**Application No:** 2013/5035  
**Application Type:** OL  
**Case Officer:** Edward Chetwynd-Stapylton  
**Ward:** Hersham North  
**Expiry Date:** 10/04/2014  
**Location:** Rydens Enterprise School and Sixth Form College (Including Playing Field Land)  
Hersham Road Hersham Walton-On-Thames Surrey KT12 5PY  
Outline planning application (means of access only to be determined at this time) for  
development comprising 296 residential units, replacement secondary school and  
sixth form college along with associated modified access, landscaping and parking  
following demolition of the existing school and sixth form college  
**Applicant:** Rydens Enterprise School and Sixth Form  
**Agent:**  
Mr Kris Mitra  
Genesis Town Planning  
26 Chapel Street  
Chichester  
West Sussex  
PO19 1DL  
**Decision Level:**  
If Permit – Planning Committee  
If Refuse – Planning Committee  
**Recommendation:** Refuse  

The North Area Planning Sub-Committee, having reviewed the relevant material  
considerations, concluded that the proposed development was unacceptable and voted to  
refuse the application for the following reason:  

The proposed access off Hersham Road to the development comprising 296 residential units,  
replacement secondary school and sixth form college along with associated modified access,  
landscaping and parking following demolition of the existing school and sixth form college by  
reason of its siting and design, would cause unacceptable harm to highway safety for  
pedestrian, cycle and vehicular traffic contrary to Policy CS25 within the Elmbridge Core  
Strategy and saved Policies MOV2, MOV4 and MOV6 of the Replacement Elmbridge Borough  
Local Plan 2000 and the National Planning Policy Framework.  

Following the vote Councillors John O'Reilly and Mrs Sheldon promoted the application for  
consideration by Planning Committee at the next meeting on 18 November 2014.  

**Below is the report to subcommittee:**  

**Representations:**  

As at some 88 letters have been received of which 68 are objections, 15 are letters of support and 5  
are comments on the application.  

The objections are concerned, inter alia, with the following issues:  

- Impact of development on local infrastructure  
- Traffic generation  
- Inadequate public transport arrangements / improvements  
- Inadequate traffic impact assessment and mitigation measures (NB this objection relates to  
the previously submitted TA and not the revised version submitted on 6 October 2014)  
- Flooding  
- Noise and light pollution from location of proposed sports facilities in close proximity to  
residential areas  
- Impact on existing local community facilities  
- Loss of playing fields / open space
Concerns as to whether local sewerage infrastructure has sufficient capacity
Loss of privacy due to overlooking
Community use of school sports facilities should not be allowed
Overdevelopment of the site out of character with the area
Unmitigated increase in pressure for school places
Size of proposed school is too large
Scale of proposed residential development is too large and too low density resulting in excessive loss of open space
The loss of a third of the area of Rydens School playing field is too large.
The proposed residential development covers too large an area and has too high density of build.
As planned, the proposed junction for the additional traffic joining Hersham Road is unacceptable.

*** This application qualifies for public speaking ***

Report

Description

1 The application site comprising the existing Rydens Enterprise School (RES) and associated playing fields covers approximately 16.4 ha of land of which 13 ha is open space. The site is located north and west of Hersham Road and is currently served by two vehicular accesses, one off Felcott Road and the main access of Hersham Road. The access off Felcott Road serves a 61 space car-park and the access of Hersham Road serves a car park for 60 cars. There is also a separate pedestrian access from Rydens Grove. The site is bounded to the west by residential development on Millers Close, Felcott Close and Felcott Road, to the north by the London to Portsmouth railway line, to the east by the Coronation Playing Fields and to the south by Bell Farm Junior School. As shown on the site plan submitted with the application, the proposed housing site extends to approximately 7.2ha of which 1.7 ha is designated open space, with the remainder of the site, 9.2ha, being for the proposed school and playing fields.

2 In terms of planning constraints the site is located in the Hersham Settlement Area (Core Strategy Policy CS5) and is within the Queensway Robinsway and Green Lane Environs Character Area (HER02) as defined in the Design and Character SPD. A proposed footpath route is shown to run adjacent to the northern boundary of the site parallel to the railway embankment. The existing playing fields are Open Space (formerly SOUL) and the north east corner is within Flood Zone 2.

History

3 Whilst there is an extensive planning history associated with the existing school there are no applications relevant to the determination of this application.

Proposal

4 This is an outline application with all matters reserved save for means of access for a scheme comprising 296 residential units, replacement secondary school and sixth form college along with associated modified access, indicative landscaping and parking following demolition of the existing school and sixth form college.

5 As set out within the documents submitted with the application and the indicative site plan the proposed development comprises two distinct but interrelated elements.

6 Access to both the proposed school and residential development would be off the Hersham Road north of Robinsway. A secondary access off Felcott Road is to be maintained to serve a small number of dwellings and to provide access for emergency vehicles.
New School

7 The proposed development comprises a nine form entry secondary school (PAN of 270) and sixth form college with up to 1688 students on roll (NOR) to replace the existing RES which is a 7 form entry (PAN of 210) with 1089 students on roll (NOR). Detailed designs will form the basis of a reserved matters application if this outline application is approved. However the concept work carried out by Scott Brownrigg and as set out in the design and access statement (Section 3.0 – Design Principles) indicates that the school would be contemporary in appearance and be predominantly two storey in height but with ‘articulated higher elements for the sixth form and four houses at three storeys’. The main entrance would be at the west end of the building and a hub of sport, dance and drama facilities would be located at the east end of the building including an indoor sports hall and associated changing facilities. Externally, the development proposes outdoor sports facilities in the form of MUGA and 3G football pitches with associated fencing and floodlighting as shown on the indicative site plan submitted with the application.

Proposed Housing

8 With regard to the proposed housing development, whilst all matters are reserved save for means of access, as set out in the Design and Access Statement submitted with the application, the preferred option (to be developed further at reserved matters stage or subsequent full application) is for an equal mix of apartments and family houses. The indicative layout as shown on the site plan extract above shows a public square at the centre of the development and a landscaped boulevard connecting the square to Hersham Road. Both the square and the boulevard provide opportunities for the safe drop off and collection of children to and from the school, by both bus and car.

