**Item No.** 6.2  
**Classification:** Open  
**Date:** 24 March 2015  
**Meeting Name:** Planning Committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Address:</strong> BREDINGHURST SCHOOL SITE, INVERTON ROAD, LONDON, SE15 3AZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposal:</strong> Demolition of all buildings and the erection of a new two storey primary school building to expand Ivydale Primary School including associated landscaping and provision of a multi use games area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward(s) or groups affected: Peckham Rye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From: Head of Development Management</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Application Start Date** 16/12/2014  
**Application Expiry Date** 17/03/2015  
**Earliest Decision Date** 08/02/2015

**RECOMMENDATION**

1. That the planning committee grant planning permission subject to conditions.

**BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

**Site location and description**

2. The site includes a total of six buildings, all currently vacant but were last in use in 2012 for education purposes for Bredinghurst School. Demolition works for these buildings is currently underway at the time of writing. The school moved into a new purpose built school which is located to the immediate south west of the site which is called 'Newlands Academy'.

3. The site is rectangular shaped and has its sole street frontage on Inverton Road. There is a public footpath to the north west of the site which connects Inverton Road with Stuart Road and Sartor Road.

4. The character of the surrounding area is predominantly residential, with buildings that are two storeys high. Nunhead cemetery and Nunhead allotments are located further to the northwest of the site.

**Details of proposal**

5. The proposal is for the demolition of all six school buildings on the site and for the erection of a new two storey school in order to form part of the Ivydale School whose main site is located 300m to the north east of the site along Lanbury Road. Consent for the demolition of the existing buildings has already been obtained (ref 14/AP/3930) and the demolition works have begun.
6. The new building would provide an additional accommodation for the Ivydale School, with two new forms of entry created. This would allow the school to expand from two forms of entry as existing, to four forms of entry. The school would be for years 3 to 6, with the other year groups at the existing school. In terms of pupil numbers, there are 459 existing pupils at the existing Ivydale School. The proposed two form entry expansion would increase the pupil roll to 840. Total staff numbers are expected to increase from 85, to 120.

7. The new school would front onto the south-eastern frontage of Inverton Road with the external play space along the north-eastern frontage.

8. No staff car parking is proposed. Cycle parking is proposed which would be accessed from Inverton Road.

9. Revised drawings were submitted showing an alternative design for the front elevation of the school. A revised Arboricultural Report was also received to correct some inaccuracies.

Planning history

10. 14/AP/3930 Application type: Prior Approval (PRAP)
Demolition of all school buildings comprising teaching space and gymnasium.
Decision date 13/11/2014 Decision: Prior Approval Required - Approved (PARA)

Planning history of adjoining sites

11. At Bredinghurst School, Stuart Road (now known as the Newlands Academy)
11/AP/1283 Application type: Full Planning Permission (FUL)
Demolition of existing buildings on school playing field and construction of a new school building of 3,780sqm up to two storeys in height, with new vehicle and pedestrian accesses from Stuart Road.
Decision date 06/07/2011 Decision: Granted (GRA)

KEY ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION

Summary of main issues

12. The main issues to be considered in respect of this application are:

   a) the principle of the development in terms of land use and conformity with strategic policies;
   b) the impact upon the amenity of adjoining occupiers;
   c) transport issues;
   d) design issues, including height and massing;
   e) impact on trees;
   f) planning obligations, and
   g) sustainable development implications.

Planning policy

13. The site lies within the Suburban Density Zone, The Peckham and Nunhead Action Area, and the Air Quality Management Area. The site is not located within a conservation area, nor is it within the setting of any listed building.

   National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework)
   Section 4 Promoting sustainable transport
   Section 7 Requiring good design
Section 8 Promoting healthy communities
Section 10 Meeting the challenge of climate change
Section 11 Conserving and enhancing the natural environment

