Proposal: Detached two storey school building (1,929sqm) and associated outdoor sports facilities following demolition of existing school building (1,669sqm)

Applicant: Bowmer and Kirkland
Rachel Wilbraham
DPP

Agent: Barnett House
53 Fountain Street
Manchester
M2 2AN

Decision Level: If Permit- Sub Committee
If Refuse- Sub Committee

Recommendation: Permit

Representations: A total of 43 letters of representation have been received including 8 letters of support (including one from the on-site caretaker) for the redevelopment of the school and a further 35 letters of objection, comments made can be summarised as follows:

- The design is unsympathetic and does not preserve nor enhance the Conservation Area
- The height is overdominant
- Object to the loss of trees
- Object to the loss of views
- Concern about noise and disruption from the construction
- The proposal would interrupt views across to St Paul’s Church from Vine Road
- Loss of light and visual intrusion to surrounding properties

*** This item is eligible for public speaking ***

Report

Description

1. The site relates to St Lawrence, a Church of England, voluntary aided, Junior School, with 3 forms of entry (12 classes) for children aged 7 - 11 years. The school was originally built in about 1974 with additional extensions in 1984, 2008 and 2011 and has had various refurbishment works carried out.

2. The site is located in a primarily residential location in East Molesey, adjacent to the Kent Road Conservation Area

Constraints

3. The relevant planning constraints are:
   - Adjacent to the Conservation Area
   - Part of the site (to the immediate rear of the existing school) in flood zone 2

Policy

4. 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:

   Core Strategy 2011
Proposal

6. This is a full planning application for a new replacement school building located to the immediate rear of the existing single storey buildings on site. The proposed building would be mostly two storey in height in a 'T' shaped formation, the top end of the proposed building would contained the proposed sports hall and have a height of 5.7m to the flat roof and then the main mass and bulk of the proposed building beyond at 7.9m in height.

7. Further to the completion of the proposed replacement school the existing school buildings would be removed from the site and the front area amended to be a play pitch and modest allotment area for the pupils.

8. Pupil capacity will remain at 360, the number of staff would remain unchanged, as would the existing access and parking arrangement.

9. Revised plans and additional information has been submitted following concerns raised from the Council in terms of design and impact on trees. A further 14 day consultation exercise was undertaken. Officers will verbally update Members on any late letters and/or consultation responses.

Consultations

10. Council’s Conservation Officer- The amendments are an improvement but would have preferred to see more brickwork. However, the constraints in siting of the new building have resulted in a two storey building and its overall appearance remains utilitarian. As before, the extensive use of rendering on the front elevation would only serve to make the building more prominent in views within the conservation area from along Church Road and Wolsey Road and from elsewhere around the site. In my view the proposed building, whilst an improvement on the previous design, would have a negative effect on the setting of the conservation area. This will need to be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.
11. Tree Officer- Further to the submission of the amended arboricultural information, the tree protection details are an improvement upon the previous submission with greater clarity as to what is proposed and the vast majority of my concerns been overcome.

Following discussions with the appointed arboricultural consultant, agreement has been reached that the specific details of proposed access facilitation works will be provided under a planning condition, prior to the commencement of development. One point that will need to be taken into account is that access facilitation works proposed to be undertaken to T1 – Black Pine will not be acceptable on this occasion. It is considered that there is an adequate clearance for demolition to be facilitated using the top down pull back method making remedial works unnecessary. If there are concerns that T1 is at risk of damage from demolition activities, then site supervision by the appointed arboricultural consultant will need to be included for this phase of demolition within the site monitoring details. The current report does not include a schedule of site monitoring so this will also need to be submitted under a planning condition.

There are number of trees that are being removed as part of this proposal and it is deemed necessary for a replacement tree planting to be included as part of this scheme. The replacement details should aim to plant larger growing species and not the usual mix of Birch and smaller growing fruit trees etc. Tree planting details will need to include planting and after care specifications. These details can be supplied under a landscaping condition.

