



Public Document Pack
TONBRIDGE & MALLING
BOROUGH COUNCIL

EXECUTIVE SERVICES

Chief Executive

Julie Beilby BSc (Hons) MBA

Gibson Building
Gibson Drive
Kings Hill, West Malling
Kent ME19 4LZ
West Malling (01732) 844522

Contact: Committee Services
committee.services@tmbc.gov.uk

27 June 2014

AREA 2 PLANNING COMMITTEE - WEDNESDAY, 2ND JULY, 2014

I am now able to enclose, for consideration at the Wednesday, 2nd July, 2014 meeting of the Area 2 Planning Committee, the following reports that were unavailable when the agenda was printed.

Agenda No Item

6. **TM/11/03020/OA - Phase 3 Platt Industrial Estate, Maidstone Road, Platt (Pages 3 - 10)**

 Supplementary report
7. **TM/14/02109/CR3 - Proposed School Site, Leybourne Chase, Leybourne (Pages 11 - 20)**

 Full report
8. **TM/14/01929/CR3 - Land at 30 Gibson Drive, Kings Hill (Pages 21 - 32)**

 Full report

J E BEILBY
Chief Executive

This page is intentionally left blank

Platt **561956 157554** **5 February 2014** **TM/11/03020/OA**
Borough Green And
Long Mill

Proposal: Outline Application: Proposed new industrial building,
 associated works plus highway amendments to the T Junction
 of the access road and A25 Maidstone Road. Landscaping
 details to be reserved

Location: Phase 3 Platt Industrial Estate Maidstone Road Platt
 Sevenoaks Kent TN15 8JL

Applicant: Prime Securities Limited

Discussion

In the main agenda Report I indicated that further detail would be provided with regard to the noise study and its findings.

The noise study predicts the noise impact to nearby dwellings as a result of the change of the kerb line. It uses conventional technical measures to assess the changes in noise climate, arising from all traffic turning to the east, as it may affect these nearby dwellings. Environmental Protection team colleagues have assessed the study.

They find that the LAmax readings (the LAmax shows the highest noise level reached in a given time period) taken during the daytime, which would be replicated already at night, show levels above those cited in both BS8233 and World Health Organisation's 'Guidelines for Community Noise' for sleep disturbance. So the existing situation currently is in excess of the guidelines for night-time sleep disturbance.

Guidance on dealing with applications that have a potential noise impact is given in NPPF Planning Practice Guidance (PPG - as cited in the Noise Report) and the Noise Policy Statement for England (NPSE – as cited in NPPF). In terms of this case the guidance that indicates the increase in LAmax by virtue of bringing the kerb line closer to the nearest property would not be significant. The change in noise would 'slightly affect the acoustic character of the area, but not such that there is a perceived change in the quality of life' and falls within the "No Observed Adverse Effect" category. This is because the change of 1.8dB (whilst technically making the environment noisier) would be imperceptible to the human ear.

The report does also highlight that the closest point of travel is actually slightly further back from the realigned kerb line, when vehicles will be level with the window. It goes on to say that the noisier part of the vehicle's travel will be when it is pulling onto the A25, which is at the point of the revised kerb line.

In light of this, I am satisfied that the changes in the noise environment resulting from the revised kerb line, provided to overcome an earlier highways objection, do not justify resisting the proposal on noise grounds.

As a result the recommendation below supports the grant of permission, subject to suitable conditions.

Recommendation:

Grant Planning Permission in accordance with the following submitted details: Elevations 3999-003 C dated 01.11.2011, Floor Plan 3999-004 A dated 01.11.2011, Topographical Survey dated 05.07.2012, Topographical Survey dated 23.07.2012, Site Plan 3999-002 E dated 05.07.2012, Letter dated 01.11.2011, Letter dated 18.06.2012, Letter dated 05.07.2012, Letter dated 23.07.2012, Design and Access Statement dated 01.11.2011, Transport Assessment Final dated 01.11.2011, Planning Statement dated 18.06.2012, Environmental Statement dated 18.06.2012, Habitat Survey Report dated 18.06.2012, Letter dated 20.01.2014, Certificate B dated 05.02.2014, Location Plan dated 20.01.2014, Road Safety Audit dated 20.01.2014, Survey Reptile dated 20.01.2014, Tree Report dated 20.01.2014, Topographical Survey dated 05.07.2012, Topographical Survey dated 23.07.2012, Letter dated 20.09.2012, Drawing 614034/SK05 Rev A dated 06.03.2014, subject to:

Conditions

- 1 Approval of details of the landscaping of the site, (hereinafter called the "reserved matters") shall be obtained from the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: No such approval has been given.

- 2 Application for approval of the reserved matters shall be made to the Local Planning Authority before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: In pursuance of Section 92(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

- 3 No new development shall take place until the applicant, or their agents or successors in title, has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological work in accordance with a written specification and timetable which has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that features of archaeological interest are properly examined and recorded.

- 4 If during the development, contamination not previously identified is found to be present on site then no further development (unless otherwise agreed in writing with the local planning authority) shall be carried out until the developer has submitted a remediation strategy to the Local Planning Authority detailing how this unsuspected contamination shall be dealt with and obtained written approval from the Local Planning Authority. The remediation strategy shall be implemented as approved.

Reason: To ensure any contamination encountered during construction works on site is properly investigated and in necessary remediated in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework aims for sustainable development. The site lies within a location where groundwater is vulnerable to pollution, due to the presence of a principal aquifer beneath the site and the location within Source Protection Zone 3 for local public water abstractions.

- 5 Prior to the commencement of the development, a detailed reptile mitigation strategy shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This strategy should include measures for reptile relocation from the site prior to development. All work shall then progress in accordance with the agreed mitigation strategy, unless otherwise approved in writing beforehand with the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In order to ensure that the reptiles found on site are adequately protected.

- 6 No development shall be commenced until:

(a) a site investigation has been undertaken to determine the nature and extent of any contamination, and

(b) the results of the investigation, together with an assessment by a competent person and details of a scheme to contain, treat or remove any contamination, as appropriate, have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The assessment and scheme shall have regard to the need to ensure that contaminants do not escape from the site to cause air and water pollution or adjoining land.

The scheme submitted pursuant to (b) shall include details of arrangements for responding to any discovery of unforeseen contamination during the undertaking of the development hereby permitted. Such arrangements shall include a requirement to notify the Local Planning Authority of the presence of any such unforeseen contamination.

Prior to the first occupation of the development or any part of the development hereby permitted

(c) the approved remediation scheme shall be fully implemented insofar as it relates to that part of the development which is to be occupied and,

(d) a Certificate shall be provided to the Local Planning Authority by a responsible person stating that remediation has been completed and the site is suitable for the permitted end use.

Thereafter, no works shall take place within the site such as to prejudice the effectiveness of the approved scheme of remediation.