The London Plan 2015 Consolidated with Alterations since 2011

Policy 3.16 Protection and enhancement of social infrastructure
Policy 3.18 Education facilities
Policy 5.1 Climate change mitigation
Policy 5.2 Minimising Carbon Dioxide Emissions
Policy 5.3 Sustainable Design and Construction
Policy 5.7 Renewable Energy
Policy 5.9 Overheating and Cooling
Policy 5.10 Urban Greening
Policy 5.11 Green Roofs and Development Site Environs
Policy 5.12 Flood Risk Management
Policy 5.13 Sustainable Drainage
Policy 6.1 Strategic Approach
Policy 6.9 Cycling
Policy 6.10 Walking
Policy 6.13 Parking
Policy 7.2 An Inclusive Environment
Policy 7.3 Designing out Crime
Policy 7.4 Local Character
Policy 7.5 Public Realm
Policy 7.6 Architecture
Policy 7.14 Improving Air Quality
Policy 7.21 Trees and Woodland

Core Strategy 2011
Strategic Policy 1 – Sustainable development
Strategic Policy 2 – Sustainable transport
Strategic Policy 4 - Places to learn and enjoy
Strategic Policy 12 – Design and conservation
Strategic Policy 13 – High environmental standards
Strategic Policy 14 – Implementation and delivery

Southwark Plan 2007 (July) - saved policies
The Council's cabinet on 19 March 2013, as required by para 215 of the NPPF, considered the issue of compliance of Southwark Planning Policy with the National Planning Policy Framework. All policies and proposals were reviewed and the Council satisfied itself that the polices and proposals in use were in conformity with the NPPF. The resolution was that with the exception of Policy 1.8 (location of retail outside town centres) in the Southwark Plan all Southwark Plan policies are saved. Therefore due weight should be given to relevant policies in existing plans in accordance to their degree of consistency with the NPPF.

Policy 2.2 – Provision of new community facilities;
Policy 2.4 – Educational deficiency – Provision of new Educational Establishments;
Policy 3.1 Environmental effects
Policy 3.2 Protection of amenity
Policy 3.3 Sustainability assessment
Policy 3.4 Energy efficiency
Policy 3.6 Air quality
Policy 3.7 Waste reduction
Policy 3.9 Water
Policy 3.11 Efficient use of land
Policy 3.12 Quality in design
Policy 3.13 Urban design
Policy 3.14 Designing out crime
Policy 3.15 Conservation of the historic environment
Policy 3.28 Biodiversity
Policy 5.2 Transport impacts
Policy 5.3 Walking and cycling
Policy 5.6 Car parking
Policy 5.7 Parking standards for disabled people and the mobility impaired

Peckham and Nunhead Area Action Plan 2014 (AAP)
Policy 8: Schools

Principle of development

14. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was published on 27 March 2012. At the heart of the NPPF is a presumption in favour of sustainable development.

15. Paragraph 72 of the NPPF states that the Government attaches great weight to ensuring a sufficient choice of school places and states that local planning authorities should take a proactive, positive and collaborative approach to meeting this requirement. It advises that great weight should be attached to the need to create, expand or alter schools.

16. Policy 3.18 Education facilities of London Plan confirms the Mayor would strongly support the provision of new schools. Strategic policy 4 – ‘Places to learn and enjoy’ of the Core Strategy, supports the building of new schools and improving of existing schools to provide improved education opportunities, and states that schools will be protected where there is a long-term need. Saved policies 2.2 ‘Provision of new community facilities’ and 2.4 ‘Educational deficiency – provision of new educational establishments’ of the Southwark Plan 2007 support the provision of new and improved educational and community facilities.

17. The Peckham and Nunhead Area Action Plan (Policy 8) refers to schools and states that additional school places would be provided in the action area to meet anticipated demand for pupil places. It also states that schools would be rebuilt to improve educational opportunities.

18. Therefore, there are no objections to the principle of constructing a new school on this existing school site, subject to compliance with all other relevant policies of the Core Strategy and Southwark Plan.

19. In line with saved policy 2.2 of the Southwark Plan and also Policy 8 of the AAP, which requires that provision is made to enable new facilities to be used by all members of the community, the school has indicated that the forest garden would be opened up for use to other schools and the wider community. It is not yet clear what other facilities would be made available, such as the MUGA and hall, and so further details are required by condition.

Environmental impact assessment

20. According to the Regulations, the site could be classified as a Schedule 2 ‘urban development project’ by virtue of its site area which is (0.435 hectares). Assessment was then made as to whether the development is likely to have a significant effect upon the environment by virtue of its nature, size or location, based on a review of the Schedule 3 selection criteria for screening Schedule 2 Development.