9 The square would be a shared surface space defined spatially by apartment villas and townhouses on three sides and the frontage of RES on the eastern side. The square would include islands of soft landscape at the centre and be connected via a wide pedestrian route to the extended Felcott Road to the north-west. The site frontage to Hersham Road to the south would also be clearly defined with apartment, villa and townhouse front facades that would address the existing landscaped open space and provide a gateway to the boulevard. The north side of the site along the railway line would be lined with larger apartment buildings addressing a smaller courtyard square that terminates the extended Felcott Road. Pockets of public realm landscape would also be are distributed throughout providing safe welcoming places for people to meet and for children to play.

10 The confirmed mix of housing proposed is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Private</th>
<th>Affordable</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-bed flat</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-bed flat</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-bed house</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-bed house</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-bed house</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>168</strong></td>
<td><strong>128 (43.2% of the total)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consultations

11 Environment Agency: No objection subject to conditions.

12 Guildford Borough Council: No comments.

13 Head of Asset Management: Application site includes land owned by EBC and as such the development could only be implemented once the necessary approvals had been granted.

14 Head of Environmental Care: No objection.
15 Head of Environmental Health & Licensing: No objection, subject to a Railway Noise Impact Assessment being required with any reserved matters application.

16 Head of Housing: No objection, subject to a Section 106 agreement which secures the quantum of affordable housing and also complies with other elements of policy CS21 and the associated guidance set out within the Developers Contributions SPD.

17 Head of Leisure & Cultural Services: The proposals could help meet the shortfall in playing pitch provision, however a community use agreement would need to be sought to make clear what extent these pitches would be available. A concern is the need to ensure that the development would not have a detrimental effect on the Coronation Playing Fields land drainage.

18 Natural England: Letter dated 28 May: As the applicant will be making contributions towards SANGS via CIL and SAMM via a S106 agreement – no objection is raised.

19 Network Rail: No objection in principle, subject to ensuring that the development does not:
   - encroach onto Network Rail land
   - affect the safety, operation or integrity of the company’s railway and its infrastructure
   - undermine its support zone
   - damage the company’s infrastructure
   - place additional load on cuttings
   - adversely affect any railway land or structure
   - over-sail or encroach upon the air-space of any Network Rail land
   - cause to obstruct or interfere with any works or proposed works or Network Rail development both now and in the future

20 Planning – Trees: Concerns regarding:
   - Protection of T65 Beech within the proposed small domestic garden.
   - Line of trees running along south eastern boundary where they are at the end of the proposed rear gardens. Particularly as they are located adjacent to the drainage ditch and significant levels changes may be required within RPAs to meet flood prevention requirements.
   - The construction methods of the access road and car parking spaces on the eastern corner of the site next to the line of poplars not shown on the tree work plans.
   - Loss of trees around the access. It is not clear from the plans what is likely to be removed and what construction methods will be used within RPAs.
   - Construction near the larger oak trees on the railway embankment.
   - Construction of artificial pitches with RPAs.
   - Tree information submitted is a preliminary Tree Survey and does not consider the implications of the proposal.

21 Planning – Landscape: No objection. This is a well bounded, functional school site which is only of local landscape significance and the development proposals will not have an adverse effect on this. Landscape proposals include strengthening existing hedgerow boundaries, tree and shrub planting and a management regime to improve biodiversity. I would suggest the use of reserve conditions for the submission of a landscape scheme, its implementation and management should the DM officer recommendation be to permit this application.

22 Planning – Conservation: No adverse impact on locally listed building.

23 Surrey County Council Conservation & Archaeology: Memo dated 29 May: no objection subject to a condition requiring the applicant to secure a programme of archaeological work in accordance with a Written Scheme of Investigation.

24 Surrey County Council Ecology: No views received
25 Surrey County Council Education: No objection, subject to a financial contribution of £310,718.00 towards the £3.25 million that another form of entry at the new Rydens is going to cost Surrey County Council.

26 Surrey County Council – Spatial Planning: Without more detailed information on size and mix of dwellings we cannot be certain of the number of school places to be generated and the potential pressure on school places that is likely to result in the proposed development. As a rule of thumb, 200 to 300 houses would generate between 35 and 53 primary age children: Bell Farm Primary and other schools in the area can accommodate 35 pupils but not 53. The development would also generate between 18 and 27 secondary age pupils. If Rydens builds a 9 form entry school (270 pupils per year) there would be sufficient secondary places.

27 Surrey County Council Transport Development Planning: Following a site inspection, the Highway Authority has assessed the impact of the proposal on highway safety and capacity and raised no objections subject to conditions and an appropriate legal agreement to secure the following:

1. £375,000 towards the operating costs of bus services serving the site (either the dedicated School bus and/or public services).
2. £6,150 towards the cost of auditing the Travel Plan for both the residential development and school expansion.

The above sums shall be index linked.

The development is considered to be in accordance with Elmbridge Core Strategy Policy CS28, Policies MOV4 and MOV6 of the Replacement Elmbridge Borough Local Plan 2000 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

28 Sport England: Object (discussed within the body of this report).

29 Surrey Bat Group: No views received.

30 Surrey Playing Fields Association: No views received.

31 Surrey Police: No objection subject to conditions requiring the development to achieve Secure By Design in full (Parts 1 and 2) as set out in the Secured By Design Schools Guidance (2010) and the New Homes Guide.

32 Surrey Wildlife Trust: Unlikely to have a significant adverse effect on legally protected species and biodiversity of the locality. A full bat survey will be required however at reserved matters stage.

33 Thames Water: No objection subject to a ‘Grampian’ style planning condition requiring a waste water drainage strategy to be submitted to and approved by the Borough Council following consultation with the sewerage undertaker and for there to be no discharge of foul or surface water from the site into the public system until the drainage works referred to in the strategy have been completed.

34 Woking Borough Council: No comments.

35 Spelthorne Borough Council: No objection.

36 Royal Borough of Kingston upon Thames: No objection.

37 Runnymede Borough Council: No objection.

38 London Borough of Richmond upon Thames: No objection.

39 Mole Valley District Council: No objection.
Positive and Proactive Engagement

40 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. Officers have:

Provided or made available pre-application advice to seek to resolve problems before the application was submitted and to foster the delivery of sustainable development.

Provided feedback through the validation process including information on the website, to correct identified problems to ensure that the application was correct and could be registered.