12. Environmental Health (Noise and Pollution) - No objections.

13. Highway Authority (Surrey County Council) - 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/informatives. The development is considered to be in accordance with policy DM7 of the Development Management Plan and CS25 of the Elmbridge Core Strategy 2011.

14. Sustainable Urban Drainage (Surrey County Council) - No objections subject to conditions

15. Heritage Conservation Team, Archaeology (Surrey County Council) - No objections subject to the archaeological work, including a desk based archaeological assessment undertaken prior to the commencement of the development.

16. Environment Agency- Refer to the standing advice. This is therefore discussed further within the Officers Report

17. East Molesey Conservation Area Advisory Committee (Comments made prior to the revised plans)- No objections to the mass and siting however we consider that the treatment of its elevations are some of the factors resulting in this development being unacceptable.

18. Sport England- No objection as the proposed development would not be located on any formal pitches.

Positive and Proactive Engagement

19. 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.

20. The applicants have entered into discussions with the Local Planning Authority, before and during the submission of this planning application. Officers have always raised concerns about the location and design of the proposed replacement school but have appreciated the wider needs and requirements of supporting improved education facilities.
Planning Considerations

21. The main considerations regarding this proposal are:
   - Principle of the development
   - Design Considerations
   - Impact on Neighbouring Amenity
   - Highway Safety and Parking Considerations
   - Impact on Flooding and any other Environmental Considerations

Principle of the development (including the siting within the site)

22. The NPPF sets out strong emphasis and presumption in favour of the development of state-funded schools. The Policy Statement for schools further states that Local Planning Authorities (LPA) should give full and thorough consideration to the importance of enabling the development of state-funded schools in their planning decisions and that the refusal of any application for a state-funded school, or the imposition of conditions, will have to be clearly justified by the LPA. Given the strong policy support for improving state education, the Secretary of State will be minded to consider such a refusal or imposition of conditions to be unreasonable conduct, unless it is supported by clear and cogent evidence.

23. The above provides a clear national policy that the redevelopment of state funded schools is one which should be supported by LPA’s and that a collaborative approach must be given to ensure their successful delivery.

24. Local Policies CS16 and DM9 also offer support for improved or new school facilities.

25. More specifically in relation to this school, in 2011, the Government set up the Priority School Building Programme (PSBP) in response to an urgent need to renew some school buildings that were in a poor state of repair. St Lawrence C of E Junior School was one of the 261 schools selected to be rebuilt, or have their condition needs met, through the PSBP.

26. The Education Funding Agency (EFA) has confirmed that in order to qualify for the programme, St Lawrence was assessed and showed the existing buildings to be amongst those in the worst condition. The surveys of the existing buildings showed that the current school is no longer fit for purpose and costs for on-going maintenance and repair were significant. The current condition of the building is such that it would not be possible to achieve the programme requirement for contractor warranted serviceable life through a ‘do nothing’ or refurbishment option. It was considered that St Lawrence Junior School has reached a point of poor condition, requiring the demolition of the existing buildings and replacement provision.

Principle of the siting of this school in the location proposed (and not on the existing footprint)

27. Whilst the LPA offers strong support for the redevelopment of this school at the initial pre-application stage the LPA raised concerns regarding the location of the proposed replacement school. The preference of the LPA has always been for any replacement building to sit on the footprint of the existing site. However, the applicants have provided further details and evidence regarding the needs and requirements of the delivery of this new school.

28. The EFA has set out that the PSBP seeks to achieve best value when implementing public funds. In order to keep the value of projects within the prescribed PSBP rates, any spend associated with temporary accommodation must be minimised wherever possible. Therefore one of the key criteria is to avoid the need for temporary accommodation and avoid the disruption associated with such this.

29. The EFA have confirmed that if a replacement building can only be accepted on the footprint of the existing school, the increased cost and associated delays due to redesign would mean that this project would become unaffordable and therefore be unlikely to proceed.
30. Therefore and in order to ensure the delivery of a new school, which would not encroach onto the existing playing field to the rear, the EFA consider that this is the only possible location for the new school.

