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Proposal:
Erection of a part two-storey (plus basement), part single-storey (plus basement) side extension to provide a multi-purpose hall, kitchen, classroom, lift and ancillary facilities and new pedestrian and refuse access, cycle and refuse storage, associated landscaping and ancillary works.

Applicant: Northwood Schools
C/o Agent

Agent: Mr Tim Byrne
JLL
30 Warwick Street
London
W1B 5NH

RECOMMENDATION

1. Resolve to grant conditional planning permission.

2. Agree to delegate authority to the Assistant Director of Planning, Transport and Development to finalise the recommended conditions as set out in this report, addendums and/or PAC minutes.

SITE DESIGNATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relevant site designations:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conservation Area</td>
<td>Streatham Park Garrads Road Conservation Area (No.12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locally Listed Building</td>
<td>3 Normancroft, Garrads Road (host building)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streets Under Conversion Stress</td>
<td>Garrads Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree Preservation Order</td>
<td>Tree Preservation Order No.241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface flood area</td>
<td>The site has a surface water flood route going through it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment Agency Flood Zone</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adjoining site designations:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>London Borough of Wandsworth</td>
<td>Garrads Road Conservation Area</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LAND USE DETAILS

| Site area (ha):                         | 2711 sq.m (0.27ha)                |
NON-RESIDENTIAL DETAILS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use Class</th>
<th>Use Description</th>
<th>Floorspace (sq.m) (Gross Internal Area)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>D1 (Non – residential institutions)</td>
<td>Lower School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td>D1 (Non – residential institutions)</td>
<td>Senior School</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PARKING DETAILS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Car Parking Spaces (General)</th>
<th>Car Parking Spaces (Disabled)</th>
<th>% of EVCP</th>
<th>Bike Spaces</th>
<th>Motorcycle Spaces</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resi</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>Visitor</td>
<td>Resi</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LEGAL SERVICES CLEARANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consultation</th>
<th>AUDIT TRAIL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name/Position</td>
<td>Lambeth department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Boucher</td>
<td>Legal Services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Planning permission is sought for the erection of a part two-storey (plus basement), part single-storey (plus basement) side extension to provide a multi-purpose hall, kitchen, classroom, lift and ancillary facilities and new pedestrian and refuse access, cycle and refuse storage, associated landscaping and ancillary works.

The lawful planning use of the application site is in educational use (Use Class D1) and serves an independent preparatory school for children aged 4-8 years of age. The application states it is intended to open an independent secondary school at the site from September 2020. The proposed extension would serve the secondary school however the change to a secondary school does not require planning permission. The principle of land use is acceptable having regard to all other relevant development plan policies.

The application under review seeks to overcome the concerns of earlier refusals and an appeal which was upheld on 11th October 2016. Whilst the appeal scheme was considered by the Inspector to cause harm, it was acknowledged there would be scope for an extension to the school that may be positioned close to the boundary with No.1 Garrads Road. The provision of a basement is considered an appropriate design solution to reduce any harmful design impacts of the multi-purpose hall.

The current proposal would be reduced in size and scale compared to the appeal scheme and earlier refusals. Given its reduction in height, scale and bulk, particularly in respect to the roof and northern boundary height; officers consider that the scheme would read as a subordinate addition. The reduction of the gap between the parent building and side boundary is considered acceptable as the scheme would include a subordinate hipped roof and stand at single storey in height. The detailed design and proposed materials would respond to the positive aspects of the original architecture of the host building, appearing sympathetic to that building. Given the context of the site and the acceptable design of the scheme the principle of a basement is accepted. The proposal would preserve the character and appearance of the relevant conservation areas and would cause no harm to the significance of the locally listed building.

The reduction of the scheme is considered to address issues of un-neighbourly development through its reduced bulk, massing and height. The proposal would read as two separate elements breaking up its appearance. Given the overall reduction in height and its pitched roofline sloping away from the boundary its design is considered to alleviate visual impact and prevent a sense of enclosure. In terms of noise, vibration and odour the scheme is considered acceptable subject to conditions to prevent un-neighbourly impacts.

The proposal is not considered to result in unacceptable transport impacts. It would not harm conditions of on street parking or prejudice conditions for the free flow of traffic and highway safety. The extension would operate in conjunction with the main building as a school and pupil numbers would be capped; both to be secured by way of condition.

Officers consider that the development would comply the development plan for the Borough, would overcome previous concerns and there are no material considerations of sufficient weight that would dictate that the application should otherwise be refused. Officers are therefore recommending approval of the scheme, subject to conditions in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development conferred upon local planning authorities by the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).
OFFICER REPORT

Reason for referral to PAC: The application is reported to the Planning Applications Committee in accordance with (4) of the Committee’s terms of reference. A specific written request has been made by a Member of the Council for the case to be reported to the Committee. In the opinion of the Chair (in consultation with the Assistant Director of Planning and Development) there is a material planning reason for doing so.