Suggested/accepted/negotiated amendments or advised the applicant of identified problems with the proposal to seek to foster sustainable development.

Proactively communicated with the applicant through the process to advise progress, timescales or recommendation.

Planning Considerations

41 This application is in outline form with all matters reserved apart from means of access. As such whilst it is necessary to consider the issues raised regarding the principle of the development (re-provision of an enlarged secondary school and 296 houses) and the detail of the proposed access including accessibility for all routes to and within the site as well as the way they link up to other roads and pathways outside the site it is also necessary to indicate the issues that the developer will need to address in any future reserved matters application in respect of:

- appearance - aspects of a building or place which affect the way it looks, including the exterior of the development
- landscaping - the improvement or protection of the amenities of the site and the area and the surrounding area, this could include planting trees or hedges as a screen
- layout - includes buildings, routes and open spaces within the development and the way they are laid out in relations to buildings and spaces outside the development
- scale - includes information on the size of the development, including the height, width and length of each proposed building

42 As such and in accordance with section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 this application falls to be determined in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The Development Plan for this area consists of the Replacement Elmbridge Borough Local Plan 2000, as amended by the Elmbridge Core Strategy. The relevant Core Strategy policies are therefore considered to include CS2 – Housing Provision, Location and Distribution, CS5 – Hersham, CS16 – Social and Community Infrastructure, CS17 - Local Character, Density and Design, CS19 – Housing Type and Size, CS21 – Affordable Housing, CS25 – Travel and Accessibility, CS26 – Flooding and CS27 – Sustainable Buildings. The relevant REBLP saved Policies are considered to be HSG16 (Design and Layout of Residential Development), HSG19 (Garaging and Car-Parking), ENV2 (Standard of Design), ENV3 (Safe & Secure Environments), ENV11 (Landscape Considerations in the Development Process), ENV12 (Retention of Trees on Development Sites), COM4 – Provision of Education Facilities, MOV2 (The Movement Implications of Development), MOV4 (Traffic Impact of Development Proposals) and MOV6 (Off-Street Parking). In addition, regard also needs to be had to the National Planning Policy Framework, particularly paragraphs 6, 11, 14, 17, 38, 72 and 74 and supporting guidance and to the Council’s Design and Character and Developer Contributions SPDs both adopted in April 2012.

43 Having regard to the scope of the application and the relevant policy base as set out above the main planning issues relevant to the determination of this application are considered to be:

- The principle of providing a new secondary school and sixth form college
- The principle of redeveloping the existing school site for housing
The principle of developing open space for housing
Detailed consideration of the access issues raised by the proposal
Issues of loss of amenity arising from the development

The Principle of Providing a New Secondary School and Sixth Form College

The Rydens Enterprise School (RES) site is identified as a Potential Development Site within the Options Consultation Draft Settlement Investment and Development Plan – Hersham and within the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment. As such the principle of providing a new enlarged secondary school and sixth form college is broadly supported. There is clear policy support for the expansion of Rydens and as set out within the applicant’s supporting statement it is clear that the current school buildings are outdated and no longer fit for purpose. For example some of the issues facing the school include:

- Teaching taking place in eleven separate buildings, students moving between classes are exposed to the weather to a far greater extent than should be necessary, despite extensive use of covered walkways.
- Temporary buildings and poorly heated and insulated structures make teaching in winter periods particularly difficult;
- The sports hall is substantially below regulation height, which renders it unsuitable for many indoor ball games;
- The gymnasium has been permanently divided into two spaces to create a dance studio in one half, leaving the school with a less than half size gym for PE;
- The music department has been created out of redundant spaces by the use of partition walls with minimal sound insulation;
- Lack of space in the foreign languages department means that a science laboratory in a separate building has had to be converted into a languages classroom;
- Very large glazed areas and skylights in many classrooms make the use of data projectors and interactive whiteboards difficult and sometimes impossible.

The policy support for an enlarged RES is set out in Core Strategy Policy CS16 which states that the Council will work in partnership with SCC and individual schools to meet the need outlined in the Surrey Education Organisation Plan. The latest iteration of this document published in 2012 identifies that whilst there is sufficient capacity in Year 7 in Elmbridge, pupil numbers are forecast to rise steadily leading to a likely need for an additional form of entry by 2015 and if the numbers continue to increase as projected, a further 5 forms of entry will be required to accommodate extra pupils by 2021. On this basis, Surrey County Council Officers recommended that Esher High School be expanded with permanent accommodation by two forms of entry by 2015 and that other schools, including RES, are considered for enlargement to meet demand from 2016 and beyond. The report also stated that projections will need to be carefully monitored to identify any change in the transfer rate from primary schools due, for example, to the impact of the recession, which may lead to a further demand for places.

As set out in the Borough Council’s Education Provision Assessment (2011), RES was then a 7 form entry secondary school with 1050 pupils on roll. The report identified that there is scope to expand RES subject to consideration of the impact of any development on the (then designated) Strategic Urban Open Land (now Open Space as defined in the NPPF).

Within the Settlement Investment & Development Plan Options Consultation document published in April 2013, it was further confirmed that there is a need for 5 forms of entry at secondary level across the Borough. The Education Provision Assessment identified the school as having significant capacity for expansion to accommodate an increase in pupil numbers and that the location of the school to the east of the existing site would offer the opportunity to create a sole access from Hersham Road, thus resolving current access issues from Felcott Road. It would also avoid locating the school in the part of the site to the northeast within Flood Zone 2.

Although the playing fields are open space, defined as ‘all open space of public value, including not just land, but also areas of water (such as rivers, canals, lakes and reservoirs) which offer important opportunities for sport and recreation and can act as a visual amenity’ within the glossary to the NPPF, the NPPF states that great weight should be given to the
need to create, expand or alter schools (NPPF, paragraph 72). The playing fields are much larger than is required for a 9 or 10 form of entry secondary school even when taking into account their status as a shared resource with the adjoining schools. Given the constraints on expanding other existing secondary school sites across the Borough and the need for additional secondary provision, it is considered such a proposal can be supported provided that the loss of open space is kept to a minimum and will deliver improvements to the remaining open space as well as increasing access to school facilities and open space for the whole community.

