on site.

32. The new head’s house would be a single storey low profile building, and would be located where the cricket nets, maintenance yard, sheds and rifle range are currently located. The building has been designed to spread across this area to mimic the existing built form on site. It is considered the scale, design and position of the proposed new head’s house would constitute limited infilling of the site which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt, in compliance with Para. 89 of the NPPF and DM17 c). The new building
would be of a limited height that would not project significantly over the boundary fence, and would replace existing structures of a comparable height and location. It is not considered the use of the building as a dwelling would have a demonstrable impact on the openness of the Green Belt beyond the existing situation. The building would still be viewed in context of the wider school site and it is not considered it would be viewed as an entirely separate building that would have a greater impact on openness.

33. **Relocated Maintenance Yard and Rifle Range** – The maintenance yard and rifle range are currently located the northern site frontage, at the western end of the built form which fronts Byfleet Road. The proposal would see the maintenance yard and rifle range be reconfigured, some existing structures demolished and new maintenance building provided close to the boundary with Byfleet Road. The rifle range would move from an east-west orientation to a north-south orientation. It is considered this change in orientation would constitute limited infilling of the site which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt, in compliance with Para. 89 of the NPPF and DM17 c). The range butt (the end which you fire towards) would abut the boundary fence, and project above this. It is however consider it would be viewed in context of other proposed buildings (new head’s house and new maintenance building) which would not project greatly over the boundary fence, and would not be of such a scale and bulk that would have an adverse impact on openness beyond the existing.

34. The new maintenance building would infill an area between the existing cricket pavilion and the boundary wall, and have a shallow pitched roof over. This building would not be higher than the cricket pavilion, and would be located in an area of hardstanding which is used in connection with the existing maintenance yard. It is considered this element would constitute limited infilling of the site which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt, in compliance with Para. 89 of the NPPF and DM17 c). The building would be viewed in relation to the neighbouring sports hall, a substantial two storey brick building and the maintenance building would not result in adverse impact on the openness of this part of Green Belt.

35. **Cricket Nets** – The existing cricket nets are located south of the existing rifle range, close to the northern boundary of the site with Byfleet Road. The nets are currently obscured from views from the road by the existing rifle range, and their design allows porous views through them. It is considered the proposed replacement nets, being located south of the proposed head’s house, would have little difference in terms of visual impact and would be considered to constitute limited infilling which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt.

d) Green Belt Impact

36. It is considered that with the exception of the proposed Art, DT & Science hub the proposal would constitute limited infilling of a previously developed site, which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt. The new Art, DT and Science hub would however by virtue of its size, height and layout be considered to be a form of development which would not constitute ‘limited infilling’ (for the reasoning explained at Para’s 27 to 29 of this report). Thus the development would constitute inappropriate development, which is by definition harmful to the Green Belt and which should not be approved except in VSC. Para. 88 of the NPPF explains that VSC will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of its inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.

37. The Council must therefore consider whether any VSC exist which would outweigh the identified harm to the Green Belt, by virtue of loss of openness. Whilst the applicant does not consider it necessary to demonstrate any VSC, it is considered the proposed Art, DT & Science building would not constitute one of the exceptions as listed at Para. 89 of the NPPF (‘limited infilling’). Whilst the proposal would bring benefits to the school by virtue of improved facilities, new head’s house to provide better living accommodation and additional on-site staff accommodation; it is not considered that these factors would constitute VSC that would clearly outweigh the harm identified. It is noted that within the applicants planning statement that the various elements are linked (except for the music facility) and if one part was found to be
unacceptable, it would impact the whole project. This factor, and the proposed improvements to the school facilities as a whole have been given significant weight, but on balance, it is considered the harm caused would not clearly outweigh the harm to the openness of the Green Belt, caused by the proposed Art, DT & Science hub building.

e) Conclusion

38. The proposed Art, DT and Science hub would by virtue of its siting, size, height and layout be considered to be a form of development which would not constitute ‘limited infilling’. Thus the development would constitute inappropriate development, which is by definition harmful to the Green Belt and for which no Very Special Circumstances have been demonstrated that clearly outweigh the harm identified.