21. The nature, scale and location of the development is not such that it would be likely to
give rise to environmental effects of more than local significance. The site is not located within a 'sensitive area' as defined by the Regulations. It is therefore concluded that no Environmental Impact Assessment would be required.

**Impact of proposed development on amenity of adjoining occupiers and surrounding area**

22. Policy 3.2 Protection of Amenity of the Southwark Plan seeks to protect the amenity of existing and future occupiers in the surrounding area or on the site.

**Daylight and sunlight**

23. A daylight and sunlight assessment was submitted with the application. The report assesses the scheme based on the Building Research Establishments (BRE) guidelines on daylight and sunlight.

24. The BRE sets out a number of detailed daylight tests. The first is the Vertical Sky Component test (VSC), which is the most readily adopted, and is the one used in the submitted report. The test considers the potential for daylight by calculating the angle of vertical sky at the centre of each of the windows serving the residential buildings which look towards the site. The target figure for VSC recommended by the BRE is 27% which is considered to be a good level of daylight and the level recommended for habitable rooms with windows on principal elevations. The BRE have determined that the daylight can be reduced by about 20% of their original value before the loss is noticeable.

25. In relation to sunlight, the test is to calculate the annual probable sunlight hours (APSH) taking into account the amount of sun available in both the summer and winter for each given window which faces within 90 degrees of due south. The assessment requires that a window should receive a quarter of annual probable sunlight hours in the summer and at least 5% of sunlight hours during the winter months.

26. The submitted report measures impacts currently experienced by surrounding residential properties and how these impacts would alter following construction of the proposed development. As referred to above, the daylight test undertaken is the VSC test, which is the main daylight test in the BRE guide. The surrounding residential properties which are in close enough proximity to the site to possibly be impacted are 83 Harlescott Road, 50 Lanbury Road, 13 Inverton Road, 2 Inverton Road and 2-12 Surrey Road. The impacts on each of these properties is assessed below. Other properties not considered have no windows in the elevation facing the site.

**83 Harlescott Road**

27. This is an end of terrace property to the north-east of the proposed school whose side elevation is on Inverton Road facing the site. In terms of daylight amenity, the windows on this property would comply with the BRE guidelines by retaining 27%. The reductions are all considered to be very minor in the region of 1%. In terms of sunlight, all of the windows comply with the BRE guidelines with over 50% of annual sun and 14% of winter sun. At these levels, the amount of sun received would be well in excess of 25% APSH including at least 5% APSH during the winter months. The impacts on this property are therefore considered acceptable.

**50 Lanbury Road**

28. This property is also located to the north of the proposed school. Its side elevation faces onto Inverton Road. All of the windows on this property would comply with the BRE recommendations for daylight with all windows continuing to receive 27% VSC in line with the BRE target. The reductions experienced are very minor, at 1%. In terms of sunlight, all windows would receive more than 50% of annual sun and 15% of
winter sun which is in considerably in excess of the minimum 25% and 5% targets respectively. This property would therefore continue to receive good levels of daylight and sunlight.

13 Inverton Road
29. This property is located opposite the school, on the other side of Inverton Road. All windows would retain more than 27% VSC with reductions of less than 1%. There would be no impacts on sunlight with all windows continuing to receive very good levels of sunlight in excess of the BRE recommendations, with over 60% of annual sunlight and over 20% of winter sun. The impacts on this property would therefore be minimal.

2 Inverton Road
30. This end of terrace property is immediately adjacent to the proposed school to the south. It has no windows in its flank elevation which faces the school; only a partially glazed door is located on this elevation with the main rear widows facing to the west and away from the site. Again, there would only be very minor reductions in daylight, amounting to less than 1%. All affected windows would continue to receive considerably more than 27% VSC. The results are similar in terms of sunlight, with all windows continuing to receive considerably more than the BRE targets, with over 65% annual sun and 25% winter sun. This property would therefore not experience any daylight or sunlight reductions.

2-12 Surrey Road
31. These are a terrace of properties whose rear gardens directly face onto the site. Accordingly all of their rear windows have been assessed. All of the rear windows would continue to receive very good levels of daylight, again with only minor reductions of 1% or less. Sunlight levels are not required to be assessed for these windows, since they are located on the north elevations.