Reason: In the interests of amenity and public safety.

- 7 The details submitted in pursuance of condition 1 shall be accompanied by a scheme of landscaping and boundary treatment which shall include a tree survey specifying the position, height, spread and species of all trees on the site, provision for the retention and protection of existing trees and shrubs and a date for completion of any new planting and boundary treatment. The scheme as approved by the Authority shall be implemented by the approved date or such other date as may be agreed in writing by the Authority. Any trees or plants which within 10 years of planting are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species, unless the Authority gives written consent to any variation.

Reason: Pursuant to Section 197 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and to protect and enhance the appearance and character of the site and locality.

- 8 The development hereby approved shall be carried out in such a manner as to avoid damage to the existing trees, including their root system, or other planting to be retained as part of the landscaping scheme by observing the following:
- (a) All trees to be preserved shall be marked on site and protected during any operation on site by a fence erected at 0.5 metres beyond the canopy spread (or as otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority).
 - (b) No fires shall be lit within the spread of the branches of the trees.
 - (c) No materials or equipment shall be stored within the spread of the branches of the trees.
 - (d) Any damage to trees shall be made good with a coating of fungicidal sealant.
 - (e) No roots over 50mm diameter shall be cut and unless expressly authorised by this permission no buildings, roads or other engineering operations shall be constructed or carried out within the spread of the branches of the trees.
 - (f) Ground levels within the spread of the branches of the trees shall not be raised or lowered in relation to the existing ground level, except as may be otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: Pursuant to Section 197 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and to protect the appearance and character of the site and locality.

- 9 No development shall commence until details of a scheme for the storage and screening of refuse has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The approved scheme shall be implemented before the development is occupied and shall be retained at all times thereafter.

Reason: To facilitate the collection of refuse and preserve visual amenity.

- 10 No development shall take place until details and samples of materials to be used externally have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority, and the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that the development does not harm the character and appearance of the existing building or the visual amenity of the locality.

- 11 The business shall not be carried on outside the hours of 06.00 to 22.00 Mondays to Fridays and 8.00 to 13.00 Saturdays, with no working on Sundays or Public and Bank Holidays unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To avoid unreasonable disturbance outside normal working hours to nearby residential properties.

- 12 There shall be no open storage of materials, plant or equipment outside the area(s) shown for such use on the approved plans, and the height of open storage shall not exceed 2 metres.

Reason: To avoid obstruction of vehicle parking/manoeuvring areas and to ensure the character and appearance of the development and the locality is not significantly harmed.

- 13 The use shall not be commenced, nor the premises occupied, until the area shown on the submitted layout as vehicle parking space has been provided, surfaced and drained. Thereafter it 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 or 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 of vehicles is likely to lead to hazardous on-street parking.

Informatives:

- 1 Prior to occupation, the applicant is required to enter into a Section 278 agreement with the Highway Authority in order to achieve the necessary associated off-site highway works.
- 2 No works can be undertaken on a Public Right of Way without the express consent of the Highways Authority. In cases of doubt the applicant should be advised to contact the Public Rights of Way officer before commencing any works that may affect the Public Right of Way. Should any temporary closures be required to ensure public safety then the Public Rights of Way office at Kent County Council will deal on the basis that:
 - The applicant pays for the administration costs
 - The duration of the closure is kept to a minimum

- Alternative routes will be provided for the duration of the closure
- A minimum of 6 weeks notice is required to process any applications for temporary closures.

This means that the Public Right of Way must not be stopped up, diverted, obstructed (this includes any building materials or waste generated during any of the construction phases) or the surface disturbed. There must be no encroachment on the current width, at any time now or in the future and no furniture or fixtures may be erected on or across Public Rights of Way without consent.

The successful making and confirmation of an order should not be assumed.

- 3 The exact position of foul sewers must be determined on site by the applicant before the layout of the proposed development is finalised.
- 4 No new soakaways should be located within 5 metres of a public sewer.
- 5 No excavation/development or new tree planting should be located within 3 metres of either side of the centreline of the foul rising main and foul sewer.
- 6 All existing infrastructure should be protected during the course of construction works.
- 7 Should any sewer be found during construction works, an investigation of the sewer will be required to ascertain its condition, the number of properties served, and potential means of access, before any further works commence on site. The applicant is advised to discuss this matter further with Atkins Ltd, Anglo St James House, 39A Southgate Street, Winchester, SO23 9EH (Tel: 01962 858688).
- 8 A formal application for connection to the public sewerage system is required in order to service this development, please contact Atkins Ltd, Anglo James Street, 39A Southgate Street, Winchester, SO53 9EH (Tel: 01962 858688) or www.southernwater.co.uk.
- 9 The applicant should contact 03708 506506 or consult the Environment Agency website to establish whether a consent will be required. www.environment-agency.gov.uk
- 10 The developer is advised to:-
 - i) follow the risk management framework provided in CLR11, Model Procedures for the Management of Land Contamination, when dealing with land affected by contamination;
 - ii) Refer to the Environment Agency Guiding principles for land contamination for the type of information that is required in order to assess risks to other receptors such as human health.
 - iii) Refer to the website at www.environment-agency.gov.uk for more information.

- 11 Care should be taken during and after construction to ensure that all fuels, oils and any other potentially contaminating materials should be stored (for example in bunded areas secured from public access), so as to prevent accidental/unauthorised discharge to ground. The areas for storage should not drain to any surface water system.
- 12 Where it is proposed to store more than 200 litres (45 gallon drum = 205 litres), or any type of oil on site, it must be stored in accordance with the Control of Pollution (oil storage) (England) Regulations 2001. Drums and barrels can be kept in drip trays if the drip tray is capable of retaining 25% of the total capacity of all oil stored.
- 13 If a protected species is encountered during the course of the development, then works should cease and advice sought from an ecological consultant.
- 14 The applicant is advised that the mammal hole on the southern boundary of the original reptile survey area be monitored in conjunction with the reptile mitigation strategy to establish whether it is being used by badgers.
- 15 The applicant is strongly advised to contact the Environmental Protection Team at the Local Authority to determine what changes will be needed with regard to the Environmental Permit, which the current site is subject to, issued by the Environmental Protection Team under Regulation 13 of the Environmental Permitting Regulations 2010 (as amended).
- 16 During the demolition and construction phase, the hours of working (including deliveries) shall be restricted to Monday to Friday 07:30 hours - 18:30 hours; on Saturday 08:00 to 13:00 hours, with no work on Sundays or Public/Bank Holidays.
- 17 Although it would not be possible at this stage under Environmental Health legislation to prohibit the disposal of waste by incineration, the use of bonfires could lead to justified complaints from local residents. The disposal of demolition waste by incineration is also contrary to Waste Management Legislation. It is thus recommended that bonfires not be had at the site.
- 18 The Local Planning Authority supports the Kent Fire Brigade's wish to reduce the severity of property fires and the number of resulting injuries by the use of sprinkler systems in all new buildings and extensions.