The design of the proposal and its impact on the character of the area

39. The school site is located on a piece of land bordered to the south by the A3 (a major arterial road), to the north by Byfleet Road (a dead end road which accesses the school site only) and to the west by woodland, and beyond that isolated dwellings, a care home and a hotel. The school site is only readily visible therefore from the Byfleet Road, with snatched views from the A245 to the north-west. Views of the site from the east are limited by trees. Due to the sites location and screening it is considered therefore the only element that would have a significant impact upon the wider character of the area is the proposed Art, DT & Science building, which would be located on the southern boundary of the site, adjoining the A3 slip road. Plans show that an existing well treed boundary would be cleared and the proposed building would therefore be prominent when viewed from this road. Whilst the existing head’s house is partially visible through the treed boundary, it is considered the loss of trees in conjunction with the height, bulk and position of the proposed Art, DT & Science hub would result in a form of built development that would be out of character by virtue of its position and scale.

40. In regards to the other elements of the proposal, it is not considered that these would result in an adverse impact upon the character of the area, having regard to the infill nature of the proposals. Each element will be addressed below.

41. Replacement Music Facility – The replacement music building would be located directly on the northern boundary of the site and connect to the main house (the Grade II Listed Building) via a glazed link. Whist this building would be closer to the road than the building it replaces, it is not considered its design or relationship with the adjoining listed building, would have an adverse impact on the character of the area. The building has a contemporary design, with a flat roof over and tall, narrow windows. It is considered this design provides a pleasing contrast the adjoining listed building to which it is linked, and provides a modern facility that would serve the school.

42. Conversion of Leighton House to staff facilities – The proposed changes to allow the conversion of Leighton House to staff facilities would have little exterior impact upon the character of the area, and this building is away from the Byfleet Road frontage, and is set in from the southern side boundary. It is not considered this element would have any adverse impact upon the character of the area.

43. Replacement Head’s House – The existing head’s house (Leighton House) is located close to the southern boundary of the site, close to the A3, and new proposed head’s house would be erected abutting the northern boundary of the site (fronting Byfleet Road). The new head’s house would replace existing sheds and rifle range. It can be seen from submitted plans that this building would have a low profile, flat roof design, and project only a limited amount over the boundary fence. Whilst the footprint of the head’s house would be quite wide, it is considered its low profile form and design would mean it would not adversely impact the character of the area. Proposed parking for the dwelling would be located to the front of the property, but would be screened by boundary treatment.

44. Relocated Maintenance Yard and Rifle Range – The existing maintenance yard is screened from views outside the site by the existing boundary wall which fronts Byfleet Road, and the
proposed alterations to its layout and erection of new maintenance building are not considered to be harmful to the character of the area. The use of the area would not change, and the new building would be of a scale and appearance that would not be incongruous in this location.

45. The new rifle range would be located between the proposed head’s house and the existing cricket pavilion building, which delineates the edge of the proposed yard area. The range would be set out so the butt (the end of the range which shots are fired) would adjoin the site boundary. This would appear as a solid wall from the Byfleet Road frontage, which would project above the proposed fence. It is not considered this element, either in isolation or in conjunction with the proposed head’s house and maintenance building would have a harmful impact on the character of the area. This area currently is characterised by low profile buildings of a utilitarian appearance, the proposed proposal would not see this character change significantly, despite an increase of built form directly on the site boundary.

46. **Cricket Nets** – The proposed new cricket nets would be located in a broadly similar location to the existing, and would not appear out of character within the sports field area in which they are viewed.

47. It is therefore considered the proposed Art, DT & Science building would by virtue of its prominent location and scale have a harmful impact on the character of the area, by introducing a large element of built form in an area currently occupied by trees and planting. This element would therefore be considered to be a feature which would be out of character and result in harm to the area.