Conclusion on daylight and sunlight
32. The results of the daylight and sunlight analysis undertaken are clear in that none of the surrounding properties would experience any reduction in their amenity. The daylight reductions are very minor, in most cases in the region of 1%, which is well within the tolerance of 20% and accordingly would not be noticeable. In terms of sunlight, all properties would retain total and winter sunlight in excess of the BRE guidelines.

Overlooking/Outlook
33. In order to prevent against harmful overlooking, the Residential Design Standards SPD 2011 requires developments to achieve a distance of 12m at the front of the building and any elevation that fronts a highway and a minimum of 21m at the rear. These distances are of most relevance between habitable room windows of different units but have nonetheless been considered here.

34. To the north-east across Inverton Road, there would be a distance of 14m, exceeding the 12m distance required by the SPD. To the south-west, across the rear of the site, there is a 25m distance to properties on Surrey Road, exceeding the required minimum of 21m. To the south-west, across the rear of the site, there is a distance of 60m to properties on Rye Road. There are no habitable room windows facing the site to the north-west.

35. In conclusion, the development would protect the privacy of neighbouring residential properties by virtue of the minimum overlooking distances being exceeded. Given the distances, it is not considered that any harm by way of loss of outlook or sense of enclosure can be demonstrated.
Noise
36. Two residents have objected to the proposal in relation to the increase in noise from the playground. The playground is located to the west of the site, and fronts onto Inverton Road. It would be used during break and lunch times. As well as noise from the playground, there could also be noise associated with pupils arriving and leaving at the beginning and end of the school day.

37. The site has been already been established as a school site, and therefore noise could not be sustained as a reason to withhold consent. It is accepted that the site has not been operating as a school since 2012, but prior to that the school grounds would have been used as external space, albeit with a smaller number of pupils. In addition, any noise audible to surrounding properties would only be during daytime hours, and would not be considered to detrimentally impact on residential amenity to the extent that planning permission should be refused.

Transport issues
38. Saved policies 5.2 'Transport impacts' and 5.3 'Walking and cycling' of the Southwark Plan state the considerations that must be had to transport infrastructure on and off an application site as a result of the development, with adequate provision for pedestrians and cyclists being a key consideration.

39. The site is not located in a controlled parking zone (CPZ) and has public transport accessibility level of two (rated on a scale of 1 to 6 where 1 represents the lowest accessibility to public transport and 6 the highest).

Servicing
40. Adequate provision has been made for servicing with on site facilities provided for deliveries and waste collection from Inverton Road. Deliveries are expected to be between 09:30 to 14:00 to avoid the beginning and end of the school day. A service management plan is recommended by condition to ensure that the servicing requirements can be accommodated without compromising the amenity of local residents.

Car parking
41. No off street car parking has been proposed owing to the constraints of the site and the availability of on street parking in the area. A parking survey has been submitted as part of the Transport Assessment which shows that many spaces are available at the beginning and end of the school day to allow for drop off and staff parking. Relying on the availability of on street parking would not normally be considered acceptable and accordingly, the school must demonstrate that they would be actively encouraging staff and pupils to travel in a sustainable fashion. A robust and ambitious travel plan should be submitted by condition to encourage a shift towards sustainable patterns of travel for both staff and pupils.

Cycle parking
42. A new covered cycle storage area is proposed to the west of the pupil entrance, providing storage for cycles and scooters. The number provided meets the minimum requirement for one space per 10 staff or students, however no detailed layouts have been provided and accordingly further details would be required by condition. It has been confirmed that the stands would comprise ‘Sheffield’ stands, and so would be convenient for use. A condition is also recommended to ensure that the stands are made available and permanently retained.

Traffic
43. A neighbour has objected to the increase in traffic arising from the drop off and pick up of pupils at the beginning and end of the day. Whilst there would be an increase in
the number of pupils at the site, it is considered that it would be unwarranted to issue a refusal on this ground. It would be difficult to sustain any refusal on the basis that the site was previously operating as a school, where pick up and drop off would already exist. Measures have been included within the application to encourage cycling and walking. Given the existing school site is located within close proximity on Lanbury Road, the catchment area for the school would be expected to be local, and so walking and cycling to the school can be encouraged through the travel plan.