The principle of the new school on open space

31. The proposed replacement building would be located on existing open space and accordance with Paragraph 74 of the NPPF, along with Policy DM20, existing open space 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.

32. The actual part of the site where the proposed new school would be located does not currently function as play pitch land and is used more as playground space for pupils. The proposed development would remove the existing school to the front of the site and replace it with a new pitch and outdoor learning and allotments area. This is considered to equate to an increased provision located to the front of the site in compliance with the above policy.

Design Considerations

33. The site is adjacent to but not within the East Molesey (Kent Town) Conservation Area. The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires that development should preserve and enhance the character or appearance of the Conservation Areas, including its setting. Both National and Local Policy reinforce this and states that new development should be of a height, scale and visual appearance which is in keeping with the character and appearance of the area.

34. In terms of design and as stated above, the preference of the LPA is that a new building would be located on the footprint of the existing building. The Council's Conservation Area Officer has also raised concerns about the position of the proposed new building and its impact on the setting of the adjacent Conservation Area.

35. The building would be greater in height than existing, two storeys within a simple flat roof design. Following the initial concerns expressed by the Conservation Officer and whilst the applicants (for reasons set out above) are unable to reconsider the position of the proposed replacement school, they have sought to make some alterations to the use of materials in the proposed elevations of the new school to break up the render frontage and provide a modern building which also responds to the character and appearance of the area.

36. The Council's Conservation Area Officer still considers that the siting of the replacement building is less than ideal but does show acknowledgement to the wider consideration which site outside of heritage and design. Whilst the proposed amendments are considered to be an improvement some concerns are still raised regarding the choice of material finish.

37. Officers attach significant weight to the harm a development could have on a Conservation Area. However this site is located adjacent to, and not within, the designated area. The proposed replacement school would also be located some 84m back form the streetscene and public views. This harm also needs to be balanced against other factors.

38. Taking all matters into consideration, including ensuring the delivery of a new school building, the position of the building is considered to be one which is considered to be visually acceptable within the streetscene. Conditions are recommended for samples of materials to be submitted prior to the construction of the new building to ensure a suitable visual appearance. It is encouraged that the applicants review the further comments from the
Councils Conservation Officer and as part of the formal discharge of such conditions considers the proposed material finish further.

Impact on Neighbouring Amenity

39. The building is an existing school site located in a predominately residential area. The immediate adjacent dwellings potentially affected by the proposed new building are No.s 11 and 13 Parsons Mead located to the north and 11 Vine Road located to the south.

40. In terms of the properties along Parson Mead located to the north of the new school building a number of concerns have been proposed in terms of loss of light and the loss of the existing holly tree which screens the application site from these dwellings.

41. No. 13 Parsons Mead is located closest to this new school building, some 22-25m north (due to existing extensions at this dwelling). In order to reduce the impact of this development on these dwellings rear facing windows the building has been designed so that the school hall is located at the north end, with a lower height to the main school building. This does result in the building complying with the 25 degree rule which assesses potential loss of light from this development. The building would also be situated some distance away to prevent any significant overbearing or visual intrusion on these properties rear facing habitable windows. No. 13 would also retain some aspect from the south west.

42. In terms of the proposed holly tree, whilst it provides some screening, the tree is of low amenity value. At the request of the local residents the retention of this tree has been reviewed by the applicants who have confirmed that the tree has to be removed in order to facilitate the proposed development. However the applicants are proposing replacement mature planting to assist in screening the new school from these properties. On this basis and in view of the proposed mitigation it is considered that the relationship between the proposed new school building and properties to the north is acceptable. Conditions have been recommended to secure this.

43. Some concerns have also been raised from increased noise and disturbance from the proposed new doors accessing/exiting the hall, located to the northern side of the building. The applicants have confirmed that these are fire doors and would only be used in emergency situations. Conditions securing this are proposed. It is not proposed to increase the community use of the building above that which takes place at the site and is largely ancillary to the main use of the school. Any such use will be contained to the hall and adjacent reception rooms. Access will be from the main front doors of the site.