**Impact on the heritage assets**

48. The proposed replacement music facility building on the northern boundary of the site would directly adjoin, and be linked to, the Main House, a Grade II Listed Building. As has been referred above at Para. 42 the proposed music building would be of a contrasting architectural style to the listed building, and be connected via a glazed link. The Council must ensure when determining applications which impact upon Listed Buildings that they have “special regard to the desirability the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses”.

49. The Council’s Listed Building Officer was consulted on the proposal and considered that the proposal would have no adverse impact upon the building or its setting, and commented that “I have no concerns about the removal of another modern building of indifferent quality and its replacement with the music centre which is of crisp simple design which contrasts effectively with the listed old school house. There is to be a new public entrance to the school at this point which will enable the qualities of the old school house to be more widely appreciated”. The Listed Building Officer also commented that the other changes proposed on site would not adversely impact the Listed Building. It is therefore considered the proposal would have an acceptable impact upon the Listed Building and no adverse impacts to the heritage asset would occur.

**The impact on highway safety and capacity**

50. The submitted submitting planning statement makes clear the proposal would not result in any increase in pupil numbers at the school, and there would be no amendments to existing access arrangements (with the exception of the new head’s house). It is considered on this basis that the proposal would not have an adverse impact upon highway safety, and the County Highway Authority raised no objections to the proposal subject to the imposition of informatives.

51. Highways England was consulted on the proposal due to the site proximity to the A3 trunk road, and they raised no objections.
52. It is considered due to the sites separation from adjoining properties the proposal would not have an adverse impact upon their amenities. The school site is located on a piece of land bordered to the south by the A3, to the north by Byfleet Road (a dead end road which accesses the school site only) and to the west by woodland, and beyond that isolated dwellings, a care home and a hotel. It is considered due to this significant separation and the natural screening provided by the trees and land the various proposed elements would not have an adverse impact upon the amenities of the adjoining properties, either in terms of visual impact or any other disturbance, beyond that already experienced from the site. The adjoining buildings on the northern side of Byfleet Road are in the same ownership of the applicant.

53. It is considered the proposed head’s house would provide an level of residential amenity for proposed occupiers. The size of the unit would exceed the minimum internal standard as set out in the National Technical Standard. It is acknowledged the rear garden would not meet the minimum depth normally required (11m) but it is considered due to the unique circumstance and location of the dwelling this matter would not weigh against the proposal. The garden would still have significant width and would be south facing to maximise solar gain.

54. The proposed conversion of Leighton House (the existing head’s house) to provide ancillary staff accommodation would see the creation of bedrooms and a kitchen. It is considered the scale and layout of this would provide an acceptable standard of accommodation for staff. In order to ensure the proposed residential uses on site (replacement head’s house and ancillary staff accommodation) are used only in relation to the school use a condition could be applied to control their use.

The impact on flood risk

55. The site is located within Flood Zone 1, the lowest flood risk area for fluvial (river) flooding. There is a pond in the south west corner of the site, and around this there are areas of high, medium and low risk of surface water flooding. As none of the proposal is in this area it is not considered it would have any impact upon the areas of surface water flooding. Due to the size of the application site the applicant has submitted a Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy, which found the proposal would not result in increase in flood risk. Surrey County Council, in it’s role as the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) has been consulted on the proposal and raised no objections subject to appropriate conditions. It is therefore considered on the basis of the above that the proposal would not increase flood risk, and so its impact would be acceptable.

The impact on trees

56. The applicant has provided an arboricultural survey of the site, detailing trees on the site and those proposed to be removed, including those trees on the southern boundary that would need to be removed to allow the construction of the proposed Art, DT & Science building. Some trees are also proposed to be removed to allow construction of the new head’s house.

57. The Council’s Tree Officer was consulted on the proposal and raised no objections subject to conditions in relation to tree protection. However, it is considered the loss of trees to facilitate the erection of the Art, DT & Science building would adversely impact the character of the area as referred in para’s 29 and 40 of this report it is considered the loss of trees in conjunction with the erection of the Art, DT & Science building would have an adverse impact on the green character of the area when viewed from the A3 and impact the openness of the Green Belt. It is not considered the loss of other trees to be removed would adversely impact the character of the area.