Contact: Holly Pitcher

This page is intentionally left blank

Leybourne West Malling And Leybourne	567910 159021	12 June 2014	TM/14/02109/CR3
---	----------------------	---------------------	------------------------

Proposal:	Regulation 3 consultation for erection of a new school together with new car parking and associated playing field landscaping (KCC ref: KCC/TM/0173/2014)
Location:	Proposed School Site Leybourne Chase Leybourne West Malling Kent
Applicant:	KCC Property And Infrastructure Support

1. Description:

- 1.1 Since the original allocation of Leybourne Grange as a strategic housing allocation in the 1990s the opportunity/need for a primary school to support the housing development has been anticipated and was finally given approval in principle when the Secretary of State granted outline planning permission for the development in 2004.
- 1.2 Many Members will be aware of the Kent Basic Needs Programme for schools that is partly funded by the Department of Education in the form of basic need capital grant and an additional and separate “Targeted Basic Need” programme. The provision of “Targeted” monies by Government is an indication that there are specific existing localised needs to be met.
- 1.3 As a result of the above factors, KCC is proposing a new primary school at Leybourne Chase which, in order to benefit from the “Targeted Basic Need” programme grant, must aim to be open to receive reception classes by September 2015. This will make provision both for the “Targeted” need and also the emerging need derived from the Leybourne Chase development itself.
- 1.4 The proposal is to provide a new primary school at Leybourne Chase for September 2015. I understand that the national overall funding regime determines that this provision will be either an academy or free school admitting 30 Reception aged pupils per year. Intake will be gradual over a 7 year period. The school is designed to also host a specialist resourced provision (SRP) for pupils who have greater difficulty learning as a result of behavioural, emotional and/or social difficulties. The SRP will be inclusive provision for up to 8 pupils (usually 1 per year group). The latest forecast data indicates that the Local Authority, without the provision of the proposed new school, will be unable to provide Reception Year places in sufficient numbers for children to be educated locally, resulting in children having to travel further for their education. This concludes that Leybourne Chase is the only available option for the timely delivery of primary school places for that locality.

- 1.5 The application comprises the erection of a new 1FE primary school (210 pupils), with the potential capacity for expanding to 2FE (420 pupils) at a future date. The site will accommodate hard standing play courts, formal and informal hard and soft play spaces, habitat areas, a sports pitch (to be upgraded to all-weather if the school is expanded to 2FE) and a car park/drop-off area.
- 1.6 The application intention is for the school to also act as a civic focus for the Leybourne Chase community.
- 1.7 It is proposed that vehicle access to the site will be achieved via Hawley Drive to the west of the school building. This will provide an access into the proposed car parking area located directly to the south of the access road. A separate access, which will provide the main route towards the school buildings and a link for service vehicles, is also proposed via the access road located to the east of the access to nearby housing. The new car park and drop off area at the western end of the site would accommodate 83 cars.
- 1.8 Pedestrian access to the school will be provided via a gated entrance to the south of the main route into the school, segregated from the vehicle access and the service access to ensure pedestrian safety. This will be linked to a section of footway provided to the south of the access road.
- 1.9 Bicycle storage is situated just inside this gated access.
- 1.10 The proposed new school building is arranged over two-storeys. The hall parapet level is at 8.9m above the finished ground level, while the teaching accommodation parapet terminates at 7.5m above the finished ground level. This extended parapet also acts as a screen to the ventilation plant.
- 1.11 As the school needs to be opened for September 2015, the use of offsite construction and standardized prefabricated components are to be utilized as much as possible to reduce material waste and increase the speed of construction. The proposal for the school is to use two different types of profiled cladding panels to help reduce the overall mass of the building. The ground floor external walls are clad using grey panels, while the upper floor, in response to the design of the adjacent housing, is clad using black panels. The external walls are punctured by a series of powder coated fixed windows, louvres and doors. The vertically arranged yellow coloured louvre panels and the coloured window reveals are intended to help to break down the linear form of the building by adding rhythm to the elevations.
- 1.12 A bin store has been located at the front of the site, which will accommodate all of the school's refuse (domestic and recycling). A refuse vehicle would need to enter the site, turn through the service yard and exit in forward gear.
- 1.13 The application includes submissions on trees, ecology, drainage, Flood Risk and contamination.

1.14 The plans give no details as to external lighting but indicated lighting will be during opening hours only.

2. Reason for reporting to Committee:

2.1 The level of local interest and the relationship with the pending renewal outline application TM/12/03238/FLEA.

3. The Site:

3.1 This site is Green Belt land. There are no Listed Buildings, Conservation Areas or Tree Preservation Orders in the red line application site but there are TPO trees close to the northern boundary with root protection zones being within the application site.

3.2 The proposed site for the new school covers an area of approximately 1.78ha and is situated to the south east of the Leybourne Grange development, approximately 1.2km to the north of West Malling and 1.4km to the north west of Leybourne. The Leybourne Grange development as a whole was previously granted outline planning permission for up to 702 dwellings together with an access road, community hall, shop, primary school and lay-by (planning reference TM/94/01253/OA, revised by TM/08/00757/FL). Some of the development has been implemented (phases 1, 2 and 3b).

3.3 The proposed school site is located at the southern end of the development, and contains a substantial belt of mature trees running through the site. The site is bounded by phase 2 and the, as yet, unbuilt phase 3a of the Taylor Wimpey residential development to the north, by the West Kent Health Needs Education Service main site and administration centre to the west and by further open land to the east and south. There are football pitches to the south.

3.4 The area proposed for development is currently composed of an open grass paddock and is not used for general recreation. A footpath runs along the site's southern boundary adjacent to the line of mature trees, although that is not the definitive route, the definitive route of the PROW runs through the site itself. KCC will need to resolve this particular issue under its own powers as a planning authority and as the highways authority.

4. Planning History:

4.1 Planning permission was initially granted for 702 dwellings plus additional units in the conversion of the Listed Building in 2004. That permission has been renewed and details approved against the original permission and the renewal. TMBC currently holds an undetermined application to extend the period for the submission of Reserved Matters – it is intended to approve this renewal in the near future; this requires the completion of a S106 planning obligation, which is currently being concluded.

5. Consultees:

- 5.1 Statutory consultations, including notification of local residents, are carried out by KCC.

