

Hadlow (Hadlow) **562446 149512** **7 July 2013** **TM/13/01705/FL**
Hadlow, Mereworth And
West Peckham

Proposal: Demolition of existing stores; external alterations to existing classroom building; provision of a new temporary building; play area; perimeter fence; associated parking and pedestrian path to form a Free School for a temporary period
Location: Faulkners Farm Ashes Lane Hadlow Tonbridge Kent TN11 9QU
Applicant: Hadlow College

1. Description:

- 1.1 Planning permission is sought for the demolition of stores and the provision of a temporary building for a period of one year to provide a temporary school for the first year's intake of the Hadlow Community Rural School. The new building is proposed to accommodate two classrooms either side of a central lobby, each served by an individual store room.
- 1.2 The proposed works also involve external alterations to an existing classroom building in order to facilitate its use by the school. The internal alterations to this building and its subsequent use as classrooms and ancillary facilities by the proposed new school (instead of by the College) does not constitute development as defined by Section 55 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and as such does not require any formal approval from the LPA in its own right. For Members' information, this building will accommodate the majority of the school facilities comprising two classrooms, a dining hall, kitchen, cloakroom, staffroom, offices and WCs.
- 1.3 A ramp is proposed to be installed between the two buildings, with a roof over.
- 1.4 Associated security fencing, parking and a pedestrian footpath are also proposed to facilitate the operation of the temporary school.
- 1.5 A proposed perimeter fence at a height of 1.8m has been included on the plans but falls within the necessary permitted development provisions and therefore does not require approval from the Local Planning Authority either.
- 1.6 The physical works are continuing to take place on site although the use itself is not intended to commence until the beginning of the academic year in September. This means that Members are required to assess this application on a partially retrospective basis.

2. Reason for reporting to Committee:

- 2.1 Significant local interest and Departure from the Development Plan.

3. The Site:

- 3.1 Faulkners Farm currently accommodates the Hadlow College Animal Management Unit (AMU), a lambing shed, various outdoor animal enclosures, an atrium and other outbuildings in addition to additional teaching accommodation.
- 3.2 Faulkners Farmhouse belongs to Hadlow College but is privately let for office use.
- 3.3 Immediately adjacent to Faulkners Farm are four maisonettes (let to Hadlow College staff) and two privately owned semi-detached cottages (3 and 4 Faulkners Farm Cottages).
- 3.4 The Hadlow Grill restaurant (previously known as the Spice Lounge and before that the Rose Revived Public House) is located on the opposite side of Ashes Lane (to the west of the application site) and is a Grade II listed building. Old Chegs (also Grade II Listed) is located some distance to the north of Faulkners Farm. To the south lies The Ashes, a detached private dwellinghouse.
- 3.5 Access to the site is taken from Ashes Lane via the A26 to the south. The site currently has a separate 'in/out' access.
- 3.6 Hadlow College facilities are provided, in addition to Faulkners Farm itself, within the main campus to the north-east and Blackmans Dairy to the south-east. The area for the proposed secondary school is to the immediate north of Faulkners Farm and currently forms a grassed area of land that is bounded by hedgerow and fencing.

4. Planning History (most recent):

TM/06/02180/FL Grant With Conditions 4 September 2006

Single storey aviary to provide enhanced educational amenities for animal management students

TM/06/03047/RD Grant 1 November 2006

Details of waste disposal and vermin control submitted pursuant to condition 3 of planning permission TM/06/02180/FL: New aviary

TM/07/00482/FL Approved 2 May 2007

Consolidation of existing farm/agricultural buildings, new purpose built animal care, dog grooming and teaching block to replace temporary facilities

TM/07/01960/ORM Approved

8 August 2007

Amendments to the design of the teaching and dog grooming buildings, phasing and layout of planning permission TM/07/00482/FL: Consolidation of existing farm/agricultural buildings, new purpose built animal care, dog grooming and teaching block to replace temporary facilities

TM/08/01235/RD Approved

28 May 2008

Details of materials submitted pursuant to condition 2 of planning permission TM/07/00482/FL: Consolidation of existing farm/agricultural buildings, new purpose built animal care, dog grooming and teaching block to replace temporary facilities