1 THE APPLICATION SITE

1.1 The application site (‘the site’) is located on the eastern side of Garrads Road, opposite Tooting Bec Common and contains a detached 1920’s Arts and Crafts style property. The property is of a substantial size set in spacious grounds. It occupies the western portion of the site with an existing extension along the southern side. The most rear portion of the garden contains a games court with fencing.

1.2 The lawful use of the site is a school (D1 Use Class). In 1993, planning permission was granted for the change of use to a private preparatory school, formerly known as 'Normancroft'. There is a planning condition attaching to that consent restricting the school to no more than 140 pupils.

1.3 The site is located within the Streatham Park - Garrads Road Conservation Area (CA12). The property is on the Council’s Local Heritage List as a non-designated heritage asset. The site is also the subject of a Tree Preservation Order (241) (TPO). The trees which benefit from this level of protection are located on the southern side of the site. There are a number of other trees on the site which are not protected by any TPO.

1.4 The site has a Public Transport Access Level (PTAL) of 2, on a scale ranging from 0 to 6b, where 6b represents the greatest level of access to public transport services. The school is however in close proximity to sites with PTAL 4 and 6a. A bus stop is located directly outside the site along Garrads Road that is served by the No.315 bus. This bus route provides access to Balham, Streatham and West Norwood. The site is located approx. 1.1 miles from Balham Underground station serving the Northern Line and Balham Over-ground station serving Southern Trains. A school mini- bus also operates transporting a small number of pupils to and from site.

Figure 1: Application site outlined in red with No.1 Garrads Road to the north, No.7 Garrads Road to the south and Tooting Bec Common to the west.
2 THE SURROUNDING AREA

2.1 To the north, east and south of the site are residential properties and to the west is Tooting Bec Common. No. 1 Garrads Road, north of the site, is a relatively large detached residential property that has been converted into flats set in substantial grounds. The boundary between the two properties comprises a close boarded timber fence with hedging and mature trees. This neighbour’s southern flank and rear wall includes window openings facing the application site. Following an officer site visit, it was observed that No.1 Garrads Road does not have a communal garden in the traditional sense. Although it is not physically subdivided by fences, each part of the garden is owned by a separate flat. The gardens of Flats 1 and 4 at No.1 Garrads Road adjoin the application site to the southern side and are therefore in close proximity to the application site.

2.2 To the south of the site is No. 7 Garrads Road, a detached residential property which also benefits from a substantial rear garden. The rear boundary of the subject site abuts the rear gardens of properties fronting Woodbourne Avenue and Mount Ephraim Lane. The rear corners of the site abut No. 90 Woodbourne Avenue to the south and No. 60 Mount Ephraim Lane to the north, which are both detached residential properties.

3 SITE PHOTOGRAPHS

Photograph 1. The application site viewed from Tooting Bec Common.
4 PROPOSAL

4.1 The application proposes the erection of a part two-storey (plus basement), part single-storey (plus basement) side extension to provide a multi-purpose hall, kitchen, classroom, lift and ancillary facilities and new pedestrian and refuse access, cycle and refuse storage, associated landscaping and ancillary works.

Detail of the proposal

4.2 The scheme proposes to construct a two-storey extension and basement level which would occupy the northern part of the site. The front elevation of the extension would be set back 0.5m from the front elevation of the host building and include a front light well. This part of the extension (western section) would stand at single storey height to an eaves height of 2.4m. It would include a hipped roof to a ridge height of 6.5m and two storey element linking the scheme to the host building. The front part of the extension would be sited approx. 1.3m from the shared boundary of No.1 Garrads Road to the north. The rear part of the extension (western section) would stand at single storey height and link to the western section of the extension through a basement. The rear part of the extension would be sited approx. 3.4m – 5.5m from the shared boundary of No. 1 Garrads Road. The end section would include louvered doors serving plant. This section would stand to a height of approx. 2.15m high. The floor area of the proposed extension would be 490 sq.m in size.

4.3 The proposed extension would be constructed in fair faced brickwork and a slate roof to match the host building. Above ground level, external windows and doors would be bronze PPC metal system in slim frames. Below ground level within the basement lightwells, window and door frames would be white PPC. The rear part of the extension would comprise of glazing and its northern wall would be constructed in brickwork. It would include a green roof with 14 photovoltaic panels atop.

4.4 The proposed extension would provide accommodation for a multi-purpose hall to serve a dining room, theatre/performance space, classroom and gymnasium. It would also provide for a kitchen for the preparation of meals for students and a kitchen staff office. Toilets would be included for staff and pupils as well as an accessible toilet.
4.4 An accessible passenger lift would be provided within the link at first floor to provide disabled access to the existing classrooms in the host building and access to the basement. A plant room would be located at basement level as well as louvres serving plant on the northern boundary at ground floor. Standalone cycle and refuse stores would be located to the front of the site close to the north western boundary.