6. Determining Issues:

- 6.1 This is a KCC application and it is KCC's role to assess the case in all policy and technical aspects.
- 6.2 The issues to be focused on are the principle of the development, the impact on Green Belt and the impact on the local road network. The latter is important in this regard as the school is shown to be accessed off roads built to serve a small number of houses in Phase 2 which, we understand, were not consciously designed to serve a primary school.
- 6.3 In terms of the principle of development, the conclusion of the Secretary of State in 2004 establishes that a school is acceptable in this location. This reflected a Local Plan allocation dating back to the 1990s. The Government has pledged its support, in general, for the development of schools by producing the Planning or Schools Development Policy Statement in August 2011. The Statement requires Local Authorities to apply a presumption in favour of the development of state-funded schools, as expressed in the NPPF paragraph 72. Local authorities are required to give full and thorough consideration to the importance of enabling the development of state-funded schools in their planning decisions and it is confirmed that the Secretary of State will attach significant weight to the need to establish and develop state-funded schools when determining appeals that come before him for decision. The Policy Statement requires Local Authorities to make full use of their planning powers to support state-funded schools applications.
- 6.4 KCC as the Strategic Commissioner of Education Provision in the County is responsible for ensuring there are sufficient places of high quality for all learners. The development of over 700 homes at Leybourne Grange is expected to produce additional demand for primary school places that cannot be met locally.
- 6.5 For 2013/14 and 2014/15 the Local Education Authority has received a basic need capital grant of £38.6 million from the Department for Education (DfE), to fund additional school places. The DfE retained a further £982 million to allocate nationally under the 'Targeted Basic Need' programme. KCC has been successful in securing Targeted Basic Need funding to manage the increased need and future need in Leybourne.
- 6.6 Policy CP3 states that national Green Belt policy will be applied. NPPF paragraph 87 states that inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. Paragraph 88 confirms that 'Very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is

clearly outweighed by other considerations. The school development would be inappropriate development within the Green Belt for the purposes of the NPPF. KCC will have to consider whether there are “Very Special Circumstances” which are considered to be of sufficient weight as to outweigh the broad policy objection in the context of the Government policy position, and the fact that there have been two previous planning permissions (one from the Secretary of State) on part of the current application site. The following matters might be considered to constitute ‘very special circumstances’ that cumulatively outweigh any policy Green Belt objection:

- Acceptance of the need for a new school in this location at original outline stage and the grant of outline planning permission on two occasions.
- The need for the new school to address current need as well the additional demand arising from the Leybourne Chase housing provision and also to seek to meet the needs of the wider area.
- The benefits of the new primary school to the wider community.
- The whole site has previously been granted planning permission for a mixture of residential and community uses, all within the Green Belt, and as such, there are no practical alternatives within the application boundary (for the original or renewed outline consent) that would fall outside the Green Belt.

6.7 Policy SQ1 (Landscape and Townscape Protection and Enhancement) seeks to ensure that new development protects or enhances the distinctive setting of, and relationship between, the pattern of settlement, roads, and the landscape, urban form and important views’.

6.8 In terms of Policy CP24 which seeks to promote a high standard of design quality , it is claimed that the proposal has been designed in such a way as to minimise the impact upon the character and appearance of the Green Belt, and in particular, its openness. The school site would be seen against the backdrop of the Leybourne Chase development but it has always been recognised that it occupies a transitional position between open undeveloped fields to the south and the residential development of Leybourne Chase to the north. I am satisfied that the balance of black/grey colour of the elevations, a subtle combination of colours in landscape terms, and the use of yellow accents to the windows, strikes a reasonable balance between restraint and the creation of a visually stimulating environment for the pupils.

6.9 Paragraph 125 of the NPPF 2012 confirms that by encouraging good design, planning decisions should limit the impact of light pollution from artificial light on local amenity, intrinsically dark landscapes and nature conservation. The new school development will require external lighting, which will be designed to comprise low-level lighting to the primary external circulation areas, access ways and car park. It is not, at this stage, proposed to introduce floodlighting to the

existing MUGA or any of the new external playing pitches, and the lighting that is installed around the school will be the minimum necessary to allow safe access in the evenings.

- 6.10 NPPF Paragraph 32 states that a transport statement or Transport Assessment should support all developments which generate significant amounts of movement. Paragraph 36 of the NPPF recognises that the key tool in achieving its Highways Strategy is the completion, monitoring and management of a Travel Plan. Policy CP2 (Sustainable Transport) requires that new development that is likely to generate a significant number of trips should be well located relative to public transport, cycle and pedestrian routes and with good access to local service centres; minimise the need to travel through the implementation of Travel Plans and the provision or retention of local services and facilities; either provide or make use of, and if necessary enhance, a choice of transport modes, including public transport, cycling and walking; be compatible with the character and capacity of the highway network in terms of the volume and nature of traffic generated; provide for any necessary enhancements to the safety of the highway network and capacity of transport infrastructure and ensure accessibility for all.
- 6.11 Policy SQ8 (Road Safety, Transport and Parking) states that development proposals will only be permitted where they would not significantly harm highway safety and where traffic generated by the development can adequately be served by the highway network.
- 6.12 Parking will be provided to the south west of the school comprising a total of 42 parking spaces for staff, 31 parental spaces, 6 drop-off bays, 4 disabled parking spaces and 2 spaces for minibuses. This provision has been based on the demand generated by school with full 2FE. The level of car parking complies with Kent SPG4 Parking Standards (which is staff plus 10%). However, there are concerns that these standards do not allow for significant parental dropping off by car and further analysis on the appropriate level of parking has been carried out by the applicant's transport consultants.
- 6.13 Existing data sourced from six primary school Travel Plans has been averaged to determine the likely pupil mode split associated with the new school at Leybourne Chase. It is assumed by the consultants that around 60 per cent of those pupils who travel by car would travel with a sibling. This sibling rate appears to be much higher than quoted in other school transport statements and needs further justification.
- 6.14 The trip assessment for parental vehicles concludes that at 1FE capacity peak would be 139 vehicle trips in the morning/afternoon peak periods with 278 at 2FE capacity.
- 6.15 SPG4 Vehicle Parking standards would require 28 staff/visitor spaces for a 1FE School and 55 staff/visitor spaces for a 2FE. The proposals provide a total of 42 spaces allocated to staff which would generally comply with the standards for a

2FE and exceeds the maximum for a 1FE by 14 spaces. This is considered to be acceptable given that the school will increase to a 2FE in the future and over provision initially in parking spaces will prevent overflow onto narrow local roads in the short term if the school opens as 1FE.