TM/08/03765/RD Approved

19 February 2009

Details of materials being European Redwood submitted pursuant to condition 2 of planning permission TM/07/00482/FL (Consolidation of existing farm/agricultural buildings, new purpose built animal care, dog grooming and teaching block to replace temporary facilities) as an alternative to permission TM/08/01235/RD

TM/11/02861/FL Approved

6 December 2011

Installation of solar photo voltaic panels

TM/13/01482/FL Pending Consideration

Relocation of existing lambing shed and erection of two storey school building together with car parking, vehicle circulation area and landscaping

5. Consultees:

5.1 PC: Hadlow Parish Council is strongly aggrieved that this constitutes a retrospective application without any prior consultation with nearby residents, particularly given that construction has already started on site. Whilst we support the principle of a free school with a rural ethos in Hadlow, we object to the application for temporary school buildings by Hadlow College for many of the reasons stated in our response to the earlier application for the permanent free school site:

5.1.1 Inappropriate location due to concerns about highway and pupil safety - We are concerned that the proposed temporary location of the school would adversely affect the safety of pupils and road users.

5.1.2 The Faulkners Farm site poses an unacceptably high risk of injury to pupils who may attempt to access or alight at the bus stops nearby where there is no safe place to cross the busy A26. We note that the Highways Agency agrees with our

previous view that not all pupils will use the planned footpath on College land to access the proposed new crossing to the bus stops nearer the village. Moreover, this footpath would emerge opposite Blackmans Lane at a particularly dangerous bend. Should application TM/13/01482/FL for a permanent school building be approved, there would also be concerns over pupils' and students' welfare and safety whilst demolition and construction is continued around the temporary site.

5.1.3 The location also poses a risk to pupils cycling to the site, whether along the A26 or in the narrow lanes where visibility is poor.

5.1.4 The site poses a risk of accidents at the junction of Ashes Lane and the A26 given current speeds and volume of traffic.

5.1.5 We are concerned about the safety of pedestrians and car-users in Ashes Lane. The road, which is narrow and has poor visibility due to the blind bends, is not suitable for the increased traffic in both directions likely to be generated by the development.

5.1.6 Inappropriate development in the Green Belt - Although the adverse impact of the development on the openness of the green belt will not be as great as that of the proposed permanent buildings for Hadlow Rural Community School, the temporary accommodation would still be visible from Ashes Lane. As with the application for the permanent school building, the applicant accepts that the proposal constitutes inappropriate development, but it fails to demonstrate adequately the very special circumstances that would outweigh its harmful effect in the green belt.

5.1.7 Again we feel that Hadlow College has not given sufficient consideration to alternative sites – particularly on the main campus, a major developed site as designated by TMBC where infill development or redevelopment may be permitted provided certain criteria are met. A site on or closer to the main campus would be preferable as regards the safety of pupils and road users. It would have a lower impact on the openness of the green belt and would create fewer issues regarding privacy, noise and impaired amenity for neighbouring residents. Moreover, a site on the campus, which is closer to the village centre, would be more likely to encourage local pupils to walk to school rather than be transported by car.

5.1.8 Finally, we are disappointed at the eleventh hour nature of this application, given that the school is due to open to pupils on 5 September – in all likelihood before the application can be determined by TMBC. This gives no time to implement the safety recommendations provided by Highways and other agencies.

5.2 KCC(Highways): No objections.

5.3 EA: No comments to make.

5.4 NE: No comments to make.

5.4.1 Private Reps: 81+site + press notice/0X/20R/0S. Objections made on the following grounds.

- Application does not fulfil the requirement of very special circumstances for this development within the Green Belt;
- Need for such a school has not been adequately demonstrated;
- Loss of important agricultural land;
- Negative impact on the landscape;
- Increased traffic and associated road safety issues have not been properly addressed;
- Fears for children's safety;
- Other more suitable sites within Hadlow College;
- Works do not appear temporary in their scale and nature;
- Increase in noise and disturbance and a loss of privacy to neighbouring dwellings;
- Increased dilution in rural tranquillity in the area;
- Ashes Lane has no pavements or street lighting, which is in character with the lane, but this can make it hazardous particularly for pedestrians;
- Question how school will manage parking during school events such as parents evenings, sports days etc – parking within the site is inadequate for such events;
- Ashes Lane already suffers from water drainage problems – increased use of the drainage system will only serve to exacerbate this situation;
- Air pollution and disturbance to nearest neighbours arising from the bus drop off area;
- Unsustainable proposal – could not be financially viable unless the whole school was to follow on;
- Two applications should have been submitted as one application – refusal of one makes the other unviable;
- Applicant has not given enough consideration to the planning application process as pupils are already registered to start attending the school in September;