4.5 The lawful planning use of the application site is in educational use (Use Class D1) and serves an independent preparatory school for children aged 4-8 years of age. The existing school is currently a two form entry pre-prep school consisting of 112 pupils and 28 staff. The application states it is intended to open an independent secondary school at the site from September 2020. The school is described as Northwood Schools Senior School. By 2024 it is anticipated the school would provide places for up 120 pupils aged 13-16 years of age and approx. 12 full time staff members. The school anticipates that it is not expected to operate fully in its first year as a secondary school. Rather, it anticipates there will be a gradual increase in the numbers of pupils attending over a five year timescale up to approx. 120 pupils. The operating hours of the Northwood Schools’ Senior School is intended to be from 08.30 to 16.00 Monday to Friday. However the application states that pupils would be encouraged to use school facilities or extend their learning after school through after school clubs. It is stated they will run until 17.00 Monday to Friday. It is also stated that the use of the School beyond these timings would occur but on an infrequent basis. Such uses include parent’s evenings typically held twice a year and concerts and plays also typically held twice a year.

4.6 The application outlines that some physical education classes would take place on the existing sports pitch on site. However the majority of sports classes and extracurricular sports events would make use of nearby facilities at Tooting Bec Common, Tooting Bec Athletics Track, Tooting Bec Lido and King George’s Park in the London Borough of Wandsworth. There is to be no change to the existing sports pitch located at the rear of the site.

4.7 The application establishes that the extension serving the multi-use hall would not be available for private hire by any external parties either at weekends or after school.

Figure 1: Proposed west (front) elevation.
RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

5.1 The following applications relate to this application site:

5.2 **90/01347/PLANAP** – Planning permission refused for change of use from a residential home for the elderly to use as an independent nursery and preparatory school for 3-9 year olds.

5.3 **93/03372/PLANAP** – Planning permission granted for change of use from a residential home for the elderly to private preparatory school on ground floor and residential on upper floors together with alterations to existing vehicular access and off street parking.

5.4 **98/01061/FUL** - Planning permission granted for use of former elderly persons care home for preparatory day school purposes for 4-8 year old children in conjunction with an existing primary school. This application was subject to the following condition (No.7)

7. The use of the school shall be limited to a maximum number of 140 pupils, unless otherwise agreed by the Local Planning Authority.
Reason: To ensure a satisfactory form of development, maximum traffic efficiency and public safety, and minimum interference with traffic in the public highway.

5.5 99/02070/FUL - Planning permission granted for formation of tennis court and erection of fencing at the rear of the site.

5.6 01/00455/FUL - Planning permission granted for removal of existing glasshouse and erection of a single storey building for use as classrooms associated with the existing school.

5.7 13/03404/FUL - Planning permission granted for installation of a new double glazed bay window and double doors to the ground floor rear elevation. Granted on 25.09.2013.

5.8 15/04271/DET - Approval of details pursuant to condition 3 (detailed drawings of all the proposed bay window) of planning permission ref 13/03404/FUL (Installation of a new double glazed bay window and double doors to the ground floor rear elevation.) Granted 21.09.2015.

5.9 15/03164/FUL - Erection of a 2 storey extension to provide a multi-purpose dining hall, kitchen, 3no classrooms and ancillary facilities. Installation of 2no disabled parking spaces and a new secondary vehicle access. Refused planning permission under delegated powers on 4th August 2015 on the following grounds:

1 The proposed development would be of an unacceptable size, scale and design which would fail to appear as a subordinate addition to the host building, adversely detracting from the established character and appearance of the host property and resulting in the loss of established gaps which are an important feature of this area. This would result in substantial harm to the character and appearance of the Streatham Park Garrards Road Conservation Area which is not outweighed by the limited public benefit resulting from the development. On this basis the development is found to be contrary to policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan 2011, policies S1 and S9 of the Lambeth Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2011 and policies 31, 33, 36, 39 and 47 of the Lambeth Unitary Development Plan: Policies saved Beyond 05 August 2010 and not superseded by the Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2011’.

2 By reason of insufficient information, the Applicant has failed to demonstrate that the extended school use would not result in any harm to the local amenity of the area in terms of noise and general disturbance and therefore has failed to demonstrate compliance with policy 26 and policy 7 of the Lambeth Unitary Development Plan: Policies saved Beyond 05 August 2010 and not superseded by the Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2011’.

3 By reason of insufficient and inaccurate information relating to protected trees located within the subject site and No. 1 Garrads Road, the Applicant has failed to demonstrate that the proposed development would not have an adverse impact on protected trees contrary to policies 39 and 47 of the Lambeth Unitary Development Plan: Policies saved Beyond 05 August 2010 and not superseded by the Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2011 and policy S9 of the Lambeth Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2011.