- 6.16 The proposals provide a total of 42 parking spaces on-site for staff use. With the school at 1FE capacity it is envisaged that the demand for staff parking would be for around 17 spaces and assuming a total of 25 staff. As the school increases to a 2FE the demand associated with 50 staff would be 34 spaces. The applicant's consultants state that parking provision can therefore accommodate the likely staff parking demand without overflow onto the local highway.
- 6.17 The applicant's consultants propose that parents will use the on-site facilities for pupil pick up and drop off and not have to rely on local roads to do so. A total of 31 'parking and stride' spaces and 6 drop off bays are provided within the car park to accommodate this. The TS says it can be expected that with a 1FE (210 pupil) capacity, the demand for the 'park and stride' spaces would be approximately 26, and for the drop off bays the demand would be around 35. The demand for the drop off bays can be accommodated within the proposed facilities. With the school at full 2FE capacity (420 pupils) the demand for the 'park and stride' spaces would be approximately 52, and for the drop off bays the demand would be around 70.
- 6.18 In light of the existing intimate residential road layout surrounding the proposal site, it is proposed by the applicant's consultants that, in the first instance when the school is created as a 1FE capacity, the on-site parking provision for staff and pupil drop-off would over-provide to the full standards required by a 2FE. This is intended to ensure that any desire for pupil pick-up/drop-off to take place on the local roads is minimised from the outset and that parental behaviour can be encouraged to utilise the on-site facilities from the outset.
- 6.19 To ease the flow of traffic outside of the school and on the local road network it has been suggested that the school implements an informal one-way route around the site as a whole, controlled through a Traffic Management Plan. However, the shared surface *in situ* may not be due for adoption in the near future and the enforceability of a one way route needs further analysis. KCC should be encouraged to plan for this, monitoring from the opening of the school.
- 6.20 It is acknowledged by the applicant's consultants that some aspects of the access layout will need to be confirmed at the detailed design stage prior to construction. This will include the relocation of two unallocated parking spaces at the site access, minor realignment of the carriageway and the consideration of access radii.
- 6.21 The road immediately outside the school is a shared surface without footway and has narrow pinch points intended to calm traffic in a residential environment. It was not designed to serve a school and the applicant's consultants have not appeared to take account of this factor nor have they detailed clearly the extent of the

adopted highway or that due for adoption. KCC need to be urged to ensure that the addition of a school at this location does not unduly burden either local residents with congestion at peak periods nor TMBC in its parking control role. In particular, there should be investigation as to moving the main vehicular access to the east so as to minimise as far as practicable 2 way traffic in front of phase 2 houses.

- 6.22 A further key factor has been omitted by the applicant's consultants. That is, that a wider Traffic Management Plan is needed which should factor in the existence of a bus gate which is currently still a requirement for the Leybourne Chase development permission. However, as the Inspector indicated in his report to the Secretary of State in 2004, the use of a bus gate was justified in the context of the then Inquiry but that the matter would better be reviewed in light of contemporary circumstances during the development process. The bus gate, if it were to be installed, will prevent the northern part of the development from directly accessing the School and similarly for any traffic seeking to enter Leybourne Chase from the Birling Lane access. It is understood that Taylor Wimpey are again looking at the potential that the bus gate is no longer needed (KCC appears to accept this and discussions are actively in hand with the Highways Agency with regard to impacts on M20/J4) but, at this point in time, it is a planning requirement and its implications in terms of access to school facilities serving the area needs to be considered in much greater detail than has been included in this application. However, in this latter regard, this Council is in discussion with Taylor Wimpey with regard to the development of the nearby Community/retail/health facilities where there will be associated parking which should be able to provide some drop-off parking even if the bus gate remains.
- 6.23 KCC should be encouraged to define the construction access and routing arrangements at the start of the project.
- 6.24 At this stage, there are no bus services that route through the Leybourne Grange development; however bus services will route to/from the site in the future as more of the residential development comes forward.
- 6.25 With regard to cycles, the standards provided in SPG4 require a minimum of one cycle space per 50 pupils. As with the mode shift towards walking once the school is increased to a 2FE capacity, it is likely that there would be more opportunity for pupils to cycle to school once the surrounding residential development is complete. The TS envisages that with the school at 1FE capacity there would be 8 trips made by bicycle, and following the increase to a 2FE there would be 16 pupil trips. It is proposed that 5 cycle stands (10 cycle spaces) will be provided in accordance with the SPG4 minimum standards.

- 6.26 Notwithstanding the matters set out above with regard to access and transport, these need to be resolved during the construction period, but should not hold-up the overall project for fear of leaving the local community bereft of adequate primary schooling for the current and emerging children of the community.
- 6.27 The rationale for a new school is appreciated and indeed has enjoyed planning permission in the past. KCC is the applicant and determining authority and will consider all the material issues. No objections should be raised in the light of the current Government Schools policy but there are some issues which might usefully be highlighted as worthy of further analysis.

7. Recommendation:

7.1 **No Objections.** KCC should consider the following points:

- 1 A Traffic Management Plan is required for a wider area to the extent of the adopted highway. This should factor in the existence of a bus gate while this is a planning requirement for the Leybourne Chase development.
- 2 Consideration should be given to the provision of a segregated footway access all the way to the entrance from any potential walking routes, including any potential drop off from the northern part of the site if the bus gate were to be installed as currently required.
- 3 Consideration should be given to the widening of highway pinch points to better allow 2 way traffic flows all the way to the adopted highway.
- 4 There should be investigation as to moving the main vehicular access more to the east, so as to minimise as far as practicable school related traffic in front of phase 2 houses.
- 5 Review the level of proposed cycle/scooter racks based on evidence of likely use from *similar* schools in the Borough.
- 6 Develop construction access and routeing arrangements as early as possible and engage local residents on the subject.
- 7 The submitted application omits consideration of the definitive line of the Public Right of Way.
- 8 Note that the Root Protection Zones of nearby TPO trees fall into the northern part of the site.
- 9 Consideration should be given to the control of external lighting operation hours to minimise impact on the Green Belt.

Contact: Marion Geary

This page is intentionally left blank

Kings Hill **567360 155580** **2 June 2014** **TM/14/01929/CR3**
Kings Hill

Proposal: Regulation 3 consultation for demolition of existing KCC commercial services building (see application reference 13/01535/OAEA and 14/01174/DEN); Construction of new access road between Gibson Drive and spur off Tower View (approved under KCC/TM/0386/2013); Construction of new two-storey, three-form entry primary school and associated vehicle and pedestrian access, car park and landscaping (KCC ref: KCC/TM/0149/2014)

Location: Land At 30 Gibson Drive Kings Hill West Malling Kent ME19 4QG

Applicant: Kent County Council Education Department

1. Description:

- 1.1 At the time of the grant of permission, by the Secretary of State in late 2004, for the Phase 2 housing scheme of 750 dwellings, KCC had not anticipated an immediate need for further primary school provision at Kings Hill. KCC indicated to the Inquiry that should further provision prove necessary then that provision would be procured by the normal strategic education planning process. As Members will be aware, the level of primary school provision on Kings Hill has, over the last few years, become a key local issue. In part this application reflects KCC’s response to the position it adopted in 2003/4 and the situation that has emerged since that time. The application is one for determination by KCC and the Borough Council is a consultee.
- 1.2 Many Members will be aware of the Kent Basic Needs Programme for schools that is partly funded by the Department of Education in the form of basic need capital grant and an additional and separate “Targeted Basic Need” programme. The provision of “Targeted” monies by Government is an indication that there are specific existing localised needs to be met.
- 1.3 As a result of the above factors, KCC is proposing a new primary school at Kings Hill which, in order to benefit from the “Targeted Basic Need” programme grant, must aim to be open to receive reception classes by September 2015. This will make provision for the “Targeted” need that has emerged since 2004. “Targeted Basic Need” monies must be used to provide either a free school or academy.
- 1.4 The KCC proposal is, therefore, to provide a third primary school at Kings Hill for September 2015. This will be an academy admitting 30 Reception aged pupils per year. The school will host a specialist resourced provision (SRP) for pupils who have greater difficulty learning as a result of behavioural, emotional and/or social difficulties. The SRP will be inclusive provision for up to 15 pupils. The latest forecast data indicates that the Local Authority, without the provision of the proposed new school, will be unable to provide Reception Year places in sufficient

numbers for children to be educated locally, resulting in children having to travel further for their education. This is stated as the only available option for the timely delivery of primary school places at Kings Hill.