The impact on ecology

58. The applicant has submitted a preliminary ecological survey and bat survey in support of the application. The ecological report concluded that the habitats within the site had a negligible to
very low ecological impact. The bat survey recommended further surveys are required for the music building to ascertain the presence of any roosts. This survey work was undertaken which found the presence of a small roost.

59. Both Surrey Wildlife Trust and the Surrey Bat Group were consulted on the proposal, and neither raised any objections on the basis of the submitted reports, subject to conditions to ensure that recommendations and conclusions in the submitted reports are carried out.

Financial matters

Affordable Housing

60. The Council’s approach to the provision of Affordable Housing is set out in Policy CS21 of the Core Strategy (July 2011) and the Developer Contributions Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) (April 2012), which states that development resulting in the net gain of 1-4 residential units should provide a financial contribution equivalent to the cost of 20% of the gross number of dwellings on site as Affordable Housing. In this instance as the head’s house is a direct replacement and the staff accommodation is ancillary to the school use, in this instance no contribution towards affordable housing is due.

61. The proposal is however liable for a financial contribution towards SAMM as it is within the Thames Basin Heath 5km buffer zone.

62. Based on the above, the appropriate level of the financial contribution towards SAMM was calculated and the application has indicated willingness to provide a completed legal agreement to secure this required contribution. The unilateral undertaking is expected prior to the Committee meeting and Members will be updated on this matter verbally at the Committee.

Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

63. The applicant has provided the relevant CIL forms.

Matters raised in Representations

64. None received.

Conclusion

65. The proposed Art, DT & Science building is not considered to constitute limited infilling as defined in the National Planning Policy Framework and would therefore represent inappropriate development in the Green Belt. No Very Special Circumstances have been demonstrated which clearly outweigh the harm to the Green Belt in this case. As such the proposal is considered to be contrary to the requirements of Policy DM17 of the Elmbridge Development Management Plan 2015 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.

66. The Proposed Art, DT & Science building is considered by virtue of its size, height, bulk and position directly adjoining the site boundary to appear out of character when viewed from the south, and whose impact would be exacerbated by the loss of trees on the site boundary. The proposal is therefore considered to be contrary to Policy DM2 and DM6 of the Elmbridge Development Management Plan 2015 and Policy CS17 of the Elmbridge Core Strategy 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Recommendation: Refuse Planning Permission
Reasons For Refusal

1 The proposed Art, DT & Science building is not considered to constitute limited infilling as defined in the National Planning Policy Framework and would therefore represent inappropriate development in the Green Belt. No Very Special Circumstances have been demonstrated which clearly outweigh the harm to the Green Belt in this case. As such the proposal is considered to be contrary to the requirements of Policy DM17 of the Elmbridge Development Management Plan 2015 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.

2 The Proposed Art, DT & Science building is considered by virtue of its size, height, bulk and position directly adjoining the site boundary to appear out of character when viewed from the south, and whose impact would be exacerbated by the loss of trees on the site boundary. The proposal is therefore considered to be contrary to Policy DM2 and DM6 of the Elmbridge Development Management Plan 2015 and Policy CS17 of the Elmbridge Core Strategy 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Informatives

1 COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY (REFUSAL)
   Notwithstanding the above reason(s) for refusal the applicant is advised that the Local Planning Authority has adopted the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) on any planning application determined after 01 April 2013. This is a non-negotiable land charge based on per sqm of development (internal gross floorspace). In the event of an appeal situation this planning application will likely be liable for CIL, further details of which can be found on the Council's website via the following link: http://www.elmbridge.gov.uk/planning/apps/cil.htm
Feltonfleet School

Site Location Plan

1. Head's House, Rifle range & Maintenance yard
2. Music Teaching Facility
3. DT / Art / Science Hub
4. Restoration of the existing wall