4 The proposal, by reason of its height, bulk and massing and proximity to No. 1 Garrads Road, would represent an un-neighbourly form of development that would appear overbearing and visually intrusive when viewed from the side elevation windows and rear garden. As such, the development is found to be contrary to policy 36 of the Lambeth Unitary Development Plan: Policies saved Beyond 05 August 2010 and not superseded by the Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2011’.

5 The applicant has failed to demonstrate that the side elevation windows and rear garden of the neighbouring residential property at No. 1 Garrads Road would achieve satisfactory daylight and
sunlight levels in accordance with the Building Research Establishment document 'Site layout planning for daylight and sunlight - a guide to good practice'. As such, the proposal may result in unacceptable daylight and sunlight loss to neighbouring residential occupiers and therefore is contrary to policy 36 of the Lambeth Unitary Development Plan: Policies saved Beyond 05 August 2010 and not superseded by the Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2011'.

6 By reason of a lack of swept-path analysis for the new car parking and servicing arrangements, the Council is unable to be satisfied that the proposed development would not have an adverse impact upon the safety and operation of the local transport network contrary to policy S4 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2011 and policy 9 of the Lambeth Unitary Development Plan: Policies saved Beyond 05 August 2010 and not superseded by the Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2011'.

5.10 16/05820/FUL: Erection of a 2 storey extension to provide a multi-purpose dining hall, kitchen, three classrooms, lift and ancillary facilities. Relocation of refuse storage and formation of a temporary construction entrance. Refused planning permission under delegated powers on 14th December 2016 on the following grounds:

1 The proposal, by reason of its detailed design and inappropriate use of materials would appear out of keeping and incongruous with respect to the parent building therefore harming the character and appearance of the Streatham Park - Garrads Road conservation area (CA No.12) and undesignated heritage asset. Consequently the development would be contrary Policies Q5, Q7, Q8, Q11, Q22 and Q23 of the Lambeth Local Plan 2015, and the adopted Supplementary Planning Document entitled Building Alterations and Extensions (2015).

2 The proposed cycle store, by reason of its prominent siting, size and stand-alone location would appear visually intrusive, create unnecessary clutter and be harmful to the appearance and setting of the host building. The development would erode the amenity value and habitat value of the application site character and appearance of the Streatham Park - Garrads Road Conservation Area (CA No.12) and undesignated heritage asset, contrary to Policies Q5, Q7, Q13, Q22 and Q23 of the Lambeth Local Plan 2015.

3 It has not been demonstrated that the amenity spaces of the neighbouring residential property (No.1 Garrards Road) would achieve satisfactory sunlight levels in accordance with the Building Research Establishment document 'Site layout planning for daylight and sunlight - a guide to good practice' 2011. As such, the proposal may result in unacceptable sunlight loss and overshadowing impact to these neighbouring residential occupier's amenity space. As such, the proposal is contrary to Policy Q2 of the Lambeth Local Plan 2015.

4 The proposal, by reason of its height, bulk and massing and proximity to No. 1 Garrads Road, would represent an un-neighbourly form of development that would appear overbearing and visually intrusive when viewed from the side elevation windows and rear garden. As such, the development is contrary to Policy Q2 of the Lambeth Local Plan 2015.

5.11 The above scheme (ref: 16/05820/FUL) was subject to appeal and was dismissed by the Planning Inspectorate on 28th June 2017 (Appeal Ref: APP/N5660/W/17/3170337).

The main issues the Inspector identified were:

5.12 The effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of the occupants of No.1 Garrads Road with particular regard to outlook and light:

5.13 The Inspector considered that owing to its length there would be a considerable mass of flank wall and roof positioned in close proximity to the property boundary. Consequently, the proposed extension
would unacceptably dominate views from the south facing windows of the flats and from the garden. The proposed development was not considered to result in unacceptable overshadowing or loss of daylight and sunlight to the occupiers of No.1 Garrads Road.

5.14 The effect of the proposed development on heritage assets and in particular whether the proposed development would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Streatham Park-Garrads Road Conservation Area and the effect on the setting of the host property which is a non-designated heritage asset.

5.15 The Inspector considered that the design, scale, mass and fenestration proportions would have an acceptable relationship to the host property. However the use of cedar boarding facing materials would be at odds with the character of the conservation area and host building and would require regular treatment if its appearance is to be maintained. The introduction of the stand-alone cycle store was not considered to be visually intrusive or cause clutter to the extent that the heritage assets would be harmed.

5.16 Whilst the Inspector identified harm caused by the appeal scheme it was acknowledged that there would be some scope for an extension to the school that may be positioned close to the boundary with No.1 Garrads Road. The submission now under review seeks to overcome the concerns of the earlier refusals under and the Appeal decision.