RES (RES) is an Academy, i.e. a publicly funded independent school not managed by a local authority since 1 August 2011 and as set out in the Academy Funding Agreement, the planned capacity of the school is 1250 including a sixth form of 200 pupils. Given the school's status there is no statutory obligation on Surrey County Council to be involved with the scheme. However Surrey CC have agreed with RES to fund an additional form of entry in response to forecast demand for secondary places across Elmbridge. RES was transferred to the Rydens Academy Trust as a secondary school with sufficient capacity to accommodate 8 forms of entry and are bound by a legal agreement to fund the replacement of the existing school to a level that will provide a 'like for like' 8FE secondary school. As such Surrey County Council has agreed to contribute £2,476,950 towards the extra 1 FE expansion, bringing it up to a 9 FE school. This is to meet the future forecast demand generated by the proposed new housing development.

However, as only part of the currently proposed housing development (148 units ~50%) was factored into the County Council’s pupil forecast data the County Council are seeking an additional contribution of £310,482 towards secondary provision to be secured via a S106 planning agreement. This contribution has been calculated based on the additional housing numbers now proposed as 148 units were already factored into SCC’s forecast methodology. SCC are also seeking a further contribution of £662,974.00 towards early years and primary school places to be secured via a S106. However they have been advised that as there is no early years or primary provision within the scheme this will have to be sought through the CIL panel process as this request does not meet the tests set out in paragraph 204 of the NPPF namely:
- necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms
- directly related to the development; and
- fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development

With regard to the design including the scale, mass and bulk of the proposed school, given the character of the school buildings to be demolished, a part two / part three storey building is considered to be acceptable.

Principle of the Housing Development

The RES Enterprise School site was been identified within the council’s Strategic Housing and Employment Land Availability Assessment (2013) as an opportunity site for 148 units deliverable within 1 to 5 years. Since then the site has been included within the Council’s forthcoming Land Availability Assessment as a potential housing site for 296 units. The site was also identified as an opportunity site within the Settlement Investment & Development Plan – Options Consultation. The site analysis identified six development options with the preferred option being to allocate land to the east of the existing school for the provision of a 10 form entry secondary school with the old school site being developed for housing.

The Core Strategy, Policy CS1, requires that new development be directed towards previously developed land within existing built up area. Whilst Walton, inter alia, has been identified as (one of) the most sustainable locations within Elmbridge, Hersham is identified as a suburban settlement area and whilst not as sustainable as Walton or Weybridge nevertheless has the capacity to accommodate new development in a sustainable manner. Policy CS2 indicates that 225 net dwellings per year will be planned for across the borough between 2011 and 2026 albeit that this is based on evidence within the SHLAA 2010 and is not a target. The SHELAA 2013 summarises the housing situation as follows:
Housing Delivery (April 2011 – March 2013):
1. Over the last 2 years (2011-2013), a total of 556 units have been completed, (278 pa average) Housing Delivery (April 2012 - 2013)
2. 256 units were delivered in 2012 – 2013

Estimated Housing Delivery (April 2013 - 2014)
3. 316 units are currently under construction. It is considered this is a reasonable estimate for housing completions by March 2014.

Housing Requirement (April 2013-March 2026)
4. 2819 units (217 pa average) need to be delivered if minimum housing requirements set out within the Core Strategy are to be achieved. Taking account of anticipated completions in 2013/14 (316 units), the annual target would be further adjusted to 209 units per annum, with a 2,503 adjusted residual target.

5 year housing land supply (April 2014-2019)
5. Based on the adjusted housing requirement set out above, 1043 units would need to be delivered to satisfy the Borough’s 5 year housing land supply. The 586 units with planning permissions yet to be implemented, added to potential opportunity sites that could be delivered in the next 5 years result in a total of 1454 units and this equates to 7 years supply or an additional allowance of 40%. These figures do not take account of unidentified windfall that is likely to occur. In the National Planning Policy Framework, Local Planning Authorities are required to show that they have a 5 years supply plus an additional 5% capacity and current figures indicate that the Borough would exceed this total requirement by 35%.

10 year housing land supply (April 2014 – March 2023)
6. 2086 units would be needed to satisfy the Borough’s 10 year housing requirements set out within the Core Strategy. Combing the number unimplemented planning permissions and identified opportunity sites, there is housing potential for the delivery of 2056 units on identified sites. It is estimated that an additional 123 units per annum will come from unidentified windfall in 2019-2026. The equivalent of five years windfall supply, added to the identified sites total takes total capacity within the 10 year period to 2673 units. This represents 12.8 years supply.

11-15 year housing land supply
7. Due to a variety of reasons, some sites are unlikely to come forward within the first 10 years of the plan period. A total of 237 units are estimated currently to have potential to come forward between 2024-2029, not taking account of small site windfall.

Based on current information, and taking account of the local market knowledge provided by the Development Market Panel, the 2013 evidence base shows that:

- There is land within the urban areas to satisfy the housing requirements set out by the Core Strategy (3,375 units)
- The Borough has a 7 year housing land supply of identified sites with no reliance on small site windfalls. This supply exceeds the additional allowance of 5%, referred to in the NPPF, to ensure choice and competition in the market.
- The Borough has a 12.8 year housing land supply of identified sites, with no reliance on windfall.
- The nature of housing development in the Borough is such that small sites play a significant role in total supply. It is anticipated that approximately 1,152 units could come forward from small sites over the next 15 years.
- There is no necessity to implement contingency measures, as set out in Policy CS29 and paragraphs 8.11 to 8.17 of the Core Strategy.

The proposed development of 296 units on a 7.2 ha site would result in a gross density of approximately 41 dwellings per hectare (dph). This broadly accords with the Core Strategy’s overall housing density target and town centre density target of 40 dph and is not considered to be an overdevelopment of the site.
With respect to the proposed mix, Core Strategy Policy CS19 seeks to ensure that there is a range of housing types and sizes on development across the Borough in order to create inclusive and sustainable communities. In this regard the Core Strategy identifies that there is a need for 90% of all new housing development to deliver 1, 2 and 3 bedroom dwellings in equal proportions in the private market housing sector. In this case the proposed development of 168 market homes would deliver 27% 1-bed flats, 50% 2-bed flats and houses, 3% 3-bed houses and 20% 4-bed houses as set out in the table at paragraph 10 above.