44. In terms of the impact of the properties along Vine Road, the proposed new school is located some 40m due north of these dwellings. Due to this separation distances it is not considered that the proposed development would result in a significant loss of light and/or visual overbearing impact.

45. In terms of increased noise and disturbance, the site is an established school. External teaching and hard play areas will not be significantly changed in use and location from the current situation. Pupil capacity is not proposed to be increased as part of this application. Therefore the noise impact from these areas will not be significantly different from that already experienced.

Highway Safety and Parking Considerations

46. The proposed development would utilise the existing access. Pupil and staff numbers are proposed to remain the same as the existing capacity. Therefore the proposed development would not result in any increased vehicle movements to or from the site and does not raise any further issues in this regard.

47. The Highway Authority at Surrey County Council has reviewed this application and has raised no objection subject to a method of construction statement.
Impact on Flooding and any other Environmental Considerations

48. In terms of flooding, the proposed development falls within a ‘less vulnerable use’. The building is shown as being located within Flood Zone 2 (the front of the site is in flood zone 1). The Standing Advice from the Environment Agency on flooding states that this type of use is acceptable within this flood zone. However, further to this, policies CS1, CS7 and CS26 of the Elmbridge Core Strategy (2011) seeks to ensure that development on this site is safe for its lifetime and that the risk of flooding is minimised, whilst not increasing the risk of flooding elsewhere.

49. An FRA has been submitted as part of this planning application and associated drainage evidence has been submitted with the application. The Government has strengthened planning policy on the provision of sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) for ‘major’ planning applications which is being introduced from 6 April 2015 (Paragraph 103 of National Planning Policy Framework and Ministerial Statement on SuDS). As per the guidance issued by the Department of Communities and Local Government (DCLG), all ‘major’ planning applications must consider sustainable drainage systems. Developers are advised to assess the suitability of sustainable drainage systems. Under the new consultation arrangements Surrey County Council, in its role as Lead Local Flood Authority, is a statutory consultee for all major applications. Previously the Environment Agency had that statutory responsibility.

50. SuDS must be properly designed to ensure that the maintenance and operation costs are proportionate and sustainable for the lifetime of the development. Hydraulic calculation and drawings to support the design need to be provided along with proposed standards of operation and maintenance in accordance with paragraph 081 of NPPF (PPG).

51. The Sustainable Drainage and Consenting Team have reviewed this information and are satisfied that the proposed development provides suitable sustainable drainage systems. This will be secured by condition.

52. Concerns were initially raised from the Council’s Tree Officer regarding the proposed development. Additional and revised Arboricultural information has now been submitted and the Tree Officer has now withdrawn his objections, subject to further conditions regarding landscape.

53. A habitats / ecology report was submitted as part of this application. The proposed new building would be located on existing playing fields/ playground area has limited biodiversity value. It is considered that the proposed landscaping and recommended additional tree planting conditions will mitigate any proposed loss.

Matters Raised in Representations

54. All relevant material considerations are set out above. Noise and disturbance from the construction activity are dealt with under separate Environmental Health Legislation. Some concerns have been expressed regarding the impact on the views to the Spire of the Church St Paul, Palace Road. The views sought to be protected are from the Spire, North West towards Hurst Park. This development will not impact on these strategic views. No person has the right to a particular view.