6 CONSULTATIONS

6.1 Statutory External Consultees

Transport for London - No objections raised subject to the imposition of conditions (refer to conditions 18 – 20).

6.2 Internal Consultees

Conservation and Design – No objections raised subject to the imposition of conditions. The proposal would overcome the concerns of the appeal scheme. The proposal would not cause harm to the significance of the identified heritage assets. This includes the Streatham Park and Garrads Road conservation area, the Garrads Road conservation area (designated heritage assets) and the locally listed building (non designated heritage asset) (refer to conditions 3 – 7).

Lambeth Building Control – No objections raised subject to the imposition of a condition seeking further details on the construction of the basement (refer to condition 22).

Tree Officer – No objections raised subject to the imposition of tree protection and tree replacement conditions. (refer to conditions 8 – 10).

Lambeth Parks and Open Spaces – No objections raised subject to the imposition of a condition securing a green roof. (refer to condition 11).

Lambeth Transport – No objections are raised subject to the imposition of conditions securing an update to the current travel plan, cycle storage and constriction management plan (CMP) (refer to conditions 20-21).

Lambeth Noise Pollution – No objections are raised subject to the imposition of conditions securing measures to prevent noise impacts (refer to conditions 14 – 17).

Lambeth Local Flooding Officer – No objections raised subject to the imposition of conditions securing surface water management. (refer to conditions 23 – 24)
Bioregional – No objections raised subject to the imposition of conditions (refer to conditions 25 – 29).

Veolia Waste – No objections are raised.

6.3 Other Consultees

London Borough of Wandsworth – no response received
Streatham Society – no response received
Streatham Action – no response received
Friends of Unigate Woods – no response received
Twentieth Century Society – no response received

6.4 Adjoining owners/occupiers

6.4.1 Two site notices were displayed from 2 August 2019 and the application was advertised in the local paper on 2 August 2019. In total 250 letters of notification were sent to neighbouring properties in the vicinity of the site. The formal consultation period ended on 23 August 2019.

6.4.2 In response to the publicity of the application 32 letters of representation have been received which are summarised below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Officer’s Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Design</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The proposed extensions do not preserve or enhance the Garrads Road and Streatham Park Conservation Area, nor the adjoining Garrads Road Conservation Area in Wandsworth. It would be harmful to the setting of the undesignated heritage asset: local heritage list.</td>
<td>Refer to the ‘Design and Conservation’ section of the report. Paragraphs 9.1 to 9.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whilst this new application is an improvement on the one refused by the Council in December 2016 (Ref: 16/05820/FUL), it is nevertheless still an unacceptable overdevelopment of the site. It would not appear subordinate and would close the gap on one side of the host building. The roof pitch is overly tall.</td>
<td>Refer to para 9.12. The revised application would be reduced in size and scale compared to the appeal scheme and earlier refusals. Given the reduction in height, scale and bulk, particularly in respect to the roof and northern boundary height officers consider that the scheme would read as a subordinate addition. The reduction of the gap between the parent building and side boundary is considered acceptable as the scheme would include a subordinate hipped roof and single storey section rear section allowing glimpses through the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The design of the freestanding structure in the rear garden is contemporary, utilitarian and blocky and does not replicate or complement the existing building, or its materials. It would be an alien feature in the Conservation Area,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Refer to para 9.12 &amp; 9.14. The contemporary design approach of the rear section of the proposal is considered by officers to be acceptable. It would appear clearly distinct from the host building appearing as a lightweight structure in its garden setting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating an intrusive and incongruous reflective glass box.</td>
<td>The siting of the PV panels are unacceptable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The siting of the PV panels atop the flat roof are in an unobtrusive location at the rear of the site. Further design details would be secured by condition to ensure the acceptability of the design of the PV panels.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unacceptable fenestration and door design and associated materials. The design is poor and bland.</th>
<th>Refer to para 9.16. The proposed fenestration and doors would ensure that the extension would respond to the positive aspects of the original architecture of the host building and local context.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>By reason of its modest scale and discreet positioning beyond established boundary treatment the cycle store would appear acceptable.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refer to para 9.1 - 9.31. The proposal has been reviewed by the Conservation and Design officers who considers it is a suitable response to the heritage context. It would preserve the character and appearance of the conservation areas and the setting of the non-designated heritage asset. Therefore the proposal would preserve the significance of the designated and non-designated heritage assets identified.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The location of the cycle store would be unsightly. It is questioned if the cycle store should have a roof.</th>
<th>The proposal would be contrary to the adopted SPD, LLP policy Q5, Q11, Q22 &amp; Q23 and the draft Conservation Area statement.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The proposal would be contrary to LLP policy Q14 (development in gardens and on backland sites).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refer to para 9.18 – 9.20 An assessment against policy Q14 has been made and the proposal would accord with its overarching aims.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| The proposed basement would be contrary to new LLP draft policy Q27 d (ii) which states that basement extensions beyond the ground floor footprint of the building "will be supported where the proposal: (ii) has a roof treatment level with ground level..." and "(iii) has a floor area that does not exceed that of the ground floor footprint of the host building (as originally built)" |
| Refer para to 9.13. Given the context of the site and the acceptable design of the scheme the principle of a large basement is accepted. Whist the scheme would not conform to the requirements of this emerging draft policy officers consider that limited weight should be applied to it given that it is not adopted planning policy and is still in the course of preparation. |