Regarding affordable housing provision should be in accordance with the most up to date SHMA or SPD. The SHMA 2008 identifies a particular need to increase the supply of family sized homes (3 & 4 bed) for rent. As set out in the Developer Contributions SPD, paragraph 3.23, the SHMA sets an overall target that at least 35% of all new affordable, general needs housing for rent should predominantly be provided in the form of three or four bedroom houses. However, provision of three-bedroom flats or maisonettes on the ground-floor of flatted developments will be considered, subject to appropriate design and the provision of suitable private outdoor space. The remaining 65% of rented units is to be provided as one or two-bedroom homes, predominantly flats, although alternative dwelling types, such as houses, may make up this element. New provision of intermediate affordable housing should reflect the identified needs, which are concentrated amongst households requiring either one or two bedrooms, although in very limited circumstances, there may be a need for intermediate housing for households needing three or more bedrooms.

With regard to the proposed development, the application proposes to provide 128 of the 296 dwellings as affordable housing, equivalent to 43% of the overall provision. This proportion represents a blend based on a part 40% target applying to the brownfield element of the site (on which one part of the housing is to be sited) and part 50% on the greenfield part of the site (where the other element of housing is to be located). The land has not been considered to be in public ownership, given the legal status of the school, so a target of 50% across the board was not considered applicable.

The applicant’s agents, by way of a letter dated 28 July, provided clarification on the unit mix of the market and affordable housing, showing the breakdown of dwelling types and sizes (by number of bedrooms). Whilst not providing a detailed breakdown of the homes to be provided as affordable rent as opposed to shared-ownership, this mix indicates that the affordable housing in the outline scheme would meet a range of needs and income types. This mix includes provision for much-need affordable housing for families requiring three or four bedrooms, thereby meeting a key objective of policy CS21.

As such the application has the support of the Council’s Head of Housing Services, conditional on reaching agreement on a Section 106 agreement with the applicant which not only secures the quantum of affordable housing as set out above, but also complies with other elements of policy CS21 and the associated guidance set out within the Developers Contributions SPD. The Section 106 would need to address the following:

- % of affordable housing
- the proportion of affordable rented accommodation relative to shared-ownership
- the size-mix by tenure (by number of bedrooms)
- the size of the affordable homes (compared to the minimum floor areas required within the aforementioned SPD)
- the affordability of the affordable housing tenures
- the standards to which the affordable housing is built
- the timing of its completion relative to the market provision
- the mechanisms for its transfer to a Registered Provider

In terms of the design and layout of the proposed housing, whilst this application is in outline form with matters of appearance, landscaping, layout and scale for consideration at a later date, nevertheless the applicant (and / or subsequent house builder) will need to work up a sustainable design in accordance with Core Strategy Policy CS27 with Level 4 of the Code for Sustainable Homes being a minimum requirement and also to have had regard to Council Policy in respect of local character and design (Core Strategy Policy CS17) and the council’s design and layout policies as saved with the Replacement Elmbridge Borough Local Plan.
62 In particular noting the indicative layout proposed with the design and access statement submitted with the application, it will be important to ensure that there will be no loss of privacy due to overlooking of properties on Felcott Road and Felcott Close and Millers Close. Having regard to the character of the surrounding area, a residential development of predominantly two stories with rooms in the roof for the proposed houses and up to three stories of flats would be expected.

Loss of Open Space

63 The application site comprises approximately 16 ha of land. The existing school footprint occupies 3.4 ha with the remaining 12.6 ha comprising playing fields. Based on figures supplied by the applicant, 2.8 ha of land would be required for the new school and that there would be a total loss of around 4.3 ha of open space and that the redevelopment of the school site would see a loss of around 33% of the school’s existing playing fields.

64 Based on the plans submitted with the application and the council’s own GIS data, a total of 5.3 ha (some 31%) of the 16.8 ha site is open space designated as Open Space. Of this 1.7 ha (10%) would be required for the housing development and a further 3.7 ha (21%) for the proposed school.

65 As set out in paragraph 74 of the NPPF and which supersedes saved Policy ENV28, existing open space, sports and recreational buildings and land, including playing fields, should not be built on unless:
   - an assessment has been undertaken which has clearly shown the open space, buildings or land to be surplus to requirements; or
   - 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
   - the development is for alternative sports and recreational provision, the needs for which clearly outweigh the loss.

66 However regard also has to be had to Paragraph 72 within the NPPF which states that due to the weight that Government attaches to ensuring that a sufficient choice of school places is available 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 as such should, inter alia, give great weight to the need to create, expand or alter schools.

67 As set out in the planning supporting statement, the applicants consider that the proposed new school will make available significant new facilities to the community including 3G pitches and that the provision of these facilities will be a boost to enhancing the current under-supply of playing and sports pitches. A deficiency in specific sports and playing pitches at the site has been identified in the supporting open space assessment carried out by JPC Strategic Planning and Leisure who state that as RES has restricted access and does not provide any informal recreation amenity to the public the area should not be classified as open space in any formal assessment of open space.

68 Officers consider that the provision of a new school at RES will go a significant way to address that shortfall and that the provision of new pitches, indoor facilities and general access to the community aspects that the school can offer are of significant benefit and can be the subject a tailored community use agreement which can be secured by way of a S106 Agreement.

69 Notwithstanding this, Sport England are maintaining an objection to the development. Sport England objected to the application on 6 February 2014, highlighting that exception E5 of its policy does not allow for selling off part of the playing field to fund investment in other sports facilities on the site (enabling development). Similarly, the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) does not support enabling development in this context. For ease of reference, Policy Exception E5 states:

(Policies ENV2 and HSG16), guidance with the adopted Design and Character SPD and as proposed within the emerging Development Management Plan.
The proposed development is for an indoor or outdoor sports facility, provision of which would be of sufficient benefit to the development of sport as to outweigh the detriment caused by the loss, or prejudice to the use, of the playing field.

Additional information, including a draft Community Use Agreement, was subsequently submitted, but Sport England maintained its objection in a letter dated 29 May 2014 and further information about the proposed sports facilities was provided by the applicant in an e-mail on 23 July 2014.

Sport England recognises that increased community access to sports facilities is an important consideration in assessing the benefit of a proposal to the development of sport. However, in this case, the proposed development is not simply just an indoor or outdoor sports facility in the context of exception E5. The proposed development also includes 296 dwellings, a replacement secondary school and sixth form college. Therefore, the test of whether there is sufficient benefit to sport, to outweigh the loss of the playing field, does not strictly come into consideration.