Conclusion

55. On the basis of the above, having attached significant weight to the redevelopment of the site to replace an out of date state school with a new and improved school and in light of any other material considerations, the proposed application is considered to be in accordance with the development plan and would provide a new school to meet the needs of local residents. Accordingly, the recommendation is to grant permission.
Recommendation: Grant Permission

Conditions/Reasons

1 TIME LIMIT (FULL APPLICATION)
The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: To comply with Section 51 of Part 4 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

2 LIST OF APPROVED PLANS
The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in strict accordance with the following list of approved plans:

- Location Plan numbered 544-PE-00-ZZ-DR-A-500 rev P01 received by the Local Planning Authority on 23.10.2015
- Site plan (with distances): ALA280SK08 rev PL0 received by the Local Planning Authority on 23.10.2015
- Amended Hard and Soft Landscaping Plan: ALA280L02 rev PL05 received by the Local Planning Authority on 28.01.2016
- Amended Ground floor plan: 544-PE-00-GF-DR-A-1201 rev P12 received by the Local Planning Authority on 27.01.2016
  First floor plan: 544-PE-00-FF-DR-A-1202 rev P07 received by the Local Planning Authority on 23.10.2015
  Roof plan: 544-PE-00-ZZ-DR-A-1206 rev P02 received by the Local Planning Authority on 23.10.2015
  Amended Proposed Elevations: 544-PE-00-ZZ-DR-A-4104 rev P06 received by the Local Planning Authority on 27.01.2016
- Amended Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Arboricultural Method Statement (including associated Tree Protection Plan appendices and Figures) received by the Local Planning Authority on 28.01.2015
- Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy received by the Local Planning Authority on 23.10.2015
- Proposed Drainage Layout: N01264-500 rev C received by the Local Planning Authority on 23.10.2015

Reason: To ensure that the development is carried out in a satisfactory manner.

3 MATERIALS SAMPLES
PRIOR TO THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE DEVELOPMENT HERE BY APPROVED SAMPLES OF THE MATERIALS TO BE USED ON THE EXTERNAL FACES AND ROOF OF THE BUILDING SHALL BE SUBMITTED TO AND APPROVED IN WRITING BY THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY. DEVELOPMENT SHALL BE CARRIED OUT IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE APPROVED DETAILS.
Reason: To ensure that a satisfactory external appearance is achieved of the development adjacent to the Conservation Area in accordance with Policy DM2 and DM12 of the Elmbridge Development Management Plan 2015. It is considered necessary for this to be a pre-commencement condition because the use of satisfactory external materials goes to the heart of the planning permission.

4 PD LIMITATION
Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town & Country Planning General Permitted Development Order 2015 (or any Order revoking or re-enacting that Order) no development falling within Part 7 Class(es) M and N of Schedule 2 to the said Order shall be carried out within the curtilage of the site unless planning permission is first granted by the Borough Council.

Reason: To safeguard the character and amenities of the adjoining properties, in the interest, to ensure the retention of Open Space and in the interest of flooding as required by the National Planning Policy Framework, policy CS26 of the Elmbridge Core Strategy and policies DM2 and DM20 of the Elmbridge Development Management Plan 2015.

5 DEMOLITION OF THE EXISTING SCHOOL
Within 6 calendar month of the completion of the new school hereby approved, the existing single storey school building(s) shall be demolished and the approved hard and soft landscaping shall be implemented or within such other timetable as agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To safeguard the character and amenities of the adjoining properties, in the interest, to ensure the retention of Open Space and in the interest of flooding as required by the National Planning Policy Framework, policy CS26 of the Elmbridge Core Strategy and policies DM2 and DM20 of the Elmbridge Development Management Plan 2015.

6 FIRE DOORS
External doors located on the northern elevation of the building hereby approved serving the hall shall be kept closed unless required for emergency access and/or egress.

Reason: To avoid adverse impacts on health and quality of life from noise in accordance with paragraph 123 of the National Planning Policy Framework and the Noise Policy Statement for England.

7 LANDSCAPING - TREE PLANTING AND AFTERCARE
No works or development shall take place until full details of all proposed tree planting, the proposed times of planting, and arrangements for aftercare over a period of 5 years have been approved in writing by the Borough Council. All tree planting and aftercare shall be carried out in accordance with those details and at those times. If within a period of five years from the date of the planting of any tree, that tree, or any planted in replacement for it, is removed, uprooted or destroyed or dies, another tree of the same species and size as that originally planted shall be planted in the same place, unless the Borough Council gives its written consent to any variation.