**Design issues**

**Layout and landscaping**

44. The building provides clusters of four years [years 3 to 6] arranged around the central school hall. There is a double height naturally daylit atrium space that provides an informal performance space with tiered seating integrated into the main stairwell.

45. The circulation space provides opportunities for small group learning, social learning and a library area. It is anticipated that this area could also provide a large format projection wall for cinema club and other multi-media requirements.

46. All ground floor classrooms have direct connections to external learning environments and the landscape has been designed closely with the school to so as to address adjacency concerns with Newlands Academy.

47. The arrangement of the site is such that the school building is located on approximately half of the site, leaving the remainder of the site for external playspace and the multi use games area. A clear strategy has been developed for the school grounds with an emphasis on using the existing site levels to create an amphitheatre 'stage' with steps to provide seating during play and an area for parents to congregate at home time. The playspace includes gentle mounding within the play garden to re-use spoil from demolition.

48. In addition, the landscape includes a forest garden and growing gardens, together with an outdoor 'mud' kitchen, and so will provide a naturalistic environment for the pupils to play and learn in.

49. It has been proposed that the bricks [London Stock] from the demolished buildings would be used to build a boundary wall to the Newlands Academy to the south-west of the site. The ornate stone arch and columns on Bredinghurst House would also be re-used within the school landscape. The re-use of these materials is welcomed and encouraged.

50. Overall, the layout and landscaping of the site is considered successful and would provide a generous space for the pupils to interact and play.

**Height, massing and elevational treatment**

51. The height, scale and massing of the building is considered appropriate for its setting with its two storeys being consistent with the scale of the local townscape. The window pattern on the front elevation was amended during the course of the application to include a greater proportion of windows, so as to avoid the elevation looking too solid.

52. The form and massing of the building would be articulated with a number of set backs. The main entrance is recessed to mark the front door and both the eastern and western elevations also benefit from some setting back. The facade includes windows with projecting bays at first floor level that provides variety and interest to the massing of the building.
53. The rear elevation of the school adjoining the Newlands Academy has been intentionally left solid, comprised wholly of brick work. This has been at the request of the adjoining Newlands Academy. The windowless facade does present a bleak elevation but as it is not a street facing elevation, the design approach here is accepted. The elevation does include coloured brick patterning which at least provide some visual interest.

54. The external palette of materials is comprised of green glazed bricks and a dark grey coloured brick. Whilst the use of brick is wholly supported and welcomed, the colours chosen appear very dark and a contrast to the yellow brick houses in the local area. Discussions are ongoing as to the final selection of brick, and these details are secured and can be addressed by condition. The height, massing and elevational treatment are therefore considered acceptable and should provide a contextual response to its setting.

Boundary treatment

55. The existing boundary walls would largely be retained under the proposals; a section of brick wall along Inverton Road would need to be removed to facilitate the new school building but the remainder would be retained. The boundary treatments along the east and west of the school would also be retained. A new brick boundary to the south (to its boundary with Newlands Academy) is proposed using bricks reclaimed from the demolished buildings; this would replace the existing temporary hoarding.

Design Review Panel

56. An earlier version of the scheme was presented to the Design Review Panel in November 2014. The Panel broadly welcomed the efficiency of the design approach, which arranges the school in roughly symmetrical, square plan form around a central hall and double height, naturally lit atrium space.

57. The efficient, cost effective and very deliverable plan form was broadly welcomed. However, concerns were expressed about the workability and of the internal layout, as the Panel felt that opportunities to create a school environment of the highest quality have been missed. It was suggested that improvements could be achieved by some relatively simply amendments to the internal layout. For example, the classrooms and routes through the building could be repositioned to offer an enhanced experience of the atrium space, and the layout could be reoriented to strengthen the relationship between the atrium and the garden.

58. The Panel broadly welcomed the civic presence of the school and the simple formality of its relationship with Inverton Road. It was however felt that, in order to strengthen the relationship between this site and the existing Ivydale School, stronger alignment with Lanbury Road should be considered. It was also suggested that the elevations represent another opportunity to raise the quality of the scheme and react against the symmetry and efficiency of the plan. For example, it was suggested that the massing could be more varied, integrated signage could be introduced, a more imaginative approach could be taken to the brickwork and deeper window recesses could be considered.