| Lambeth needs to preserve what green spaces and areas of conservation value it has. Allowing private gain to override the public good will only diminish Lambeth as a whole. |
| Refer para to 9.13. Given the context of the site and the acceptable design of the scheme the principle of a large basement is accepted. Whist the scheme would not conform to the requirements of this emerging draft policy officers consider that limited weight should be applied to it given that it is not adopted planning policy and is still in the course of preparation. |

| The application proposal is wrongly described as a side extension, when in reality it also includes a massive partly subterranean but still |
| The design of the extension is considered to be acceptable. The extension would provide enhanced facilities to an existing school. |
| Officers are satisfied that the description of development accurately describes the proposal. |
single storey rear extension and a tall roofed bicycle shelter in the front garden.

The application documents wrongly describe the existing house as "Edwardian" when it was built in 1920.

**Trees**

It is assumed that all trees in the school's own grounds and all neighbouring gardens will be fully protected.

**Amenity**

**Visual impact:**
The proposed extension would create a sense of enclosure and overbearing impact at No. 1 Garrad's Road.

PV panels should lay flat on the roof so as not to add to the height.

**Basement development and cycle storage** is included in the description.

This would not materially affect how the proposal has been assessed by officers. It is noted that the building was constructed in 1920 in an Arts and Crafts style. Refer to para 9.27

Refer to the 'Tree' section of the report. Paragraphs 12.1 -12.2

The Tree Officer has commented that the submitted arboricultural report is acceptable and its conclusions are agreed with. This relates to the removal and replacement of the trees. The potential impacts on trees are noted and concluded as acceptable. This is provided that the methodology and Tree Protection Plan detailed are implemented which would be secured by way of a planning condition. A further planning condition would secure suitable replacement trees.

Refer to the 'Amenity' section of the report. Paragraphs 10-10.30

Refer to para 10.8 – 10.11. Officers consider that the reduction of the scheme is considered to address issues of un-neighbourly development through its reduced bulk and massing. It is acknowledged that the scheme would have a similar depth to the Appeal scheme. However in this case the proposal would read as two separate elements breaking up the appearance of its mass and bulk. Given the overall reduction in height and its pitched roofline sloping away from the boundary its design is considered to alleviate visual impact and prevent a sense of enclosure. Therefore the proposal would address the concerns of the Inspector and the Council.

Given the siting of the panels are located on the flat roof of the extension to the rear of the site they are not considered to appear visually intrusive. A condition is recommended to secure further detailed design information to ensure their acceptability. Please refer to condition 3 of the draft decision notice. Appendix 1
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Loss of views and visual impact to Fishers Close.</th>
<th>Fishers Close lies to the south/south-west of the site beyond No.5 Garrads Road and Woodbourne Avenue (over 50m from the application site). Given this and the acceptable design of the scheme it would not be harmful to their amenity. Officers note that loss of views would generally not be a material planning consideration. The Inspector considered that the appeal scheme would substantially eliminate views to the south from No.1 Garrads Road. However Officers consider that the Inspector was referring to a sense of enclosure and visual impact.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Loss of light:</strong> Unacceptable loss of daylight and sunlight and overshadowing impacts to 1 Garrad's Road.</td>
<td>Please refer to para 10.2-10.7 The submitted report demonstrates that any daylight and sunlight effect from the development to habitable windows and overshadowing to gardens accords with the BRE Guidelines. The Inspector’s analysis of the larger Appeal scheme also raised no objections in this regard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Privacy:</strong> Side windows would overlook the garden of 1 Garrads Road. Obscure glazed windows are proposed but they should also be permanently fixed shut to lessen noise nuisance.</td>
<td>Refer to para 10.3. Four rooflights are proposed in the northern elevation of the front section of the extension. A condition is recommended that the windows would be obscure glazed and fixed shut. Refer to condition 12 of the draft decision notice. Appendix 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The flat roof of the rear extension should not be allowed to be used as a terrace.</td>
<td>A condition is recommended to restrict the flat roof as an amenity area. Refer to condition 13 of the draft decision notice. Appendix 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Noise:</strong> The siting of the plant room doors and vents mean that noise would be most audible to the neighbours in Garrad's Road and Mount Ephraim Lane. The plant room doors and vents should be located such that any noise and disturbance should be experienced by the occupiers of the School which is the source of this nuisance. Information on the precise nature of the plant should be secured. There should be a restriction on timings of the plant. Increased noise and disturbance impacts from the proposal.</td>
<td>The Council’s Environmental Health Officer raises no objections following the receipt on the information of the type of plant proposed. Conditions are recommended to prevent undue noise impacts. This is to include a noise barrier, restriction on operations and information to demonstrate that noise targets are met. Refer to condition 14-17 of the draft decision notice. Appendix 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officers consider that there would not be any unacceptable additional noise and disturbance impacts generated by users of the extension</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Light Pollution:**
Light spill from the glazed element of the extension to neighbouring occupiers.

