

**PLANNING**  
**COMMITTEE**  
**24<sup>th</sup> July 2014**

THE FOLLOWING ALTERATIONS AND AMENDMENTS HAVE BEEN  
RECEIVED SINCE THE PLANNING OFFICER'S REPORT WAS  
PRESENTED TO MEMBERS

**P/07830/015 - Lynch Hill Primary School**

The following comments have been received from the Council's Transport Consultant:

**Background**

The site of the new classrooms has already received planning consent for 2 lecture theatres and toilets. The application that this formed part also included new office accommodation for the head teacher and several interview rooms. The head teachers office and interview rooms were constructed several years ago, but the lecture theatres have not been constructed. When the lecture theatres were proposed it was my understanding that there would be no increase in staff or pupils.

When this application was submitted it did not make reference to the fact that the additional classrooms would lead to an increase in number of pupils on the school role. It made no mention of the building to be used as a secondary school and no mention that the northern access of the site would be opened up for pupil access. No assessment of the transport impact of the proposed development had been undertaken. I queried this with the applicant's agent and he did agree to provide a transport statement and travel plan in support of the application. These documents were submitted on 23/7/14.

**Proposal**

This is a proposal to construct 4 new classrooms to house 80 secondary school age pupils. It is stated within the document that the school has planning consent to accommodate 1000 pupils at the school, although when reviewing previous applications I can find no reference to this being the case. It is said several times within the application documents that

"the proposed secondary aged pupils and associated staff would simply take up some of the future allocated capacity at the school on a temporary basis, albeit that the capacity would be taken up earlier than originally forecast."

Table 3.2 of the Transport Statement would indicate that the total agreed capacity of the school is 960 pupils and that the total enrolled pupils in September 2014 for the school for years 1-6, plus the Nursery and the Reception is 908 pupils. Therefore there would appear to be capacity for an additional 52 pupils. With the addition of the 80 pupils for Year 7 this would mean that the total expected number of children enrolled for September 2014 is 988 i.e. 28 pupils above the agreed level from previous planning consents. Therefore I would conclude that the point being made by the applicant in this application of the agreed capacity being taken up earlier than expected is not sound. However, having said the above, I would consider it to be a bit of mute point because the purpose of this application is to provide new teaching space to which effect will be an increase in pupils on the school roll. The increase in pupils is said to be for a temporary period of 1 year, but it should be made clear that this application is for the permanent construction of these buildings and they will not be removed in a year's time.

Taking account of the fact that the proposed location for the new school is on the site of the Former Arbour Vale school and that as yet no planning application has been received for this development as of yet then, I think it is reasonable to assume that it is unlikely that the new school will be ready for occupation for the start of the next school year in September 2015. Therefore it is likely that the secondary school will need to be in operation at this site for more than 3 terms and there would become a problem in September 2015 of where the new pupils would be accommodated until the new buildings are available for use. This risk has not been considered in the current application and there is no explanation of how this problem will be overcome.

**Trip Generation**

The Transport Statement has undertaken an assessment of the current travel patterns of Year 6 pupils and found that 41% of pupils currently get driven to school by car; this would equate to 33 pupils in the new secondary school. Of the 6 new staff that will be employed, 5 of the staff are expected to travel by

car. Therefore the school will attract an additional 38 arrivals in the morning drop off period and 33 departures and in the afternoon/evening collection period there will be 33 arrivals and 38 departures. Over the course of the day the new development will attract an additional 142 vehicle trips.

### **Car Parking**

The application states that there will be no additional car parking provided for the new staff members. This approach is considered acceptable as these new staff will only be present at the school for a limited period. However it is noted that staff parking will be accommodated within the northern part of the site and accessed from Gaveston Road. No plans have been submitted that illustrate the proposed or existing parking arrangement. I am unclear how this area does currently work and is proposed to work in the future in terms of accommodating staff parking and servicing for the primary and secondary school. Therefore I would request that detailed plans are submitted of the development showing the proposed parking layout and to include swept paths for service vehicles demonstrating that they can enter the site in a forward gear, turn within the site and leave in a forward gear, without in any way over running the proposed pedestrian path to the school. This requirement should be secured by way of a condition.

There is no opportunity to provide on-site parking or drop off facilities parents, nor would the local highway authority wish to encourage such provision as this has the potential to lead to a greater proportion of parents driving their children to school and in so doing so undermining efforts to change the travel behaviour away from the car to walking and cycling.