- 1.5 Kent County Council Education department has secured a targeted basic need funding for building a new school; it will initially build 1FE (30 pupils per form entry, giving 210 over seven years). It will also accommodate up to 15 autistic spectrum pupils.
- 1.6 Phase 2 of the school is larger and would create a 3FE with up to 630 pupils. The design and access statement indicates that 1FE school is for the existing deficiency at Kings Hill/Mereworth generally taking into account committed but unbuilt dwellings. The 2nd and 3rd FE are intended to provide for the extra houses that may arise should the current planning application for the provision of 635 dwellings in lieu of commercial development be approved and implemented (a case which is as yet undetermined).
- 1.7 An existing office/warehouse on the site formerly occupied by Kent County Supplies will be fully demolished and a new access road from Tower View will form the main access point. The application now submitted by KCC includes the remainder of the new access through-road which is significantly traffic calmed. The existing access to Gibson Drive is shown to become left in-left out and is expected to be a secondary access.
- 1.8 The new school will be 7.9 m tall. It will be flat roofed and have a brick faced ground floor and white rendered upper floor. Louvered panel windows with bright primary colours are proposed to add visual interest. Phase 1 is longitudinal and phase 2, if added later, would convert it to a L-shape.
- 1.9 Parking will comprise 70 spaces in phase 1 and an additional 30 spaces is the intended final car park size. Therefore 100 spaces in total with 7 extra spaces to be used as drop off that will be in front of the school frontage on its south east elevation. Two pedestrian access routes from the new access road are shown but there is no pedestrian route to the actual door of the school.
- 1.10 Turfed playing pitches will be built within phase 1. There will be a covered seating area. Two MUGAs (multi use games areas) will also be built. There will be an area of soft play. This will be fenced with a hedgerow to the road frontage.
- 1.11 The car park will be built at the NE corner of the site. Where it abuts a line of mature trees, it will have a “no dig” form of construction and be permeable over the Root Protection Zones. A footway access also runs alongside the tree belt but again this be partially “no dig” construction and made permeable for similar reasons.
- 1.12 There is to be a cycle stand for 15 bikes for children and 3 bikes for adults.

- 1.13 There is proposed a 2m high weld mesh fence to the road with hedge to be planted. The MUGA will have 3m high weld mesh fence, part will be along the road frontage.
- 1.14 The new school will have a footprint of 185 8 m² and will be 7.9 m tall. It will be built to BREEAM standards “very good” but no on-site energy generation is proposed as this is an element that is not funded by the education grants.
- 1.15 An ecological survey was carried out in November 2013 - there has been no follow-up report regarding bats.
- 1.16 The flood risk assessment indicates there is no risk from flooding: surface water will go to deep bore soakaways using petrol interceptors when necessary.
- 1.17 In terms of contamination, a submitted report states that further studies were to be carried out: again these have not yet been received by TMBC.
- 1.18 In terms of noise, it is submitted in an acoustic report that there are no issues. Possible residential development opposite within phase 3 has been included into the assessment: any noise from the MUGA is said to be masked by the road noise.
- 1.19 The plans give no details as to external lighting but indicate lighting will be during opening hours only.
- 1.20 An archaeological desk top study has been carried out indicating the possible presence of airfield and related structures: the level of archaeological interest is low to moderate. Trial trenching is recommended.
- 1.21 An arboricultural report states that there are trees to the north and north-east boundaries, some of which may need removal but they would be of low quality.

2. Reason for reporting to Committee:

- 2.1 The level of local interest and the relationship with the pending outline application TM/13/01535/OAEA.

3. The Site:

- 3.1 The proposed site for the new school covers an area of approximately 2.7 ha and is situated on the eastern part of Kings Hill with an access off Gibson Drive.
- 3.2 This is an existing office/warehouse formerly occupied by Kent County Supplies to be demolished. This measures 128 m x 140 m and is 11.5 m high.
- 3.3 Kings Hill is a new settlement formed of business and residential areas. The proposal is located within the business section of the site. A range of office developments surround the site. There is a 6m drop on the north side of the site.

- 3.4 The units are two storeys and are screened from the site by trees edging the perimeter to the site. The site currently has a single vehicular entrance from Gibson Drive in the south western corner of the site that also provides pedestrian access. The access is gated and regulated by a gate house. Parking is provided around the entire perimeter of the depot.
- 3.5 This site is designated employment land within an urban area, subject to Policy E1 (r) of the DLADPD which safeguards the area for mixed use employment, including education.
- 3.6 There are no Listed Buildings, Conservation Areas or Tree Preservation Orders on the site.

4. Planning History: update

TM/77/11100/FUL No Objection 2 August 1977

County Supplies Department Complex and improvement to access road.

TM/90/10835/OLD No Objection 1 October 1990

Detailed submission under Reg 4: alterations to and use of existing accommodation for County Library Services Offices, workshop and storage.

TM/99/00302/CR3 Grant With Conditions 18 June 1999

change of use of parts of the building from warehouse/storage to office use, plus provision of 161 car parking spaces and retrospective permission of current office space(1045 sq.m.)(KCC ref: TM/99/Temp/C)

TM/11/00321/CR3 Approved 10 March 2011

Enlargement to car park and improvements to disabled access. KCC ref TM/10/TEMP/0039

TM/13/01535/OAEA

Outline Application (with all matters reserved except for means of access) for the demolition of existing buildings including the KCC Supplies depot and removal of a section of Kings Hill Avenue; the erection of up to 635 residential dwellings; a two form entry primary school with associated playing fields and land safeguarded for an extension to create a three form entry primary school; a multi-functional extension to the community hall; -a skate park; formalisation of car parking areas at the Community Centre and adjacent to Crispin Way; improvements to the highway network at Alexander Grove, Gibson Drive and Queen Street; and trim trails, woodland paths and green spaces

TM/14/01174/DEN Prior Approval Not
Required

Demolition of Kent County Council Supplies Depot, ancillary buildings and
hardstanding

5. Consultees:

5.1 Statutory consultations, including notification of local residents, are carried out by
KCC.

6. Determining Issues:

6.1 This is a KCC application and it is KCC's role to assess the case in all policy and
technical aspects.

6.2 This detailed full planning application for a primary school has come forward
independent of the phase 3 residential application, TM/13/01535/OAEA,
submitted to TMBC (and which itself promoted a 2FE school in outline). In the
responses to TM/13/01535/OAEA received to date, much concern has been
expressed that the third primary school was too close to Kings Hill School and
would be better on the north side of Tower View, closer to the houses proposed in
phase 3.

