

This is the addendum text for the school application:

Committee Members are requested to note the following:

1. An amended site location plan has been submitted, showing (outlined in blue) additional land to the south of the application site that has very recently been acquired by the Council. The amended drawing reference is 8645-PL001 P2 and this drawing must replace the equivalent reference in draft condition no.2. The application site (outlined in red) remains unchanged and this does not change the planning application proposals. Additional drawings referenced PL002/02, PL100/P3 and PL101/P3 also replace their equivalents for consistency on the blue line boundary.

The acquisition of additional land to the south of the application site has already been addressed in paragraph 5.30 of the report, in response to representations already made on this point. Members are advised that, as the report notes, the local planning authority is required to determine the planning application as currently submitted and on its own planning merits having regard to the development plan and material planning considerations, including the compelling need for a new secondary school which weighs heavily in favour of the proposal.

2. The 'Park and Stride' proposal on land to the south of the application site, as shown on indicative drawing 5587-2019-F4 within Appendix R of the Transport Assessment, has been amended in response to objection from Transport for London (TfL) and the Greater London Authority (GLA) to its provision as it is considered to undermine other sustainable travel choices by users of the school. In response to these concerns the plan has been amended (referenced 5587-2019-F5) to indicate that this facility would be a 'Drop-Off Facility' only, with no allowance to be made for parent parking on this hospital land which remains subject to existing hospital parking controls. It is to be noted that the resolution of Planning Committee will be referred to the Mayor of London for consideration and the Mayor has statutory authority to direct refusal of the application or to 'call-in' the application and take over determination of the application as local planning authority.

3. A further planning condition (No.41) is also recommended to require the submission of a management plan for the Drop-Off Facility, outlining how the facility would operate (in line with the indicative drawing). In addition this condition expressly limits the lifetime of this facility to a maximum of 3 years from the date of first occupation of the new school by which time the facility would be removed and rights of access by parents expressly prevented, by which time it is expected that the School Travel Plan measures and performance of the associated Transport Review Group will have become embedded and an increased reliance upon non-car travel to the school can be expected. The amended condition 41 is to read as follows:

*(41) The school shall not be occupied until details of the provision and management of a temporary drop-off facility as shown on indicative drawing reference 5587/2019-F4 as contained in Appendix R of Transport Assessment, shall be submitted to the local planning authority for approval,*

*such approved details to be implemented in full. The drop-off facility shall operate for a period not exceeding 3 years from the first occupation of the school and shall be fully decommissioned in accordance with details to be set out in the approved Management Plan.*

4. For the same reasons outlined in points 2 and 3 above, the recommended draft condition 8 is to be amended to expressly stipulate a requirement of the amended School Travel Plan to remove any targets associated with increased use of the 'Park and Stride' facility, as is currently stipulated. Therefore, the additional text is to be added to the end of draft Condition 8 as follows:

- *"- removal and re-assignment of targeted travel choices away from 'Park and Stride' facility to other sustainable travel options."*

5. Paragraph 3.56 of the report should be corrected to reflect that an objection to the development was received from Councillor Patrick McManus.

6. In respect of the measures of publicity outlined in section 3.0, it is also necessary to note that the required Press Notice was published in the Sutton Guardian on 19th January 2017.

7. As requested in the Stage 1 response from the GLA, additional modelling data has been provided by the applicants to the GLA in respect of the intended Passivhaus design standards for the development, confirming the anticipated design performance. This has been verbally agreed with the GLA and will be forwarded as part of the Stage 2 referral. The modelling identifies a likely 7.2% reduction in total emissions through on-site renewable energy, and as such condition 30 is to be amended by removing the words "...the stated.." from the penultimate line of the condition.

8. Condition 20 is to be amended to ensure that final details of the means of enclosure around the site are submitted for approval by the local planning authority prior to installation. The condition is to read as follows:

*"(20) Final design specifications of the means of enclosure around and within the application site, as shown on the submitted drawing referenced 435/903/F, shall be submitted to the local planning authority for approval (such approved details to include acoustic-specification rebound fencing at the eastern end of the MUGA) to be implemented in full prior to first occupation of the school and retained in good condition for the lifetime of the development."*

9. A response has been received from Reigate and Banstead Borough Council raising 'No Objection' to the development.

10. A further 7 letters of representation have been received since the finalisation of the Committee report. With the exception of the following points, there are no issues

raised that have not already been addressed in the main report:

- Reference is made to the application site abutting or being within a Conservation Area. *This is not the case. The closest Conservation Area is the Landseer Road CA, approximately 1.6km to the north.*
- If the applicant were a private developer, the Council would resist these proposals. *The application has been considered on its planning merits, having regard to the development plan and other material planning considerations, as set out in the main report and the same approach would be taken irrespective of the applicant.*
- Can local residents now propose their own local plan? *Yes, this is possible, but it is not considered to be relevant to the current planning application which must be determined against the policies of the adopted development plan and other material planning considerations.*
- What is a Supplementary Air Quality Neutral Report? *This is explained in the main report at paragraph 5.160.*

11. A further representation has been received from the Belmont and South Cheam Neighbourhood Forum, including a Technical Note in respect of the submitted Transport Assessment provided by highway consultants acting for the Forum and an assessment of design principles for the school project.