Despite the above, it was agreed that sport National Governing Bodies (NGBs) should have the opportunity to comment on the proposal, to determine whether or not exceptional circumstances arise in this instance that might justify an alternative approach.

Sport England consulted the main pitch sport NGBs and UK Athletics (as a plan was received showing how an athletics track could be accommodated on the site, albeit at the expense of one the two proposed artificial grass pitches).

In response to that consultation, a question was raised from UK Athletics as to how the proposal would fit with plans for a facility at Stompond Lane and only the Football Association (FA) commented. Contrary to the applicant’s statement, that there are no existing clubs or teams that use the site, the FA understand that ‘Walton Casuals Youth (CS Community Club)’ currently use the site for weekend (Sunday) fixtures. The FA would welcome additional community use for mid-week training and weekend matches. It stated that there is a need for additional pitches in the borough for league matches, which could be played on 3G artificial grass pitches if they are built to meet the FA’s technical standards and placed on the FA register. Additionally, Sport England also received a letter from England Netball in support of the proposed development.

Notwithstanding the comments made by the FA and England netball in respect of the proposed sports facilities, Sport England is not satisfied that the circumstances in this case justify a departure from paragraph 74 of the NPPF or Sport England’s playing fields policy. Therefore, the objection raised in its letters dated 6 February 2014 and 29 May 2014 continues to stand.

Officers views on this however is that whilst Sport England’s objection is clearly noted and due weight attached to it given their role as a statutory consultee it is considered that there are sufficient planning benefits associated with this scheme to allow an exception to Sport England’s policy in this case. Specifically the scheme is considered to deliver against Core Strategy Objectives 2, 3, 4, 6, 9, 11, 12 and 18 as set out on pages 15 and 16 of the Core Strategy and is also considered to accord with the Core Strategy’s stated aim of protecting the Green Belt, accommodating new development within the urban area, providing policy compliant market and affordable housing and providing additional capacity at a key secondary school in the Borough as well as providing enhanced sports facilities that will offer community use. Officers also consider that the scheme complies the second bullet point of Paragraph 74 of the NPPF namely that the loss of open space / playing field resulting from the proposed development is to be replaced by equivalent or better provision in terms of quantity and quality in a suitable location in the form of improved playing and sports pitches, the provision of all-weather surfaces and enhanced community access to both the outdoor and indoor facilities.

With regard to access, the Transport Assessment Revision B (September 2014) submitted on 6 October 2014 has assessed existing conditions and the proposed development in terms of
trip generation and impact on the highway network. Promoting smarter choices via travel plans in order to mitigate the impact of the development on the existing network have also been considered.

78 The policy framework for assessing the transportation impacts of the development is contained within the NPPF (paragraphs 29, 30 and 32), the Core Strategy (Policy CS25) and saved Policies MOV2, MOV4 and MOV6 within the Replacement Elmbridge Borough Local Plan 2000. Regard also needs to be had to guidance contained in the Borough Council’s Parking standards (2004) and Surrey County Council’s Vehicular and Cycle Parking Guidance 2012. This states that for housing in suburban locations, parking spaces should be provided as follows:

- 1 & 2 bed flats – 1 space per unit
- 1 & 2 bed houses – 1+ space per unit
- 3 bed houses – 2+ spaces per unit
- 4+ bed houses – 2+ spaces per unit

79 For schools the advice is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Guidance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School Parking</td>
<td>New Schools, or those where expansion is proposed, are expected to develop, update and monitor School Travel Plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cars</td>
<td>Operational requirements (broadly defined as staff and visitors) should be provided for only, together with overflow parking areas for community uses. Parent parking, pupil parking and drop off/pick up areas should not be provided as this is a disincentive to travelling by sustainable modes. Existing sites may be an exception if further on-street parking reduces highway safety or emergency access. Measures to discourage parking should be considered first and could include car sharing, staggered school days, parking restrictions, parking permits issued on the basis of need and other measures as appropriate. A parking management plan should be prepared and submitted as an integral part of any planning application where parking is an acknowledged problem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coach/Bus</td>
<td>On all new school sites where it is likely that pupils will travel to and from school in coaches, sufficient space should be reserved to allow coaches to enter the site, drop off and pick up pupils. Where appropriate, bus stops, bays, raised kerbs, seating and shelters shall be provided on the highway by the applicant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycles and non-motorised Scooters</td>
<td>Provision of cycle and non-motorised scooter* parking will be a condition of any new or expanded school. Whenever possible, improvements to cycle routes and other appropriate safety measures should be provided by the applicant.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*for Pre-school and Primary School education

80 All of the above has been agreed with the applicant agreeing that £381,150 can be secured through a S106 Agreement. The remaining highway works to enable access to the site should be carried out directly by the applicant and hence the suggested conditions worded above. In line with the CIL Regulations, the applicant would not be expected to fund the above in addition to the full CIL payment as this would be ‘double counting’ and would therefore recommend that a reduction in the CIL payment be made to take account of this.

81 The proposed access to the site has been safety audited and subsequently modified to take account of the issues raised as shown on drawing no 120713-02 Rev D. The detailed design of the access will be subject to a further safety audit and may alter slightly from that shown on drawing no. 120713-02 Rev D.
The Transport Assessment shows that 153 additional journeys will be made each day on the existing school bus (881) creating a significant capacity issue for the existing bus service. It is expected that an additional 2 buses would be necessary to accommodate the additional demand. The applicant has agreed to pay a £375,000 financial contribution towards the operating cost of this additional service. This should provide funding for the additional service for a 5 year period but does not guarantee the longevity of the additional service.

All of the junctions that have been modelled and assessed within the T A are shown to continue to operate with spare capacity once the development traffic has been added. The exceptions to this are the following 2 junctions; Queensway/Molesey Road Roundabout (Barley Mow) and Hersham Road/Rydens Road/Station Avenue signalised junction (Halfway Green).