Reason: To preserve and enhance the visual amenities of the locality in accordance with Policy DM6 of the Elmbridge Development Management Plan 2015.

8 LANDSCAPING - IMPLEMENTATION
ALL HARD AND SOFT LANDSCAPING WORKS SHALL BE CARRIED OUT IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE APPROVED DETAILS. ARBORICULTURAL WORK TO EXISTING TREES SHALL BE CARRIED OUT PRIOR TO THE COMMENCEMENT OF ANY OTHER DEVELOPMENT, OTHERWISE ALL REMAINING LANDSCAPING WORK AND NEW PLANTING SHALL BE CARRIED OUT PRIOR TO THE OCCUPATION OF ANY PART OF THE DEVELOPMENT OR IN ACCORDANCE TO THE TIMETABLE AGREED WITH THE
BOROUGH COUNCIL. ANY TREES OR PLANTS, WHICH WITHIN A PERIOD OF FIVE YEARS OF THE COMMENCEMENT OF ANY WORKS IN PURSUANCE OF THE DEVELOPMENT DIE, ARE REMOVED, OR BECOME SERIOUSLY DAMAGED OR DISEASED, SHALL BE REPLACED AS SOON AS PRACTICABLE WITH OTHERS OF SIMILAR SIZE AND SPECIES, FOLLOWING CONSULTATION WITH THE BOROUGH COUNCIL, UNLESS THE BOROUGH COUNCIL GIVES WRITTEN CONSENT TO ANY VARIATION.

Reason: To preserve and enhance the visual amenities of the locality in accordance with Policy DM6 of the Elmbridge Development Management Plan 2015.

9 METHOD OF CONSTRUCTION STATEMENT
NO DEVELOPMENT SHALL COMMENCE UNTIL A CONSTRUCTION TRANSPORT MANAGEMENT PLAN, TO INCLUDE DETAILS OF:

(A) PARKING FOR VEHICLES OF SITE PERSONNEL, OPERATIVES AND VISITORS
(B) LOADING AND UNLOADING OF PLANT AND MATERIALS
(C) STORAGE OF PLANT AND MATERIALS
(D) PROGRAMME OF WORKS (INCLUDING MEASURES FOR TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT)
(E) PROVISION OF BOUNDARY HOARDING BEHIND ANY VISIBILITY ZONES
(F) HGV DELIVERIES AND HOURS OF OPERATION
(H) MEASURES TO PREVENT THE DEPOSIT OF MATERIALS ON THE HIGHWAY
(J) NO HGV MOVEMENTS TO OR FROM THE SITE SHALL TAKE PLACE BETWEEN THE HOURS OF 8.00 AND 9.00 AM AND 2.45 AND 3.45 PM NOR SHALL THE CONTRACTOR PERMIT ANY HGVs ASSOCIATED WITH THE DEVELOPMENT AT THE SITE TO BE LAID UP, WAITING, IN CHURCH ROAD, VINE ROAD, WOLSEY ROAD AND PARSONS MEAD DURING THESE TIMES
(K) ON-SITE TURNING FOR CONSTRUCTION VEHICLES HAVE BEEN SUBMITTED TO AND APPROVED IN WRITING BY THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY. ONLY THE APPROVED DETAILS SHALL BE IMPLEMENTED DURING THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE DEVELOPMENT.

Reason: In order that the development should not prejudice highway safety, the free flow of traffic nor cause inconvenience to other highway users in accordance with Policy DM7 of the Elmbridge Development Management Plan 2015. It is considered necessary for this to be a pre-commencement condition because the demolition and construction works could have implications on highway safety and amenity and should be agreed before any works begin.

10 DRAINAGE STRATEGY
Prior to construction works, the applicant must in their drainage strategy, provide results from infiltration testing in accordance with BRE Digest 365. The Sustainable Drainage System should then be designed in accordance with these results and shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority.