- Works have already commenced on site and residents feel that this is therefore a 'done deal';
- Serious concerns that, if the temporary school is allowed, the College would use it as a further argument for the permanent school to be allowed. They should not be considered in isolation;
- Disputes contents of Transport Assessment Addendum as being unrealistic and suggests that this has been submitted in an attempt to salvage an application that is '*fundamentally flawed*';
- Submission of the TA Addendum seems to suggest that highways and transport matters are the only remaining obstacles – no further information regarding very special circumstances have been provided;
- Management strategy to ensure pupils use the designated footpath is inadequate;
- Disagree with the conclusions of the TA Addendum that there is no need for the speed limit to be reduced;
- Sceptical about the data provided in respect of school travel patterns;
- Question why the footpath does not follow the desire line across the field rather than around its perimeter as proposed – more likely to be used by children and less impact on neighbours;
- Planting the route of the footpath with a line of Poplars would improve the view of the AMU when viewed from the A26;
- DfE cites a 'small school' as being an establishment with 100 or fewer children of statutory school age. Applicant states that this would be a small school but with 330 children it would not comply with the DfE definition;
- Nothing has been put forward that would address traffic backing up along Ashes Lane as vehicles attempt to turn right onto the A26;
- College has not passed the first stage at EOI to be considered for funding for their Sports Centre project so this site should not have been discounted;
- Temporary building already in situ already blights the Green Belt.

6. Determining Issues:

- 6.1 This proposal, while not being identical in terms of planning considerations to the previous application on this Agenda, TM/13/01482/FL, shares with that case many key policy considerations in respect of development in the Green Belt and in relation to new state schools. Members are invited to cross refer to paragraphs 6.1 – 6.7 of that report.
- 6.2 The merits of this particular case must be made in light of that policy framework and the particular circumstances of the proposal and the site and its surroundings in relation to a temporary rather than permanent proposal. I would however stress that, although there is a discernible link between this current application and the application for the permanent school, this application must be judged on its own merits irrespective of any conclusion reached in the case of the proposal for a permanent school.
- 6.3 The site lies within the Metropolitan Green Belt, outside the defined settlement confines of Hadlow. The NPPF sets out the national planning policy for Green Belt land. I will deal firstly with the principle of each aspect of the works in turn.
- 6.4 The proposed car park, access route and footpath must be considered in light of Paragraph 90 of the NPPF which states that engineering operations are not defined as inappropriate development as long as they preserve the openness of the Green Belt and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it. With this in mind, I do not consider the proposed car park, access route and footpath constitute inappropriate development within the Green Belt. I consider that the physical works required in the creation of these areas would have a negligible impact on the openness of the MGB. Clearly, when in use, the parked cars will change the landscape and have some impact on openness and the appearance of the site but this would be transient by its very nature rather than a permanent change and in itself must be seen in the context of the farm/AMU complex in this vicinity. This situation already exists elsewhere across Faulkners Farm. I therefore consider that this aspects of the proposal is not in conflict with the requirements of paragraph 90 of the NPPF.
- 6.5 Turning to the alterations to the *existing building*, paragraph 89 of NPPF allows for the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building. The proposed alterations to the existing classroom would not create any additional floorspace and therefore do not constitute inappropriate development and are policy compliant. As I have explained earlier in this report, neither the use of this existing classroom for the temporary school nor the associated internal alterations constitute development and thus the Council has no locus to consider those matters. They may go ahead independent of the Council's consideration.