If the glazed extension is permitted then there should be a condition securing planting of a thick screen of evergreen trees across the southern and eastern walls of the glazed extension. Black out blinds should be included. This is to prevent spillage of light to the south and east.

**Conditions should be imposed to mitigate impacts:**

1. No buildings erected on this site to be made available for private hire by third parties.

2. No use of the school buildings or land on Saturdays and Sundays;

A condition is recommended that the extension may operate only in conjunction with the use of the main building as a school. Refer to condition 18 of the draft decision notice. Appendix 1. Officers do not consider it is reasonable to restrict the hours of operation of the extension given the school has un-restricted hours of operation.

Presently there are no restrictions on operating hours of the school. Given that the extension would operate in conjunction with the main building as a school it is not considered reasonable or necessary to restrict operating hours.
### Transport

The use of the premises as a secondary school does not in itself require planning permission. However, it would be impossible for the premises to function as a secondary school without the substantial extensions proposed. Therefore the transport impact of use of the site as a secondary school is a material planning consideration.

The school's claim that existing pupils come from within a mile radius is unlikely to apply to secondary age pupils. As such, the patterns of car use will not necessarily reduce.

The site is not particularly well served by public transport.

Increase parking pressures

| 3. No other buildings/development should be erected at the application site. | Any further applications at this site would be assessed on their own merits. |
| 4. The sports pitch should not be equipped with flood lights | Planning permission is not sought for floodlights. |
| **Transport** | Refer to the ‘Transport’ section of the report. Para 11-11.16 |
| Officers acknowledge that planning permission is not required to change to a secondary school use. The extension would operate in conjunction with the main building as a school. Given the size and scale of the extension and the recommendation to cap by condition the number of pupils at the school as extended - it is considered that the proposal would not result in unacceptable transport impacts. Transport Officers and TfL raise no objections to the proposal subject to conditions. Refer to conditions 18-20 of the draft decision notice. Appendix 1 |
| The school's claim that existing pupils come from within a mile radius is unlikely to apply to secondary age pupils. As such, the patterns of car use will not necessarily reduce. | Refer to para 11.8. Transport Officers have advised that the proposed change from a primary to a secondary school is expected to result in a larger proportion of pupils using active travel or public transport to reach the school, as older children are less likely to be driven to and from school. |
| The site is not particularly well served by public transport. | Refer to para 11.10. As identified above, a bus stop is located directly outside the site along Garrads Road that is served by the No.315 bus. This bus route provides access to Balham, Streatham and West Norwood. The site is located approx. 1.1 miles from Balham Underground station serving the Northern Line and Balham Over-ground station serving Southern Trains. A school mini- bus also operates transporting a small number of pupils to and from site. |
| Increase parking pressures | Refer to para 11.9. Transport Officers accept that the level of pupils being driven to school is likely to fall from the current level of 29% by car, and therefore local traffic and parking conditions are likely to be relieved to some extent by the proposals. |
The number of staff that will be required to deliver a senior school curriculum will far exceed the number of staff currently on site.

The impacts of this application and the Streatham and Clapham school expansion should be considered cumulatively.

The travel mode comparison with Dunraven School is not accepted, as Dunraven’s catchment area is tiny compared to the likely catchment area for this new senior school. Also Dunraven is on a number of bus routes with frequent services, whereas this school is only served by a single decker bus every 20 minutes during peak times.

There is no Travel Plan submitted with the application to show how travel patterns and modes may change and be managed in the future.

Air and noise pollution from increased traffic movements

Refer to para 11.6. Officers consider that the change from primary to secondary school will mean there will be fewer support staff required so it is likely that the number of staff on site would fall.

Refer to para 11.9-10. There are a number of other schools in the vicinity, including Henry Cavendish Primary School on Woodfield Avenue some 450m from the school, and Streatham and Clapham High School on Abbotswood Road some 250m from the school. It is noted that there is a current planning application in for Streatham and Clapham High School (ref 19/02374/VOC), which would extend the permitted size of the school from 505 pupils to 650 (although its understood the actual school roll is around 560 pupils). While the Transport Statement submitted with 19/02374/VOC demonstrates that parking impacts would be unlikely to extend to Broomwood School, the combined impacts on local public transport have been considered by Officers. Given that the proposals are expected to increase the number of pupils using the bus to reach the school, the capacity of public transport provision is considered acceptable. Officers are awaiting further comments on the capacity of the 315 bus route which will be reported by way of an addendum.