6.3 This KCC application is, however, different in that it now proposes a 1FE school
intended to serve the existing community at Kings Hill, independent of the future
housing application (albeit the second phase of the school application would allow
for educational provision to support the future proposed residential scheme,
should that obtain planning permission in due course). In this regard, its location
south of Tower View makes sense, not least because the Education Authority has
secured this site and is seeking to promote this approach to deal with an urgent
and existing deficiency. Clearly it is intended that it could be enlarged to also deal
with any need should Phase 3 be granted planning permission. Thus in those
circumstances and bearing in mind the strong Government policy support for its
new school programme as a whole, I consider that the location of the school within
Kings Hill overall is an appropriate response to the circumstances as they currently
exist.

6.4 Therefore the issues to be focused on are the principle of the development, the
impact on Employment land and the impact on the local road network. The latter is
important in this regard as there is a record in Kings Hill, as in many locations
around Primary Schools, of problems caused by parental dropping-off and
collection of children from the public highways in the vicinity of primary schools.

6.5 In terms of the principle, the Government has pledged its support for the
development of schools by producing the Planning or Schools Development Policy
Statement in August 2011. The Statement requires Local Authorities to apply a
presumption in favour of the development of state-funded schools, as expressed in

the NPPF paragraph 72. Local authorities are required to give full and thorough consideration to the importance of enabling the development of state-funded schools in their planning decisions and it is confirmed that the Secretary of State will attach significant weight to the need to establish and develop state-funded schools when determining appeals that come before him for decision. The Policy Statement requires Local Authorities to make full use of their planning powers to support state-funded schools applications.

- 6.6 KCC as the Strategic Commissioner of Education Provision in the County is responsible for ensuring there are sufficient places of high quality for all learners. The existing and committed development at Kings Hill is expected to produce additional demand for primary school places that cannot be met locally.
- 6.7 For 2013/14 and 2014/15 the Local Education Authority has received a basic need capital grant of £38.6 million from the Department for Education (DfE), to fund additional school places. The DfE retained a further £982 million to allocate nationally under the 'Targeted Basic Need' programme. KCC has been successful in securing Targeted Basic Need funding to manage the increased demand in areas such as at Kings Hill: Phase 2 of the scheme is dependent upon the grant of a planning permission for that development.
- 6.8 The property lies within the E1(r) policy area which covers the existing built-up commercial area of Kings Hill. This safeguards this area of Kings Hill as a mixed use employment area suitable for offices, research and development and light industrial use (B1) as well as hotel, conference, education and training and commercial leisure uses. The policy seeks to safeguard the policy area for employment uses i.e. Class B2 General Industrial, Class B1 Business and Class B8 storage and distribution except where otherwise specified. In this case an exception is specified with regard to educational development. In addition the policy states that any new development or redevelopment within the policy area must not result in any unacceptable impact on residential amenity through impacts such as noise, dusts, visual intrusion or traffic generation. The policy preamble notes that it is essential to continue to maintain the quality of the Kings Hill development and that employment uses which would detract from the low density, high quality character of the area would be refused. This also states that the design of individual buildings will need to pay regard to the wider landscape setting of the site and should not intrude on the wider area through inappropriate building heights, colour of materials, inappropriate illumination or inadequate marginal screening.
- 6.9 The application site is located in a policy area safeguarded for employment (Class B1, B2 and B8) use under the Core Strategy. However the later and more detailed policy guidance of the Land Allocations DPD (adopted 2008) specifically allocates the site as part of a wider mixed use area: uses including educational development are considered suitable. In terms of policy reliance, it is considered that the Land Allocations DPD policy hold greater weight. In addition it needs to be borne in

mind that NPPF requires that Planning Authorities do not seek to retain employment land if there is no obvious market for that purpose. (It must be borne in mind that KCC, corporately, has detailed knowledge of the property market in respect of commercial use of this site as it is the underlying land-owner.)

- 6.10 It would appear from the documentation contained in the already submitted Outline Application for Phase 3 Kings Hill development, which currently promotes a primary school to support its residential proposal, that employment floorspace within Kings Hill has been slow on uptake, and not solely as a result of economic conditions since 2007/8 and the demand for the type of premises, available across Kings Hill as a whole, is low.
- 6.11 Policy SQ1 (Landscape and Townscape Protection and Enhancement) seeks to ensure that new development protects or enhances the distinctive setting of, and relationship between, the pattern of settlement, roads, and the landscape, urban form and important views. In terms of Policy CP24 which seeks to promote a high standard of design quality, the proposal has been designed in such a way as to minimise construction costs and time but still provide building form and materials in keeping with the locality and allow for a sensible approach to expansion should that prove necessary.
- 6.12 Paragraph 125 of the NPPF 2012 confirms that by encouraging good design, planning decisions should limit the impact of light pollution from artificial light on local amenity, intrinsically dark landscapes and nature conservation. The new school development will require external lighting, which will be designed to comprise low-level lighting to the primary external circulation areas, access ways and car park. It is not proposed to introduce floodlighting to the MUGA or any of the new external playing pitches and the lighting that is installed around the school will be the minimum necessary to allow safe access in the evenings.
- 6.13 NPPF Paragraph 32 states that a transport statement or Transport Assessment should support all developments which generate significant amounts of movement. Paragraph 36 of the NPPF recognises that the key tool in achieving its Highways Strategy is the completion, monitoring and management of a Travel Plan. Policy CP2 (Sustainable Transport) requires that new development that is likely to generate a significant number of trips should be well located relative to public transport, cycle and pedestrian routes and with good access to local service centres; minimise the need to travel through the implementation of Travel Plans and the provision or retention of local services and facilities; either provide or make use of, and if necessary enhance, a choice of transport modes, including public transport, cycling and walking; be compatible with the character and capacity of the highway network in terms of the volume and nature of traffic generated; provide for any necessary enhancements to the safety of the highway network and capacity of transport infrastructure and ensure accessibility for all.