6.6 The new building is certainly the most significant element of the application. The NPPF states that new buildings within the Green Belt are considered to be inappropriate development which, by definition, is harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. There are however specific exceptions to this, the most pertinent to this proposal being:

- *“The replacement of a building, provided the new building is in the same use and not materially larger than the one it replaces; or*
- *Limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed sites (brownfield land), whether redundant or in continuing use (excluding temporary buildings), which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development,”*

6.7 NPPF Green Belt policy is supported by policy CP3 of the TMBCS.

6.8 The store facilities demolished equate to a footprint of approximately 98sq.m whereas the new building has a footprint of 190sq.m, giving a net increase in footprint of approximately 92sq.m. The new building is therefore materially larger and would be in a different use to the stores. As such, it would constitute inappropriate development by definition. The NPPF states that *“inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt”* and such development should not be approved, except in very special circumstances. In view of the presumption against inappropriate development, substantial weight is attached to the harm to the Green Belt when considering any planning application concerning such inappropriate development. NPPF reads, at paragraph 88, *“When considering any planning application, local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to the harm to the Green Belt. ‘Very special circumstances’ will not exist unless the harm by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.”* It is therefore necessary to consider whether the development causes any other harm beyond that caused by virtue of its inappropriateness and, having done so, whether there are any other considerations relevant to the overall balance that demonstrates very special circumstances.

6.9 The Planning for Schools Development Policy Statement (DCLG - August 2011) is also relevant, stating that:

“...We expect all parties to work together proactively from an early stage to help plan for state-school development and to shape strong planning applications. This collaborative working would help to ensure that the answer to proposals for the development of state-funded schools should be, wherever possible, “yes”.

The Government believes that the planning system should operate in a positive manner when dealing with proposals for the creation, expansion and alteration of state-funded schools, and that the following principles should apply with immediate effect:

- ***There should be a presumption in favour of the development of state-funded schools, as expressed in the National Planning Policy Framework.***
- ***Local authorities should give full and thorough consideration to the importance of enabling the development of state-funded schools in their planning decisions.*** *The Secretary of State will attach significant weight to the need to establish and develop state-funded schools when determining applications and appeals that come before him for decision.*
- ***Local authorities should make full use of their planning powers to support state-funded schools applications.*** *This should include engaging in pre-application discussions with promoters to foster a collaborative approach to applications and, where necessary, the use of planning obligations to help to mitigate adverse impacts and help deliver development that has a positive impact on the community.*
- ***Local authorities should only impose conditions that clearly and demonstrably meet the tests set out in Circular 11/95.*** *Planning conditions should only be those absolutely necessary to making the development acceptable in planning terms.*
- ***Local authorities should ensure that the process for submitting and determining state-funded schools' applications is as streamlined as possible,*** *and in particular be proportionate in the information sought from applicants. For instance, in the case of free schools, authorities may choose to use the information already contained in the free school provider's application to the Department for Education to help limit additional information requirements.*
- ***A refusal of any application for a state-funded school, or the imposition of conditions, will have to be clearly justified by the local planning authority.*** *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.*
- ***Appeals against any refusals of planning permission for state-funded schools should be treated as a priority.*** *Where permission is refused and an appeal made, the Secretary of State will prioritise the resolution of such appeals as a matter of urgency in line with the priority the Government places on state education.*

• Where a local planning authority refuses planning permission for a state-funded school, the Secretary of State will consider carefully whether to recover for his own determination appeals against the refusal of planning permission.

This statement applies to both change of use development and operational development necessary to the operational needs of the school...

- 6.10 There is clearly a strong Government presumption in favour of school development as a matter of principle and the question that must therefore be addressed in terms of this new-build work is whether its status as “inappropriate development” is overridden by the strong presumption in Government policy in favour of new state schooling. Unlike proposal TM/13/01482/FL, that judgement needs to be assessed in the context of the proposal being for limited life, bearing in mind not only that in the earlier report it is accepted that a land based secondary school could reasonably co-located with Hadlow College but also because of the work, described in 6.6 above, that can take place without the need for the Council’s involvement.
- 6.11 In their supporting information, the applicant’s agent explains that they do not consider the works to constitute inappropriate development as the net increase in development on site is small when taking into account the demolished stores and therefore, they argue, would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt. This approach does not, in my view, represent a correct interpretation of the NPPF. For the reasons explained earlier, and notwithstanding the agent’s submissions, the new building does constitute inappropriate development and therefore requires justification in terms of whether any very special circumstances exist. The agent’s case, which has been articulated as an alternative to the argument above (an entirely legitimate approach to adopt), is essentially a duplicate of that produced in support of the case for the permanent school on this site, which is discussed at great length elsewhere on this Committee Agenda, but must be considered in light of the far more limited physical impact on the Green Belt from the new build.
- 6.12 In this latter sense it is important to make the distinction between the harm caused to the Green Belt by virtue of the inappropriateness of the development and the material physical harm ‘on the ground’. In this respect, I consider that the openness of the Green Belt would not be fundamentally compromised by the arrangements for the controllable aspects of the temporary school and, given the policy support for Government for new school facilities, the benefits of co-location of a land based school and the College amount to very special circumstances
- 6.13 Moreover, in terms of the net increase in footprint, whilst this does result in the development constituting inappropriate development by definition, its impact on the open visual character of the Green Belt at this point would be negligible when considering the far more substantial buildings located in close proximity to the new