59. In conclusion, the Panel supported the proposals but looked forward to seeing further development that took the school beyond a cost effective and deliverable plan form and achieve a truly exemplar scheme. It was suggested that the design team should challenge the brief more and focus in particular on revisions to the internal layout and architectural expression proposed.

*It should be noted that revisions to the design were made to address to the comments made by the Panel, in terms of a revised elevational approach and some internal arrangements.*
Impact on trees

60. An Arboricultural Report has been submitted with the application. There are a total of 11 trees on the site, seven of which are proposed for removal. One of these trees is a Category A tree (T9 Lime) which are trees considered to have the highest amenity value. This tree has since been removed.

61. The other six trees proposed for removal (T7 False Acacia, T8 Walnut, T10 Garrya, T11 Magnolia, T14 Stag's Horn Sumach and T15 Cabbage Palm), have lower amenity values comprising of Category B (moderate quality) and C (low quality) species. Trees T7 and T8 are located within the footprint of the proposed school and therefore retention is not possible. Trees T10, T11, T14 and T15 are very small trees of limited amenity value.

62. The replacement planting plan indicates the provision of 22 semi mature trees of 20-25cm girth and smaller multistem trees (including Lime, Magnolia, Birch, Maple, Cherry, Rowan and Hazel) which should adequately compensate for those lost. The new trees would be planted in the forest garden and also along the perimeter of the playground. Tree T9 Lime is to be replaced with a significantly sized specimen of 70-80cm girth. The replacement planting is therefore considered acceptable, subject to detailed information to be requested by condition.

Planning obligations (S.106 undertaking or agreement)

63. Saved policy 2.5 of the Southwark Plan advises that planning obligations can be secured to overcome the negative impacts of a generally acceptable proposal. This policy is reinforced by the Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) for Section 106 Planning Obligations, which sets out in detail the type of development that qualifies for planning obligations, and Circular 05/05, which advises that every planning application will be judged on its own merits against relevant policy, guidance and other material considerations when assessing planning obligations.

64. Education (D1) use is not subject to the standard charge planning obligations listed in the SPD on Section 106 Planning Obligations. Despite this, planning obligations listed can still be necessary if a development, when considered on its merits, would result in negative impacts. In this case, the proposed design and operation of the development would largely ensure that its impacts are internalised to the site or would be of a nature and scale that do not warrant planning obligations and can be appropriately mitigated by way of condition. Therefore it is not proposed to have any s106 agreement or undertaking attached to this application.

Sustainable development implications

65. Strategic policy 13 ‘High environmental standards’ of the Core Strategy gives targets that developments must meet. It requires that community facilities, including schools, achieve a minimum BREEAM rating of ‘very good’, and that major development achieve a 44% saving in carbon dioxide emissions above the building regulations from energy efficiency, efficient energy supply and renewable energy generation. Major development is also required to achieve a reduction in carbon dioxide of at least 20% from the use of on-site or local low and zero carbon sources of energy.

66. An Energy Strategy report has been submitted. It details the passive measures that would be installed to reduce carbon emissions such as increasing the insulation and increasing daylighting (to reduce electrical lighting demand). These measures would result in 6.8% carbon savings. Energy efficient measures such as heating and cooling would contribute a further 8.9% of savings. In terms of renewables, the
installation of photovoltaic cells and air source heat pumps would result in 24.4% of carbon savings.

67. The feasibility of incorporating a green roof was considered. However, owing to the requirements for photovoltaic cells, plus the clerestorey lights to the main hall and access hatches is such that roof space is limited and accordingly no green roof is proposed. Soft landscaping is proposed within the forest garden and growing garden, together with trees along the perimeter edge of the playground, all of which would have biodiversity benefits.

**BREEAM**

68. A BREEAM Pre-assessment report has been submitted with the application. It states that the predicted rating for the school would be 'very good' with a score of 65%. This meets the minimum policy requirement and is therefore acceptable.

**Ecology**

69. An ecological appraisal was submitted with the application. The report notes that the site has medium potential to support breeding birds and low potential for roosting bats. The report sets out proposals for three nesting boxes on the new building; this is welcomed. Bat boxes will also be required by condition. Japanese Knotweed has been found on the site and this is proposed to be removed with the demolition of the existing buildings.