Reason: To ensure that infiltration has been fully considered as a discharge option and to show evidence of why infiltration is not feasible for the site as required by the National Planning Policy Framework, it associated guidance and policy CS26 of the Elmbridge Core Strategy (2012).

11 INFILTRATION FEASIBILITY
In the event that infiltration is not found feasible:

a) the applicant needs to supply evidence that there design is permitted to connect into the surface water sewer and agreement of the discharge rate into the surface water system shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority.

b) a detailed design calculations for peak discharge rates onsite must be supplied for all storm events (1 in 1, 1 in 30 and 1 in 100 + 30% CC events) and evidence showing that the sewer has capacity to take these flows, shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority.
Reason: To ensure that surface water can discharge offsite as required by the National Planning Policy Framework, it associated guidance and policy CS26 of the Elmbridge Core Strategy (2012).

12 IMPERMEABLE AREAS
Prior to construction works, the applicant must in their drainage strategy provide a labelled plan showing all impermeable areas on the site, this shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority.

Reason: To ensure that the proposal has fully considered system failure as required by the National Planning Policy Framework, it associated guidance and policy CS26 of the Elmbridge Core Strategy (2012).

13 EXCEEDANCE / SYSTEM FAILURE
Before the commencement of the construction of the school hereby approved, details of how the Sustainable Drainage System will cater for system failure or exceedance events, both on and offsite, must be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority.

Reason: To ensure that the proposal has fully considered system failure as required by the National Planning Policy Framework, it associated guidance and policy CS26 of the Elmbridge Core Strategy (2012).

14 DRAINAGE LAYOUT
Prior to construction of the development hereby approved, a drainage layout detailing the location of SUDs elements, pipe diameters and their respective levels must be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority.

A long and cross sections of each proposed SuD element, must be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority.

Reason: To ensure the drainage design meets the technical standards compromise the functioning of the agreed Sustainable Drainage System as required by the National Planning Policy Framework, it associated guidance and policy CS26 of the Elmbridge Core Strategy (2012).

15 CONSTRUCTION PHASE
Before the commencement of the construction of the school hereby approved, details of how the Sustainable Drainage System will be protected and maintained during the construction of the development shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall thereafter be carried out in strict accordance with those approved details.

Reason: To ensure that the construction works do not compromise the functioning of the agreed Sustainable Drainage System as required by the National Planning Policy Framework, it associated guidance and policy CS26 of the Elmbridge Core Strategy (2012).

16 MANAGEMENT AND MAINTENANCE
Prior to construction of the development hereby approved, an agreement of who will own and maintain the SUDs features and their associated maintenance regimes, must be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority.

Reason: To ensure the drainage system is maintained throughout its life time to an acceptable standard as required by the National Planning Policy Framework, it associated guidance and policy CS26 of the Elmbridge Core Strategy (2012).

17 VERIFICATION REPORT
Prior to the first occupation of the development, a verification report carried out by a qualified drainage engineer must be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority to
demonstrate that the Sustainable Urban Drainage System has been constructed as per the agreed scheme or such other timetable as agreed by the Local Planning Authority which takes into account the demolition of the existing school buildings which form part of the development approved

Reason: To ensure the drainage design meets the technical standards as required by the National Planning Policy Framework, it associated guidance and policy CS26 of the Elmbridge Core Strategy (2012).

18 ADDITIONAL TREE INFORMATION AND PRE-COMMENCEMENT INSPECTION

BEFORE DEVELOPMENT TAKES PLACE FURTHER ARBORICULTURAL DETAILS SHALL SUBMITTED TO AND APPROVED IN WRITING BY THE BOROUGH COUNCIL AND THESE WORKS SHALL BE CARRIED OUT AS APPROVED.

THIS SCHEME SHALL INCLUDE DETAILS OF:

A) THE EXISTING TREES AND HEDGES TO BE RETAINED IN THE FORM OF A TREE SURVEY AND ARBORICULTURAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT, IN LINE WITH BS5837:2012, AND SHALL INCLUDE DETAILS OF ALL CURRENT AND PROPOSED HARD SURFACES, WALLS, FENCES, ACCESS FEATURES, AND GROUND LEVELS.