Parking surveys have been undertaken in Gaveston Road and adjoining streets on 16<sup>th</sup> January 2014 and again on 9<sup>th</sup> July 2014. The extent of the streets covered by the parking survey and the times of the survey were agreed with the applicant's consultant. The parking surveys found that within a 300m walk distance (4-5 minute walk time) of the school entrance on Gaveston Road that there is ample spare spaces to accommodate the additional parking demand of parents. This does not mean that there will not be any parking problems or inconsiderate parking acts occurring, as site observations at this school in the past have proved that parents have the habit of wishing to park as close to the school gates as possible, often without due consideration for parking restrictions or inconvenience caused to local residents.

Potentially the biggest area of risk will be to residents living in close proximity to the proposed pedestrian access to the site on Gaveston Road. It is difficult to recommend measures that will be effective in preventing inconsiderate parking, as the timeframe for implementation can often be considerable.

### **Pedestrian Access**

Pedestrian access to the secondary school is proposed from Gaveston Road. This pedestrian access to the school has been closed for several years on the grounds that it was not safe for pupils in terms of personal security. No explanation has been provided as to what has now changed to make it safe for pupils and I would recommend that this point is put to the school for an explanation. However it is stated that the access will be closed again in the future once the secondary school has moved to its permanent site. I can understand why local residents might be rather irritated by the school's approach on this matter, as the opening up of this access for pedestrian use would help to disperse the current parking and traffic pressure that exists on Garrard Road. Since the rear pedestrian access was closed it placed significantly greater pressure on Garrard Road and the residents have repeatedly complained that it has affected their amenity.

The drawings do not show in detail the proposed pedestrian access arrangements at the Gaveston Road access and I require these to be submitted prior to the determination of the application. If a safe pedestrian route that is physically separate, by way of fence and gate, from the car parking and servicing access can not be provided then this element of the proposal would have to be withdrawn. This would result in all of the pupil access being taken from Garrard Road and I think that in this

instance the application should be refused as this would place an additional burden of traffic and parking demand on the residents of Garrard Road, which could not be reasonably accommodated and thus the application should be refused.

In consideration of this application, I would recommend that the school and its Governors in liaison with the local ward councilors (and where necessary the local highway authority) review again the reasons for closing the Gaveston Road pedestrian access as it would appear from this application that the reasons for closing the rear access are not as unsolvable as previously suggested by the school.

### **Cycle Parking**

It is proposed that 9 additional cycle parking spaces are proposed to be provided, although there is no indication on the submitted plans where these will be located and in what form they will be provided. The cycle parking should be secured by way of a planning condition.

### **School Travel Plan**

The travel plan has been produced to support the proposal for Year 7 pupils being accommodated on site from September 2014 for one academic year.

The travel plan in its current form is of very poor quality in several areas and does very little to suggest involvement with the school in the travel plan process, or evidence that a range of measures will be put in place from the outset to actually deliver sustainable travel results. Furthermore there are no suggested targets within the plan.

It is recommended that the transport consultant and/or the school meets with SBC's Travel Plan Officer (Laura Wells) in order to discuss the travel plan in further detail. The travel plan in its current format is not acceptable and it is recommended that the travel plan is brought up to an acceptable standard prior to the determination of the application.

### **Summary**

An outcome of this application should be that clarity is provided on the agreed capacity of this school. It is my understanding that agreed capacity is 960 pupils for years 1-6 and the Nursery and the Reception. Therefore I would recommend that preferably the school is required to enter into a S106 agreement that binds them to having a capacity of no greater than 960 pupils for the year groups that I have identified. For the proposed Year 7 that the capacity of the school is no greater than 80 pupils as stated in this application and I would be willing to accept this for a maximum of up to 2 years as there is clearly a high risk that the new buildings will not be ready for occupation in September 2015. Further information is required prior to determination as to what happens if the school needs a year 8 – what are the contingency plans for this occurrence?

In terms of whether it would be acceptable to accommodate a Year 8 on this site for temporary period I do think that there comes a time when the impact of the development means that no further development on a site can be accommodated.

If these recommended limits on the number of pupils on the school roll cannot be secured by a S106 agreement then it will have to be done by a planning condition, but as planning conditions can be appealed there would still be a risk that this condition could be removed.