temporary school building. The new building is seen very much within the context of the group of existing buildings within the Faulkners Farm complex by virtue of its particular siting. Furthermore, the physical scale of the building is such that, rather than being at odds with this established development, it would be seen very much as a subservient structure. Its particular treatment, having been timber clad, also assists in reducing its physical presence.

- 6.14 In addition, I would stress that the temporary classrooms are only proposed to be used by the School for a single academic year, ending on 23 July 2014, after which time, it is suggested, the new build classrooms would be removed and the land restored to its former use. This can be controlled by the use of planning condition, although it might be considered reasonable to allow this to run to September 2015 (or such earlier date as may be possible) to allow for a practical development programme for any permanent school that may be granted planning permission.
- 6.15 It is also necessary to assess the proposed development in all other respects, particularly its detailed design, impact on residential amenities and implications regarding highway safety. In these respects, the NPPF attaches great importance to the design of the built environment, stating that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development and is indivisible from good planning (paragraph 56). It also stresses the need for development to respond positively to local character, reflecting the identity of local surroundings whilst not discouraging appropriate innovation (paragraph 58).
- 6.16 Furthermore, policy CP24 of the TMBCS requires that development must respect the site and its surroundings and that it will not be permitted where it would be detrimental to the built environment and amenity of a locality. This is supported by policy SQ1 of the MDE DPD (2010) which states that all new development proposals should protect, conserve and where possible enhance:
- the character and local distinctiveness of the area including any historical and architectural interest and the prevailing level of tranquillity;
 - the distinctive setting of, and relationship between, the pattern of settlement, roads and the landscape, urban form and important views.
- 6.17 I consider that the proposed specific design, scale and relationship with the nearest neighbours would ensure the visual amenities of the area and the residential amenities of those nearest neighbours would not be adversely affected, especially in the context of the current farming/educational uses in the vicinity that do and/or can take place under the current planning position. The new building would be of such a scale that would not harm the visual amenities of the site and its surroundings.

- 6.18 I also appreciate the representations made by the nearest neighbours in connection with their residential amenities, given the proximity of the proposed car park to their boundaries. The College could intensify agricultural/educational operations on this part of the site, or for instance extend hard surfacing, without needing any approval from the local planning authority, and this is the context for judging the impact of the proposal on residential amenity arising from the increased levels of activity as a result of the proposed temporary school use.
- 6.19 Paragraph 121 of the NPPF states that planning decisions should ensure that sites are suitable for their new use taking account of ground conditions and land instability, including from natural hazards or former activities such as mining, pollution arising from previous uses and any proposals for mitigation including land remediation or impacts on the natural environment arising from that remediation. Clearly, given the position of the buildings in what is effectively a farmyard and the historic use of the site for agricultural operations, there may be a risk of some contamination. However, the temporary school is not intended to include any areas of soft landscaping providing play space or teaching gardens. The only associated outside space to be hard surfaced thus effectively limiting any potential for contaminants to be problematic.
- 6.20 A key objection to the scheme raised by local residents centres upon highway safety and in the case of the temporary school, a complex balance of issues must be struck.
- 6.21 The existing classroom and related provision at Faulkners Farm is already extensive and is contained within the AMU building as a lecture hall along with a series of teaching spaces and seminar rooms along with another classroom located to the south-east of the building which is already undergoing internal alterations. There is clearly a large student body which attends this set of facilities during the academic day. In contrast the temporary school identifies a limited, predetermined number of pupils registered to attend the School during its initial academic year. This will allow for an increased level of control/management of pupils when compared to the current onsite situation described above and also in contrast to the far higher number of pupils that are proposed to occupy the permanent school once it is operating at full capacity. I therefore consider that this proposal is acceptable in terms of potential traffic generation/pedestrian movements provided that there is a limitation on the number of pupils during the start-up period.
- 6.22 In light of all the above considerations, I consider that while some elements of the work to create the temporary school are “not development” and that some is “not inappropriate development” the small additional new build is not consistent with Green Belt policy and must be justified by very special circumstances if it is to be granted planning permission. In my view the strong national policy support for new state schools, the key benefits of co-location in relation to land based studies, the limited transport impacts *of this particular scale of* development and the limited