**Conclusion on planning issues**

70. The principle for redevelopment of this site for educational uses is supported and in line with Southwark and London Plan policies. The design and massing of the buildings has been carefully considered and their height would relate to adjoining context, and the position of the building along the street would establish a more traditional pattern of development. Further discussions would however be required to determine the colours of the green and grey brick.

71. The impact of the scheme on daylight and sunlight has been considered with respect to the tests contained within the BRE guide, and the results show that surrounding properties should continue to receive good daylight. Separation distances between residential windows and proposed windows should ensure that there is no direct overlooking.

72. In terms of trees, adequate replacements are provided to compensate for those to be removed, with appropriate species.

73. There is likely to be some overspill parking on the highway as a result of the proposal, resulting from staff parking on the street, but this parking is likely to occur during the daytime, rather than evenings or weekends, and so should not generate significant parking stress to warrant any concern being raised.

74. It is therefore considered that planning permission be granted subject to conditions.

**Community impact statement**

75. In line with the Council’s Community Impact Statement the impact of this application has been assessed as part of the application process with regard to local people in respect of their age, disability, faith/religion, gender, race and ethnicity and sexual orientation. Consultation with the community has been undertaken as part of the application process.

The impact on local people is set out above.
Consultations

76. Details of consultation and any re-consultation undertaken in respect of this application are set out in Appendix 1.

Consultation replies

77. Details of consultation responses received are set out in Appendix 2.

Summary of consultation responses

78. External consultees
   Environment Agency: No objection subject to the attachment of conditions.
   Thames Water: No objections, subject to attachment of informatives relating to water pressure.
   Flood and drainage Team: No objections to the development; welcome the use of sustainable drainage systems.

79. Internal consultees
   Ecology: The bat survey and appraisal are acceptable; the existing buildings have no bat roosts. However, bats have been recorded using the site for foraging and commuting and so the introduction of a bat friendly lighting scheme would enhance biodiversity. Recommend conditions in relation to the removal or long term management of Japanese Knotweed and also for the implementation of biodiversity mitigation and enhancement.
   Environmental protection: Conditions recommended in relation to plant noise, external lighting, contamination and also construction management.

80. Neighbours
Four objections received from neighbours.
   A resident at 29 Harlescott Road: Object to increase in traffic; the school would be larger, meaning more pupils would come from further away. Buses would become congested at school start and finish times. Teachers could drive and park on surrounding roads. A comment is made in the application documents that "ample on-street parking is available in the surrounding residential streets to cater for an increase in vehicles using the site". Parking is already a problem on Harlescott Road. There would also be an increase in deliveries to the site, meaning more lorries using quiet residential roads.
   No address: Object to the new school; there are too many schools in close vicinity which would affect our right of reasonable peace and quiet. The school would create excess noise from the playground. The school would also contribute to parking congestion through increased staff numbers.
   Basden Villa, Sartor Road: Object to loss of trees (trees T14, T15 and T16 are flagged for removal). The trees and other fauna contribute to the nature of the area. Object to the games area, which is right up to the north-west school boundary. Details of the boundary treatment to this boundary are unclear. Object to any increase in boundary height but also fear if it is not increased then balls could be thrown over. Object to the dramatic, incongruous and modern design of the new building, in an area of Victorian housing stock.
   No address: Residents should continue to enjoy the benefits of calm which has been
a feature of this part of the borough. The new building will inevitably introduce increased noise unless sufficient screening and landscaping is provided to serve as a barrier along the length of Inverton Road. It is not clear whether the existing wall will remain at the current height.

Regarding parking, the comments made in the submitted documents that there is 'ample on street parking available in the surrounding residential streets to cater for the increase in vehicles attracted to the site' are unwelcome.

The façade seems unduly dark in tone and quite sombre and detracts from the intended desire to be 'compatible with the character of the buildings within the surrounding area'.

Finally, the footprint of the main building appears to be too close to the perimeter of the site and every effort should be made to set it back from the street boundary to the line of the original buildings.

**Human rights implications**

81. This planning application engages certain human rights under the Human Rights Act 2008 (the HRA). The HRA prohibits unlawful interference by public bodies with conventions rights. The term 'engage' simply means that human rights may be affected or relevant.