### **Recommendation**

The following information is required prior to determination:

- detailed drawings are submitted of the development showing the proposed parking layout and to include swept paths for service vehicles demonstrating that they can enter the site in a forward gear, turn within the site and leave in a forward gear, and without over-running the pedestrian path to the school;

- detail the proposed pedestrian access arrangements at the Gaveston Road access and I require these to be submitted prior to the determination of the application;
- the school to enter into a S106 agreement to limit the number of pupils on the school roll;

Furthermore I would strongly recommend that a process is agreed for how the school and its Governors together with local ward councilors (and where necessary the local highway authority) could review whether the pedestrian access to the school from Gaveston Road can remain open for use by pupils following the closure of the temporary secondary school.

Enter into a S106 agreement to agree the limit on number of pupils on the school roll.

Subject to the above being achieved and incorporating the conditions set out below I would not raise a highway objection.

### **Condition(s) required**

Should the application be revised in accordance with my comments the following condition(s) will apply.

1. No development shall be begun until details of the cycle parking provision (including location, housing and cycle stand details) have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The cycle parking shall be provided in accordance with these details prior to the occupation of the development and shall be retained at all times in the future for this purpose.

Reason: To ensure that there is adequate cycle parking available at the site in accordance with Policy T8 of The Local Plan for Slough 2004, and to meet the objectives of the Slough Integrated Transport Strategy.

2. No development shall be occupied until such time as a Travel Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Once agreed, the development shall operate in accordance with the agreed Travel Plan.

Reason: In order to minimise danger, obstruction and inconvenience to users of the highway, to reduce travel by car in accordance with Policy T15 of the Slough Local Plan 2004 and to meet the objectives of the Slough Integrated Transport Strategy.

3. The scheme for parking and manoeuvring and the loading and unloading of service vehicles using the Gaveston Road access as shown on the submitted plans shall be laid out prior to the initial occupation of the development hereby permitted and that area shall not thereafter be used for any other purpose.

Reason: To enable vehicles to draw off, park, load/unload and turn clear of the highway to minimise danger, obstruction and inconvenience to users of the adjoining highway.

### **Informative(s) required**

Should the application be revised in accordance with my comments the following informative(s) will apply.

1. The development must be so designed and constructed to ensure that surface water from the development does not drain onto the highway or into the highway drainage system. In order to comply with this condition, the developer is required to submit a longitudinal detailed drawing indicating the location of the highway boundary.

2. The applicant is advised that if it is intended to use soakaways as the method of dealing with the disposal of surface water then the permission of the Environment Agency will be necessary.
3. The permission hereby granted shall not be construed as authority to obstruct the public highway by the erection of scaffolding, hoarding, skip or any other device or apparatus for which a licence must be sought from the Highway Authority.
4. The applicant must apply to the Highway Authority for the implementation of the works in the existing highway. The council at the expense of the applicant will carry out the required works.

### **Intermodal Transportation Ltd Response to the Council's Transport Comments**

Photos, an aerial map and a site plan showing the parking layout, position of security fences and entrance gates from Gaveston Road have been received.

The comments below are in relation to addressing some of the matters raised by the Council's Transport Consultant:

#### **Pedestrian Access**

It is proposed to utilise the existing pedestrian access point to the site from Gaveston Road. As can be seen from the attached photographs and aerial screen print, the existing pedestrian access is segregated from the vehicle access way in that location and can be accessed via a wide segregated footway. The attached aerial screen print also shows the existing parking arrangements that are accessed from Gaveston Road.

#### **Car Parking and Access for Service Vehicles**

As indicated within the Transport Statement (TS) for this proposal no amendments to the car parking arrangements at the site are proposed in conjunction with the proposal. In addition, the TS indicates that day to day servicing arrangements for the proposal would be the same as for the existing school and service vehicles would enter the main site using the existing access from Garrard Road. As such we do not consider that swept path analyses for service vehicles are required.

### **Agent's Response to the Council's Transport Comments**

To reiterate Gillian Coffey's statement in an earlier email to you, the rear car park was not used as a pupil entrance as it works better from a security aspect if all the pupils can use the Garrard Road entrance. For calibration purposes, the rear access is currently used by refuse vehicles at restricted times, i.e. when school is in class, for fire access and when building operations require large plant to come on site or for temporary site huts.

The day to day service vehicles will still continue to use the Garrard Road access as outlined in the Inter-Modal report.

As a result of the **temporary** need for secondary school pupils on this site it was considered appropriate for those pupils to use the Gaveston Rd access as the classroom block they will be using is directly accessible to this entrance. Due to the earlier and later operating hours for the secondary school it will mean the existing security arrangements for the lower school will remain undisturbed.