B) THE MEASURES TAKEN TO PROTECT EXISTING TREES AND HEDGES DURING CONSTRUCTION, DEMOLITION, AND DELIVERY OF MATERIALS / MACHINERY, INCLUDING A TREE PROTECTION PLAN AND AN ARBORICULTURAL METHOD STATEMENT IN LINE WITH BS5837:2012 (SEE ARBORICULTURAL METHOD STATEMENT INFORMATIVE.)

C) THE SCHEME SHALL PAY PARTICULAR ATTENTION TO (LIST SPECIFIC TREE / AREAS OF DEVELOPMENT OR DELETE IF NOT APPROPRIATE)

D) PRIOR TO THE COMMENCEMENT OF WORKS ON SITE AND AFTER THE INSTALLATION OF THE TREE PROTECTION IN ACCORDANCE WITH (B) ABOVE THE APPLICANT SHALL ARRANGE A PRE-COMMENCEMENT MEETING BETWEEN THE BOROUGH COUNCIL AND THE APPLICANT'S PROJECT ARBORICULTURIST TO ALLOW INSPECTION AND VERIFICATION OF THE PROTECTION MEASURES.

Reason: This permission is granted on the basis that trees would remain on site to mitigate the impact of the development and to preserve and enhance the visual amenities of the locality in accordance with Policy DM6 of the Elmbridge Development Management Plan 2015. It is considered necessary for this to be a pre-commencement condition because the demolition and construction works could have implications for the future health and amenity of retained trees within the site.

19 TREE PROTECTION

In this condition ‘retained tree’ means an existing tree, which is to be retained in accordance with the approved plans and particulars; and paragraphs (a) and (b) below shall have effect until the expiration of 5 years from the first occupation of the development.

a) no retained tree shall be cut down, uprooted or destroyed, nor shall any retained tree be pruned other than in accordance with the approved plans and particulars, without the written approval of the Borough Council. Any pruning shall be carried out in accordance with British Standard 3998 (tree work) and in accordance with any supplied arboricultural method statement.

b) if any retained tree is removed, uprooted or destroyed or dies, another tree shall be planted at the same place and that tree shall be of such size and species, and shall be planted at such time, as may be specified in writing by the Borough Council.

c) tree protection shall be maintained in-situ and not moved or removed until all construction has finished and equipment, materials, or machinery are removed from site.

d) any arboricultural protection information and plans submitted as part of the application, and listed in the approved plans condition, or submitted to meet a condition of consent shall be implemented and adhered to at all times during the construction process unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Borough Council. This shall include any requirement for arboricultural supervision and site monitoring. This condition may only fully be discharged on completion of the development subject to satisfactory written evidence of contemporaneous
supervision and monitoring of tree protection throughout construction by the appointed arboriculturist.

Reason: This permission is only granted on the basis that the trees would remain on site to mitigate the impact of the development and to preserve and enhance the visual amenities of the locality in accordance with Policy DM6 of the Elmbridge Development Management Plan 2015.

ARCHAEOLOGY - SCHEME OF WORKING (SITE OF HIGH ARCHAEOLOGICAL POTENTIAL)

NO DEVELOPMENT SHALL TAKE PLACE UNTIL THE APPLICANT HAS SECURED THE IMPLEMENTATION OF A PROGRAMME OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL WORK ON THE SITE IN ACCORDANCE WITH A WRITTEN SCHEME OF INVESTIGATION WHICH HAS BEEN SUBMITTED BY THE APPLICANT AND APPROVED IN WRITING BY THE BOROUGH COUNCIL.

Reason: The site is one of/within an area of high archaeological potential and it is important that the archaeological information should be preserved as a record before it is destroyed by the development in accordance with Policy DM12 of the Elmbridge Development Management Plan 2015.
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