82. This application has the legitimate aim of providing a new building for Ivydale School. The rights potentially engaged by this application, including the right to a fair trial and the right to respect for private and family life are not considered to be unlawfully interfered with by this proposal.
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APPENDIX 1

Consultation undertaken

Site notice date: 16/01/2015

Press notice date: 01/01/2015

Case officer site visit date: n/a

Neighbour consultation letters sent: 08/01/2015

Internal services consulted:

Ecology Officer
Environmental Protection Team Formal Consultation [Noise / Air Quality / Land Contamination / Ventilation]
Flood and Drainage Team
Waste Management

Statutory and non-statutory organisations consulted:

Environment Agency
London Fire & Emergency Planning Authority
Metropolitan Police Service (Designing out Crime)
Thames Water - Development Planning

Neighbour and local groups consulted:

Flat 2 Vicarage Court SE15 3DD 46a Limesford Road London SE15 3BX
Flat 3 Vicarage Court SE15 3DD 8 Surrey Road London SE15 3AU
Basden Villa Sartor Road SE15 3BB 73 Stuart Road London SE15 3BA
Flat 1 Vicarage Court SE15 3DD 4 Surrey Road London SE15 3AU
Flat 6 Vicarage Court SE15 3DD 6 Surrey Road London SE15 3AU
Flat 1 15 Inverton Road SE15 3DD 79 Stuart Road London SE15 3BA
Flat 4 Vicarage Court SE15 3DD 81 Stuart Road London SE15 3BA
Flat 5 Vicarage Court SE15 3DD 75 Stuart Road London SE15 3BA
10b Inverton Road London SE15 3DD 77 Stuart Road London SE15 3BA
2a Inverton Road London SE15 3DD Newlands School Stuart Road SE15 3AZ
46b Limesford Road London SE15 3BX 83b Harlescott Road London SE15 3DA
10a Inverton Road London SE15 3DD 83a Harlescott Road London SE15 3DA
8a Inverton Road London SE15 3DD 14 Surrey Road London SE15 3AU
8b Inverton Road London SE15 3DD 2 Surrey Road London SE15 3AU
4a Inverton Road London SE15 3DD 10 Surrey Road London SE15 3AU
6a Inverton Road London SE15 3DD 12 Surrey Road London SE15 3AU
Flat 2 15 Inverton Road SE15 3DD 83 Stuart Road London SE15 3BA
4 Inverton Road London SE15 3DD 2 Inverton Road London SE15 3DD
First Floor Flat 81 Harlescott Road SE15 3DA 6 Inverton Road London SE15 3DD
5 Inverton Villas Inverton Road SE15 3BY 50 Lanbury Road London SE15 3DB
St Quentin Sartor Road SE15 3BB 12 Inverton Road London SE15 3DD
Ground Floor Flat 81 Harlescott Road SE15 3DA
14a Surrey Road London SE15 3AU
Flat 5 15 Inverton Road SE15 3DD Tyndale Sartor Road SE15 3BB
Flat 6 15 Inverton Road SE15 3DD 10a Surrey Road London SE15 3AU
Flat 3 15 Inverton Road SE15 3DD 12a Surrey Road London SE15 3AU
Flat 4 15 Inverton Road SE15 3DD 6 Sartor Road London SE15 3BB
3 Inverton Villas Inverton Road SE15 3BY 47 Limesford Road London SE15 3BX
4 Inverton Villas Inverton Road SE15 3BY 87 Stuart Road London SE15 3BA
1 Inverton Villas Inverton Road SE15 3BY 5 Sartor Road London SE15 3BB
2 Inverton Villas Inverton Road SE15 3BY 88 Harlescott Road London SE15 3BZ
90 Harlescott Road London SE15 3BZ

Re-consultation: n/a
APPENDIX 2

Consultation responses received

Internal services

Ecology Officer
Environmental Protection Team Formal Consultation [Noise / Air Quality / Land Contamination / Ventilation]
Flood and Drainage Team

Statutory and non-statutory organisations

Environment Agency
Thames Water - Development Planning

Neighbours and local groups

Basden Villa Sartor Road SE15 3BB
Email
Email representation
29 Harlescott Road London SE15 3DA
83a Harlescott Road London SE15 3DA