### **CHANGE TO RECOMMENDATION.**

**Delegate to the Development Management Lead Officer for formal determination following the consideration of any additional comments received from consultees, consideration of further information regarding highway and transport matters and finalising conditions.**

24<sup>th</sup> July 2014 Slough Borough Council Planning Committee Amendments

**P/15809/000 - 412-426, Montrose Avenue, Slough**

**Consultation**

**Transport and Highways**

The Council's transport consultant has commented that there are outstanding issues with the proposal.

Car parking and cycle parking provision is considered to be acceptable.

The proposed retail units would be serviced from the rear and swept path drawings have been provided which are considered acceptable.

A Travel Plan has been provided however it is considered that this is not currently acceptable and must be revised.

The need for transport mitigation has been identified and this is subject to on-going negotiation.

**Planning Policy**

For clarity, it should be noted that Planning Policy were consulted on the application (as stated at paragraph 9.7) and raised no objections. Planning Policy's comments were incorporated into the main body of the officer report.

**Conditions**

Additional conditions are recommended covering the means of access; the submission of a Construction Management Plan; vehicle crossovers; access gates; pedestrian visibility; and surface water.

**NO CHANGE TO RECOMMENDATION**

**P/01913/010 - 9-10, Chapel Street, Slough, SL1 1PF**

Discussions have been undertaken with the Council's Transport Consultant who has confirmed that they would have the same issues and concerns as stated in the previous applications and outlined in section 13 of the Officers Report but would also require any Section 106 Agreement to restrict future residents from obtaining Residents Parking Permits for the area and an increase to the bin store to allow for the extra units.

It is acknowledged that the space that has been provided for cycle parking may be acceptable in terms of area but no details have been provided about the actual storage but this could be secured via condition if planning permission was to be granted and therefore reason for refusal number 7 can be deleted.

Reason for refusal 6 has been reworded to make the distinction between the shared access being for the ground floor commercial uses and upper floor housing and not the basement uses as follows:

The proposed building would result in an unsuitable singular entrance for ground floor commercial and the upper floor housing resulting in a crowded and congested entrance leading to security and amenity issues with concerns over security and the failure to design out crime, and given the scale and intensity of the layout could not be adequately designed out at the reserved matters stage. The development is therefore contrary to National Planning Policy Framework, Core Policy 8 of the Slough Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2006-2026 Development Plan Document: December 2008 and Policies EN1, of the Adopted Local Plan for Slough: 2004 (incorporated in the Composite Local Plan for Slough 2013).

**NO CHANGE IN RECCOMENDATION**



**P/05898/023 – Cornwall House, 67, High Street, Slough, SL1 1BZ**

**Environmental Quality**

The applicant has confirmed that they are agreeable to the requested contribution towards air quality monitoring and the provision of electric vehicle charging points. In addition, conditions are recommended regarding the submission of details relating to a sound insulation and ventilation scheme. The wording of these additional conditions is as follows:

**Noise**

No development shall commence until a noise impact survey and a scheme which shall include details of window and ventilation specifications for protecting the future occupiers of the flats hereby approved from road traffic noise has been submitted to the Local Planning Authority and approved in writing. Once approved, all measures that form part of the scheme approved by the Local Planning Authority shall be implemented prior to the first occupation of the development, and retained in that form thereafter unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

REASON In the interests of the living conditions for future occupiers in accordance with Core Policy 8 of The Slough Local Development Framework, Core Strategy 2006 – 2026, Development Plan Document.

**Air Quality**

No development shall commence until details of mitigation measures that will be implemented to protect the internal air quality of the development have been submitted to the Local Planning Authority and approved in writing. Once approved, the mitigation measures shall be fully implemented prior to the first occupation of the development and retained in that form thereafter unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

REASON In the interests of air quality and the living conditions for future occupiers in accordance with Core Policy 8 of The Slough Local Development Framework, Core Strategy 2006 – 2026, Development.

Subject to the above, the proposal is considered to be acceptable and compliant with Core Policy 8 of the Core Strategy.

**Section 106 Agreement**

An undertaking pursuant to Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act will be required for the payment of the contribution relating to air quality.

This contribution is considered to comply with Regulation 122 of The Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 in that it would be:

- (a) necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms;
- (b) directly related to the development; and
- (c) fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.

## **Conditions**

The above conditions relating to environmental quality are recommended along with an additional condition regarding the hours of use for the leisure unit. It is recommended that the use of this unit should be limited to 08:00-23:00 on Mondays-Saturdays and 10:00-20:00 on Sundays/Bank Holidays.

**NO CHANGE TO RECOMMENDATION**