1. Drawing to be read in conjunction with Architect's specification
2. Drawing to be read in conjunction with Structural Engineer's drawings and specification
3. Drawing to be read in conjunction with MEP's drawings and specification
4. Landscape indicative only: drawings to be read in conjunction with Landscape Architect's drawings and specification
5. Dimensions to be confirmed on site to tie in with existing.
Feltonfleet School

Key:
1. Tennis fields
2. David Rutherford Centre
3. Rowan Block
4. Junior School
5. Leighton House
6. DT & Art hub (new)

2. David Rutherford Centre
A. Entrance
B. Classroom
C. Science preparation room
D. Science lab
E. Storage

5. Leighton House
F. Entrance
G. Store
H. Accessible toilet
I. Toilet
J. Staff Offices

6. DT & Art hub
N. Entrance
P. Store
Q. Classroom - Design Technology
R. Specialist room (bandsaw)
S. Upper Entrance
T. Toilets (including 1 no. accessible toilet)
U. Plant room
V. Condenser

Planning

Access to building

1. Drawing to be read in conjunction with Architect's specification
2. Drawing to be read in conjunction with Structural Engineer's drawings and specification
3. Drawing to be read in conjunction with MEP's drawings and specification
4. Landscape indicative only; drawings to be read in conjunction with Landscape Architect's drawings and specification
KEY

1. Tennis fields
2. David Rutherford Centre
3. Rowan Block
4. Junior School
5. Leighton House
6. DT & Art hub (new)

2. David Rutherford Centre
   A. Hall
   B. Science lab
   C. Science preparation room
   D. Office

5. Leighton House
   E. Staff accommodation - Kitchen
   F. Store
   G. Staff accommodation - Bedroom
   H. Toilet

6. DT & Art hub
   J. Hall
   K. Specialist Room - Kiln
   L. Store
   M. Classroom - Art
   N. Office (2 teachers)
   O. Plant room
   P. Laser machine + Vinyl Plotter

Feltonfleet School

Planning

1. Drawing to be read in conjunction with Architect's specification
2. Drawing to be read in conjunction with Structural Engineer's drawings and specification
3. Drawing to be read in conjunction with MEP's drawings and specification
4. Landscape indicative only: drawings to be read in conjunction with Landscape Architect's drawings and specification

Refer to Landscape DWG’s for Courtyard Design

PORTSMOUTH ROAD

Section DA1200

Section DA1201

1.200 @ A3

This drawing is copyright. Do not scale. Check dimensions on site.
1. New glazed entrance
2. Kitchen
3. Wash room
4. Kitchen door
5. New access path
6. New Steps
7. New Music Facility

This drawing is copyright. Do not scale. Check dimensions on site.
Feltonfleet School

MF - Proposed Lower Ground Floor Plan

KEY
1. Main House (Grade II Listed)
2. Music facility (new)
3. Swimming pool

3. Music Facility
A. Lobby
B. Lift
C. Accessible WC
D. WC
E. Storage space
F. Memorial Hall
G. Practice room
H. Group Practice room
I. Music Instrument Storage
J. Plant Room
K. Cleaner cupboard
L. Condenser units

BYFLEET ROAD

Section
MF1201

Section
MF1200

Rev
Date
Amendment
Rev
Date
Amendment

23.06.17
Issued for Planning

Planning

1. Drawing to be read in conjunction with Architect's specification
2. Drawing to be read in conjunction with Structural Engineer's drawings and specification
3. Drawing to be read in conjunction with M&E's drawings and specification
4. Landscape indicative only: drawings to be read in conjunction with Landscape Architect's drawings and specification
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BYFLEET ROAD

HEAD’S HOUSE
A. Entrance
B. Garage
C. WC
D. Cloack Cupboard
E. Storage / Laundry
F. Kitchen
G. Dining
H. Living
I. Office
J. Bathroom
K. Bins
L. Carpark
M. Plant Room
N. Family Bathroom
O. Bedroom
P. Master Bedroom
Q. En Suite
R. Bike shed

RIFLE RANGE
S. Targets
T. Shooting Lane
U. Passage
V. Gun Room
W. MAINTENANCE SHED

Hard paving
Permable paving
Grass
Cricket nets