The Barley Mow roundabout is already operating at full capacity during peak times. The proposed development will add some additional traffic to this junction but it would not be a significant increase, the impact is marginal and therefore it was not considered reasonable to request that the applicant provide direct mitigation to address this. The greatest impact during the AM peak is an additional queue length of 5 extra vehicles on the Molesey Road North entry. During the PM peak the greatest impact is on Esher Road entry amounting to an additional queue length of 2 extra vehicles. The Halfway Green junction is currently operating at or above full capacity and the proposed development will result in some additional traffic using the junction. Due to land restraints, it has not been possible to identify a scheme to increase the capacity at this junction. However, the applicant has agreed to fund the cost of re-validating the signals that will ensure they are operating at their optimum, therefore maximising the operational capacity.

In addition to this the applicant has agreed to fund the re-validation of the Robinsway/Queensway signals to maximise the operational capacity. This additional mitigation will go some way to offset the impact at the Halfway Green. The Travel Plan will also be used to try and encourage further modal shift away from the private car towards more sustainable modes of travel that will further reduce the impact on the highway network.

Other Matters

Due to this application being in outline form in order to establish the principal of the proposed development and with only means of access for determination at this stage, other inter-related issues raised regarding trees, landscaping, protected species, light pollution, accessibility for bin collection and storage will fall to be considered in the detail at the reserved matters stage subject to the following considerations.

With regard to the landscape context, the site is within the Thames Basin Lowlands area identified as part of Surrey County Council’s landscape character assessment study published in 1997. The Elmbridge Design and Character SPD identifies this as sub area HER02 Queensway, Robinsway and Green Lane environs and notes the tight urban grain of the residential area and extensive tree lined playing fields of Rydens and Bell Farm schools. Much of the site is open space but is not within Green Belt or an area of Nature Conservation Importance. As such the site can be described as being of local rather than regional or national significance.

The mainly triangular site is bounded by the elevated railway embankment to the northwest, Coronation Playing Fields to the southeast and residential and school buildings along Hersham Road to the southwest and is generally flat with some mature tree within and on the boundaries to the site. The school landscape is mainly hard surfaced or mown sport pitches and although this will be reduced its character is unlikely to change significantly with the new proposals. The proposed school has been located to face the main access road and maximise open space to the rear and there are a variety of different residential layouts that could be achieved within the parameters set by this application. In terms of impact on landscape, due to the site being of only of local landscape significance the development proposals are not considered to have an adverse effect on this. Whilst landscape proposals include strengthening existing hedgerow boundaries, tree and shrub planting and a management
regime to improve biodiversity, these can be secured through the imposition of suitably worded conditions at the reserved matters stage.

89 With regard to trees, the tree officer has a few concerns, specifically:
- the protection of tree T65 (Beech)
- the line of trees running along south eastern boundary where they are at the end of the proposed rear gardens and are located adjacent to the drainage ditch and significant levels changes may be required within RPAs to meet flood prevention requirements.
- the construction methods of the access road and car parking spaces on the eastern corner of the site next to the line of poplars not shown on the tree work plans.
- The loss of trees around the proposed access
- The construction methods that will be used within RPAs.
- Construction near the larger oak trees on the railway embankment.
- Construction of artificial pitches with RPAs.

90 It is considered that these issues can be addressed through the submission of details at the reserved matters stage and through the imposition of suitably worded conditions.

91 With regard to biodiversity, Surrey Wildlife Trust have commented that the Phase One Ecological Assessment Extended to Include a Search of Buildings for Bats and Nesting Birds, which the applicant has provided in support of the above planning application, provides much useful information for the Local Authority to be able to assess the potential status of protected and important species on the proposed development site and the likely effect of the development on them.

92 The Surrey Wildlife Trust have therefore advised that this proposal is unlikely to have a significant adverse effect to the legally protected species and the biodiversity value of the locality, provided no trees which contain bat roost potential area affected and any dense vegetation removal is undertaken outside the main bird nesting season (March to August inclusive).

93 They would further advise if the Council is minded to grant planning permission that the applicant be required to undertake all the recommended actions in section 6 of the Ecology Report, including the biodiversity enhancements detailed in sub-section 6.4. This will help prevent adverse effect to legally protected species resulting from the proposed development works and help to off-set adverse effects to the biodiversity value of the site resulting from the proposed development.

94 With regard to bats, SWT have advised that a bat activity survey is undertaken on the site prior to the main development proposal being determined, as this will help establish any bat roosting status in buildings and trees on site and the existence and location of any bat commuting and foraging areas. This information is likely to be required to allow the Local Authority to fully assess the possible impact of the development on bat species from for example, demolition works and any proposed new external lighting, particularly floodlighting and to consider any required mitigation/compensation proposals required to help prevent adverse effect to these species. All species of British bats are protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act and under Regulation 40 of The Conservation of Species and Habitats Regulations 2010. Together this legislation makes it an offence to kill, capture or disturb the animal, or to damage or destroy a breeding site or resting place of such an animal.

95 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (paragraph 109), requires the planning system to aim to conserve and enhance the natural and local environment by minimising impacts on biodiversity. Paragraph 118 of the NPPF also states that opportunities to incorporate biodiversity in and around developments should be encouraged.

96 The Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act (2006)(Section 40) states, "Every public authority must, in exercising its functions, have regard, so far as is consistent with the proper exercise of those functions, to the purpose of conserving biodiversity". Section 40(3) also states that, "conserving biodiversity includes, in relation to a living organism, or type of habitat, restoring or enhancing a population or habitat".
The SWT therefore advise that the Council when considering the biodiversity value of this site, should the new school and housing development application proceed, should require the applicant to undertake the Mitigation described in section 6 and Figure 7 of the applicant's Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment Report dated December 2013, as this will help to add biodiversity value to the site. They also advise that the Council may wish to approve a Landscape and Ecological Management Plan for the site which will detail landscaping and planting proposals, biodiversity enhancement features, a conservation management scheme for the site and a monitoring scheme for habitat and species. Development of wildlife habitat could provide an important educational facility for the new school.

With regard to flooding and flood risk, the majority of the site is within Flood Zone 1 with only a small percentage in the far north east corner being within Flood Zone 2. As such the Environment Agency consider that outline planning permission could be granted to the proposed development subject to conditions requiring the Implementation of the Flood Risk Assessment and details of a Surface Water Drainage Scheme have been submitted to and approved by the council prior to commencement. In relation to Ground Water, it is acknowledged that maximum depth of ground water is near surface which would impact on viability of infiltration devices, but nevertheless the Environment Agency would recommend lifting ground levels marginally to allow permeable sub base under the pitches.