visual impact of the controllable new development constitute in combination very special circumstances such that I am able recommend that temporary planning permission be granted on a part retrospective basis.

7. Recommendation:

- 7.1 **Grant Temporary Retrospective Planning Permission** in accordance with the following submitted details: Letter MFP/HB/9575 dated 10.06.2013, Email dated 04.07.2013, Planning Statement dated 04.07.2013, Design and Access Statement dated 04.07.2013, Report special circumstances dated 04.07.2013, Report temporary access dated 04.07.2013, Site Plan A620-PL-201 B dated 07.06.2013, Existing Site Plan A620-PL-202 A dated 07.06.2013, Existing Roof Plan A620-PL-203 A dated 07.06.2013, Site Plan A620-PL-205 A demolitions dated 07.06.2013, Existing Elevations A620-PL-230 A dated 07.06.2013, Site Plan A620-PL-301 B proposed in context dated 07.06.2013, Site Plan A620-SK-105 C proposed dated 04.07.2013, Proposed Roof Plan A620-PL-303 A dated 07.06.2013, Proposed Elevations A620-PL-330 B dated 07.06.2013, Transport Assessment Addendum dated 09.08.2013 subject to the following:

Conditions:

- 1 The temporary school use hereby permitted shall be discontinued and the land restored to its former use on or before 30 September 2015 or at the opening of any permanent school at Hadlow College whichever is the earlier.

Reason: In the interests of preserving the open nature and function of the Metropolitan Green Belt.

- 2 This consent shall enure only for the benefit of Hadlow College and it shall not enure for the benefit of the land or any other person or persons for the time being having an interest therein.

Reason: To enable the Local Planning Authority to regulate and control the future use of the site in the interests of preserving the open nature and function of the Metropolitan Green Belt and in the interests of highway safety.

- 3 Within three months of the date of this permission, the footpath shown on plan number A620-PL-301 B shall be provided and maintained at all times thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of highway and pupil safety.

- 4 No external lighting shall be installed in connection with the building or the footpath until such details have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority, and the work shall be carried out in strict accordance with those details.

Reason: To ensure that the development does not harm the character and visual amenity of this rural locality.

- 5 The area shown on the submitted layout as vehicle parking space shall be kept available for such use and no permanent development, whether or not permitted by the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any order amending, revoking and re-enacting that Order) shall be carried out on the land so shown or in such a position as to preclude vehicular access to this reserved parking space.

Reason: Development without provision of adequate accommodation for the parking or garaging of vehicles is likely to lead to hazardous on-street parking.

- 6 The area shown on the submitted plan as turning area shall be kept available for such use and no permanent development, whether or not permitted by the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any order amending, revoking and re-enacting that Order), shall be carried out on the land so shown or in such a position as to preclude vehicular access to this reserved turning area.

Reason: Development without provision of adequate turning facilities is likely to give rise to hazardous conditions in the public highway.

- 7 The number of pupils in the first year of opening shall not exceed that set out in the Design and Access Statement:

Reason: In the interest of pedestrian and traffic safety.

- 8 The measures detailed in the Transport Assessment and the Transport Assessment Addendum dated August 2013 (insofar as it relates to the temporary school) shall be fully implemented to ensure compliance with the aims of the report.

Reason: In the interests of highway and pupil safety.

Contact: Emma Keefe