- 6.14 Policy SQ8 (Road Safety, Transport and Parking) states that development proposals will only be permitted where they would not significantly harm highway safety and where traffic generated by the development can adequately be served by the highway network.
- 6.15 Parking will be provided to the south west of the school comprising a total of 70 then 100 parking spaces with 7 drop-off bays and includes disabled parking spaces. The level of car parking over-provides against Kent SPG4 Parking Standards (which is staff plus 10%) and this is to be welcomed in light of difficulties experienced at both Kings Hill School and Discovery School at various times. However, there are concerns that these standards do not allow for significant parental dropping off by car and further analysis on the appropriate level of parking has been carried out by the applicant's transport consultants.
- 6.16 Further assessment has been undertaken in the light of the prevailing pattern in Kings Hill where a significant proportion of parents drive their children to and from primary school. Generally the TS reports that Discovery School is 3FE and is thus a precedent for the 3FE proposed at this site. However, Discovery School has only been 3FE since 2010 and does not have the full 630 roll yet and so the actual pupil numbers there are needed in order to assess if their extrapolation is robust.
- 6.17 Statistics from the applicant's transport consultant indicate 33% of children will travel by car to the school and that, factoring in any siblings, they take this down to 25% actual vehicular attraction from parents. They convert this into saying that the 1FE school will attract 53 vehicles overall whereas 3FE school would attract 160 vehicles overall. The TA estimates a 20% reduction in this figure for after-school clubs. It estimates that 10% will arrive from the south via Gibson Drive; the remainder will all arrive from the north via Tower View. The transport statement states that 66% will all arrive at the same time - this gives an 84 maximum demand from parents in the car park, with 36 spaces estimated already being taken up by staff. The overall peak demand is given as 120. Whilst this is greater than the capacity of the car park, there is scope for parental vehicles to drop off in the circulatory area and thus be contained on site.
- 6.18 Vehicular and pedestrian access to the school will be new. The vehicle circulation will be one way to ease flow and avoid congestion at peak times. The main car-parking area also has a by-pass route, again to aid flow at peak times allowing parents who drop and go to exit swiftly.
- 6.19 The justification for the left in/left out change for the Gibson Drive junction is not clear and may simply encourage U-turns in Gibson Drive (or Churchill Square etc) and so not have the intended effect of stopping rat running but actually worsen conditions. KCC should be invited to review this notion, although as Highways Authority it has the final decision on any necessary Traffic Regulation Order (if one proves necessary).

- 6.20 Existing data sourced from 4 primary school Travel Plans has been averaged to determine the likely pupil mode split associated with the new school at Kings Hill. This approach is considered to accurately reflect local travel patterns. It is assumed that around 47.5 per cent of those pupils who travel by car would travel with a sibling.
- 6.21 The trip assessment concludes that parental traffic at 1FE capacity peak would be 115 and 112 vehicle trips in the morning/afternoon peak periods with 351 and 337 at 3FE capacity.
- 6.22 With regard to staff parking, standards would require 28 spaces for a 1FE School and 97 spaces for a 3FE. The proposals provide a total of 70 and then 100 spaces allocated to staff which would comply with the standards for a 3FE and exceeds the maximum for a 1FE by 14 spaces. There is no justification given in the report for over provision initially. There would be a tripling of pupil numbers but only a 35% increase in parking on site.
- 6.23 The proposals provide a total of 39 parking spaces on-site for staff use. With the school at 1FE capacity it is envisaged that the demand for staff parking would be for around 17 spaces and assuming a total of 25 staff. As the school increases to a 3FE the demand associated with 88 staff would be 36 spaces. The parking provision can therefore accommodate the likely staff parking demand without overflow onto the local highway.
- 6.24 It is proposed that parents will use the on-site facilities for pupil pick up and drop off and not have to rely on local roads to do so. A total of 64 'parking and stride' spaces and 7 drop off bays are provided within the car park to accommodate this.
- 6.25 It is concluded by the applicant consultant that once Travel Plan initiatives have been implemented this can be reduced to a level that can be fully catered for with the introduction of the pupil pick up and drop off facility proposed and would not result in severe transport impact upon the surrounding road network. It is claimed that the proposed new school would also meet with the requirements of MDEDPD policy SQ8 in that it provides for safe access and could not be detrimental to highway safety and can be adequately served by the highway network.
- 6.26 The proposals will lead to an increase in the number of those travelling to and from the site on foot. The new link road will be traffic calmed with 2m wide footways.
- 6.27 Pedestrian access is provided by two gates serving pedestrians approaching from either direction. From the west, entry is adjacent to the vehicle entry gates; from the east, entry is adjacent to the vehicle exit gates. This means that pedestrians do not need to cross vehicle entry points, although there is no segregation at these points which may need to be addressed.

- 6.28 In the context of the existing walking facilities surrounding the site, it is not considered that any further local infrastructure will be required to facilitate the development other than a controlled pedestrian crossing on Tower View if phase 3 were granted planning permission and resulted in a flow of children needing to access this school by foot or cycle. However, it is considered that a crossing is only effective and safe when actual road speeds are near 30mph. This part of Tower View is not due to be adopted and so traffic calming may be necessary to control actual speeds if a crossing is to be installed.
- 6.29 Bus services to Kings Hill use Tower View and, if phase 3 were to be granted planning permission, there would be a circular bus route to/from the site in the future as more of the residential development comes forward.
- 6.30 With regard to cycles, the standards provided in SPG4 require a minimum of one cycle space per 50 pupils. As with the mode shift towards walking, once the school is increased to a 2FE capacity, it is likely that there would be more opportunity for pupils to cycle to school once the surrounding residential development is complete. It is proposed that 18 cycle spaces (15 child and 3 adult) will be provided in accordance with the SPG4 minimum standards. However, the consultant do not appear to have taken account of empirical evidence from other local schools which have a lot more cycle use than that estimated.
- 6.31 In conclusion, the rationale for a new school is appreciated – there is a current unmet need and should phase 3 be permitted and go ahead then the 2/3 FE capacity will need to be commissioned (and any planning permission for Phase 3 will require a legal obligation to be placed on the developer to secure the provision of the necessary additional resources). KCC is the applicant and determining authority and will be obliged to fully consider all the material issues. No objections should be raised in the light of the current Government Schools policy but there are some issues which need to be highlighted which require further analysis.

7. Recommendation:

- 7.1 **No Objections.** KCC should consider the following points:
- 1 Consideration should be given to provision of a segregated footway access all the way to the entrance from any potential walking routes.
 - 2 Consideration should be given to provision of more cycle/scooter racks based on evidence of likely use from similar schools in the Borough.
 - 3 A condition is needed regarding construction access and routeing arrangements.
 - 4 Follow up bat survey and contamination survey and review should be considered.

- 5 Transport Statement - the justification for the left in/left out change for the Gibson Drive junction should be reviewed as it may simply encourage people to U-turn in Gibson Drive (Churchill Square etc).
- 6 Consideration should be given to the opportunity to manage traffic speeds on Tower View near the site.

Contact: Marion Geary

This page is intentionally left blank