Whilst layout will be a reserved matter, the Council’s Environmental Care Team has commented at this stage that in terms of vehicle access for waste collection, a waste collection vehicle needs to be able to safely enter and exit a development and as such access roads must be a minimum of 5m wide and have suitable foundations to withstand the maximum weight of the vehicle (generally 26 tonnes). Manhole covers, gully gratings etc. must also be heavy-duty. For tracking purposes, the dimensions of the vehicles currently used in Elmbridge are 10.4m long and 3m wide. The minimum turning circles are 19.9m (kerb to kerb) and 21.6 (between walls). No provision for a turning circle has been provided especially in the proposed extended Felcott Road. In certain instances, vehicles are able to reverse into a development over a distance not exceeding 12 metres to a point within 10 metres of the storage area. Unfortunately, the distance from Felcott Close to the proposed extended Felcott Road exceeds 12 metres. Arrangements should also be put in place to prevent or control unauthorized parking that could prevent access on collection days.

With regard to collection points and bin areas, assumptions have been made that bins will be presented at the front boundary of individual properties in line with other properties in the area. For the proposed flats, a communal bin store area should be provided for any flats. The maximum distance from this area to the point where the waste collection lorry stops should be 10m or less and the pathway should be level and at least 1.5m wide with no kerbs or steps. The bin store should be large enough to accommodate communal bins with sufficient capacity for fortnightly collections of landfill and recycling and weekly collections of food waste.

The average volume of waste generated per household, per week based on a two to three bedroom property is 260 litres comprising:
- 120 litres - landfill wheeled bin, collected fortnightly
- 120 litres - Recycling wheeled bin, collected fortnightly
- 20 litres - food waste, collected weekly

This should be used as a guide to determine the minimum number and size of communal wheeled bins to provide. The number of bins should always be rounded up to ensure that there is sufficient capacity if the period of collection is extended (for example over bank holidays). All residential units should also have sufficient space in the kitchen to segregate recyclable and non-recyclable waste and store it until it is taken out to the bins.

CIL / S106 Issues

the proposal would result in additional development and accordingly is liable for the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). The amount being sought as CIL is bespoke to the development due to the applicant agreeing that £381,150.00 of highway related works can be secured through a S106 agreement and therefore outside of CIL. Notwithstanding this the
total amount of CIL net of this amount and social housing relief is likely to be in the region of £753,000. The applicant has provided the relevant liability forms required to pay the chargeable amount required by the Council’s adopted Charging Schedule in accordance with the relevant regulations.

103 In addition, the applicant has confirmed their agreement to providing a bi-lateral S106 Legal Agreement (within [time to be specified]) to secure the following:

- The necessary affordable housing provision in accordance with policy CS21 of the Core Strategy
- A bespoke Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM) mitigation payment for new dwellings of £31,920 equivalent to £190 per each market dwelling in accordance with policy CS13 of the Core Strategy and paragraph 3.83 of the Developer Contributions SPD, adopted in April 2012. Whilst the development is 5.5km from Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (TBHSPA), the TBHSPA Delivery Framework, referred to in the Core Strategy (Policy CS13), sets out that more sizeable developments (of 50 dwellings or more) located between 5-7 km should be considered on a case by case basis. On this basis the applicant has is making a contribution towards Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace through Elmbridge’s Community Infrastructure Levy and is also offering a proportionate contribution of £190 per dwelling towards Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM) to be secured through a Section 106 agreement.
- As the applicant is contributing to sufficient avoidance and mitigation measures, then Natural England do not object to this application.
- A financial contribution of £310,482 towards secondary education to be used specifically to contribute to the £3.25 million that the additional form of entry at the new Rydens School is going to cost Surrey County Council. The County Council’s agreement with Rydens Enterprise School is to rebuild like for like i.e. an 8FE school, and the County Council pay for an additional 1 FE. As the costs of this scheme falls far short of the funding the County Council receive from Central Government for the Capital programme in Surrey, there is a need for additional developer contributions.
- £375,000.00 towards the operating costs of bus services serving the site (either the dedicated School bus and/or public services).
- £6,150.00 towards the cost of auditing the Travel Plan for both the residential development and school expansion.
- A Community Use Agreement to cover:
  - Out of hours access arrangements to the agreed sports facilities;
  - Out of hours access to school building and internal facilities;

Matters raised in Representations

104 The issues raised in the representations received have been covered in the above report.

Conclusion

105 This outline application for development comprising 296 residential units, replacement secondary school and Sixth Form College along with associated modified access, landscaping and parking following demolition of the existing school and sixth form college (means of access only to be determined at this time) would not have an adverse impact on the character or amenity of the area and would provide additional housing units and a replacement school within the urban area. The proposal has been considered against Core Strategy policies CS2, CS5, CS16, CS17, CS19, CS21, CS25, CS26 and CS27; saved Local Plan Policies HSG16, HSG19, ENV2, ENV3, ENV11, ENV12, COM4, MOV2, MOV4, and MOV6 (Off-Street Parking). In addition, regard has also been had to the NPPF particularly paragraphs 6, 11, 14, 17, 38, 72 and 74 and supporting guidance and to the Council’s Design and Character and Developer Contributions SPDs both adopted in April 2012 and other material considerations including third party representations. It has been concluded that the development would not result in any harm that would justify refusal in the public interest.
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Officer Recommendation: Permit, subject to referral to the Secretary of State and subject to the negotiation and execution within six months of the date of this decision, of an Agreement under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 to secure a planning obligation and subject to conditions

Sub Committee Recommendation: Refuse Outline Planning Permission

Recommendation: Refuse Outline Permission

Reasons For Refusal

1. The proposed access off Hersham Road to the development comprising 296 residential units, replacement secondary school and sixth form college along with associated modified access, landscaping and parking following demolition of the existing school and sixth form college by reason of its siting and design, would cause unacceptable harm to highway safety for pedestrian, cycle and vehicular traffic contrary to Policy CS25 within the Elmbridge Core Strategy and saved Policies MOV2, MOV4 and MOV6 of the Replacement Elmbridge Borough Local Plan 2000 and the National Planning Policy Framework.
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