In summary, the Technical Note states the following, to which Officer comments are added below, following further consultation with Council Highway Engineers:

- Uncertainty in respect of the location and permanence of the 'Park and Stride' facility, thereby compromising the school's sustainable travel credentials;

*It is important to consider that the temporary Park and Stride (now re-classified as a 'Drop-off facility') is just one element of the School Travel Plan (STP), and cannot be considered in isolation. The impact of the drop-off facility must be assessed against a number of factors relating to the anticipated modal split of traffic for the school. The predicted level of vehicular trips to the school from all directions in year 1-3 is a maximum of 155, and from that only a portion of those trips will use this facility. The submitted STP target for the 'Park and Stride' had been 10% of such trips, which would suggest 16 vehicles out of the overall car related journeys at Year 3 of the school roll out. As such, the number of trips that are likely to be generated by this facility are relatively low in comparison to existing traffic levels on Cotswold Road, where there are existing two ways flows of over 500 vehicles.*

*It is considered acceptable to allow this facility to operate for an initial 3 years, whilst the school and the proposed Transport Review Group work to implement the STP sustainable transport measures. Any STP is a 'live' document and offers opportunities for targets and mitigation measures to be reviewed regularly.*

- The proposed Voluntary Exclusion Zone would not be enforceable and are rarely observed to work effectively;

*Officers would reiterate that this is also just one element of the STP, and whilst it is noted that this facility is voluntary, it sets a clear example for parents as to unacceptable parking behaviours. With this being a new school it offers an opportunity to embed these measures into the everyday behaviours and the Transport Review Group would be able to monitor and reinforce compliance.*

- A clearer strategy is therefore required to deal with parent drop-off and pick-up;

*It is considered that the range of measures proposed in the STP provide a clear strategy, and seeks to promote more sustainable methods of travel to the proposed site. All new parents will be aware that there are no drop-off facilities in adjoining roads.*

- There is not enough detail as to how bus service enhancements are to be secured;

*The Committee report confirms that bus services are to be enhanced to meet anticipated increases in demand, as identified in the consultation response from TfL and GLA. The recommendation confirms that a Unilateral Undertaking will be entered into by the Council to confirm the necessary funding for these enhancements in the event that Government funding is not provided.*

- There is no commitment by the applicants to improve the uncontrolled crossing on Cotswold Road;

*The crossing arrangement at Cotswold Road is identified as being improved in terms of providing better width and condition of the crossing, with new tactile facilities for those road users with visibility issues. As confirmed in the TA and Stage 1 Safety Audit, the uncontrolled crossing point is well sited and has good visibility in both directions. The crossing point is protected by double yellow line no waiting 'At Any Time' restrictions and well positioned on the existing desire line for pedestrians.*

- Assumptions in respect of pedestrian volumes are based upon unrealistic Pedestrian Impact Assessment data and existing survey data. A more detailed assessment should be undertaken;

*The data used for pedestrian assessments relate to the TRICS data and the local modal splits, and as such the data is consistent with that used throughout the TA, which is considered to be robust and sufficiently detailed.*

- Trip generation data is based upon the TfL 'Stars' survey data of travel modal choices. However, data from the TRICS database would be more robust;

*The development site traffic generation has been determined using the TRICS database. It is only the local modal split data that has been derived using STARS data from secondary schools in Sutton as a base, and it is considered that this will give a more realistic picture of travel patterns than remote TRICS sites. As such the methodology used is considered to be robust.*

- The applicant should be expected to facilitate and fund necessary highway mitigation, as would be the case for any commercial developer.

*Those mitigation factors that are necessitated by the school and its associated impacts are being funded through this application.*

With regard to the Forum's stated design principles, concerns remain in respect of the proximity of the MUGA to existing residential gardens by reason of noise and overlooking, hours of use of the MUGA extends to 8pm and on Saturdays, the location of vehicular access on Chiltern Road remains in the scheme, massing of the building to Chiltern Road, 4-storey (plus plant enclosure) too high for the site, loss of mature trees, limited screening from newly planted trees, lack of firm commitments to fund highway junction improvements or public transport improvements, inadequate consideration of crowded pavements on Brighton Road, ineffectiveness of the proposed School Travel Plan, lack of consideration of cumulative transport requirements with Overton Grange School.

Officers consider that the above design principle points have been addressed in the main Officer report.

12. There are a couple of corrections required to the proposed conditions as follows:

- Condition 2: reference to the submitted Design and Access Statement is to be added;
- Condition 21: The switching off time for approved external lighting details should read "from 2300 to 0700 hours" rather than "0700 to 2300" as stated.

13. Paragraph 2.22 of the report should be amended to read as follows:

"2.22 The building would have a maximum depth of roughly 83m from front to rear and overall the school building footprint, inclusive of the sports hall, would extend roughly 96.0m from north to south."

14. The final sentence of paragraph 5.58 of the report should read as follows:

"Recommended planning condition 26 is proposed to this effect."

This page is intentionally left blank