Refer to para 11.10 The submitted TS compares the modal split of nearby secondary schools and found on average 13% of secondary school pupils are driven to school. However, the schools used (Dunraven and Bishop Thomas Grant) are not necessarily considered comparable. As an independent school, it is likely it would have a larger catchment, resulting in a larger proportion of pupils being driven to school than at Dunraven or Bishop Thomas Grant for example.

A condition is recommended to secure an update to the existing Travel Plan. Refer to condition 20 of the draft decision notice. Appendix 1

Refer to para 11.9. Transport Officers accept that the level of pupils being driven to school is
There is no information about school bus and coach parking. Secondary schools tend to use large coaches for school trips. The existing school buses are regularly seen parked at the bus stop and on the double yellow lines outside the school.

Unacceptable highway safety impacts regarding servicing of the site.

Highway safety issues resulting from proposed construction works, the bus stop will have to be moved and additional pressure will be placed on the surrounding roads in terms of parking.

Errors on documents in the Planning statement to include omission of the double yellow lines on each side of the vehicular entrance to Fisher's Close on Garrad's Road (on the corner of Garrad's Road and Woodbourne Avenue).

No financial contribution is proposed under s.106 or CIL to address improvements to sustainable travel.

Conditions recommended to mitigate against traffic impacts:

1. No parking double yellow lines

likely to fall from the current level of 29% by car, and therefore local traffic and parking conditions are likely to be relieved to some extent by the proposals.

One minibus parking bay will be retained on site. Any breach of traffic orders is dealt with via Highways legislation.

Refer to para 11.13. Given the nature of the proposal it is not anticipated that the proposal would result in any significant uplift in servicing requirements.

Refer to para 11.14. A Construction Management Plan (CMP) would be secured by condition. This is to avoid hazard and obstruction being caused to users of the public highway from the start of the construction process. A temporary vehicular access is proposed to the north of the site to accommodate heavy vehicles during construction. This proposed access is adjacent to a bus cage and is on the exit zig-zags for the adjacent zebra crossing. Vehicles would have to reverse in or out of the site, and if a bus were at the bus stop there would not be sufficient visibility to the south. Therefore the use of banks-men would be conditioned

Noted however this would not influence the assessment of the scheme in terms of parking and highway safety. The double yellow lines are in place and restrict parking governed by highways legislation.

Given the nature of the proposal it is not considered necessary or reasonable to secure planning obligations.

This would be enforced by Highways legislation

Presently there are no restrictions on operating hours of the school. As the proposal relates to
2. All deliveries to take place before 7am or after 7pm Monday to Fridays and no delivery/collections on Saturdays and Sundays.

3. In the construction period estimated to last between 44-46 weeks this must be carried out between the hours of 8am and 5pm Monday-Friday and no work carried out on Saturdays and Sundays.

**Surface water flooding**

The school is in a Conservation Area which has in recent years seen much of its grass and earth paved over to make way for car parking and hard standing. The area close to the common is prone to flooding in wet weather and needs as much soft space as possible around it to help absorb the water.

The proposed astroturf pitch is undesirable for similar reasons.

**Other**

The school contributes nothing to the local community, and with the benefit of hindsight this was a very unfortunate decision.

The application was submitted during the summer holiday when many local residents are away. LB Lambeth were asked to review this and to extend the deadline for comments to be made.

Failure of the School to engage and consult with local residents.

**Support**

I have been a resident for over 5 years and I have seen the plans and I support this application.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Noted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have been a resident for over 5 years and I have seen the plans and I support this application.</td>
<td>Noted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The development is currently run as a school. This provides a much needed asset to the local community. This part of LB Lambeth requires good, local education. It is understood that the property will continue to be run as a school, albeit for differently aged children.

The school currently operates only on weekdays and adheres to term dates. Accordingly it operates on approximately 180/365 days of the year, less than 50% of the time.

7 POLICIES

7.1 Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires planning decisions to be made in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The development plan in Lambeth is the London Plan (2016, consolidated with alterations since 2011) and the Lambeth Local Plan (September 2015) (LLP).

7.2 The Draft London Plan (DLP) was published on 1 December 2017 (updated August 2018) for consultation and will eventually supersede the current 2016 consolidated London Plan once the final version is published (anticipated early 2020). The Draft London Plan is a material consideration in planning decisions. The Examination in Public on the Draft London Plan was held between January and May 2019, and the Panel of Inspectors appointed by the Secretary of State have now issued their report and recommendations. This was made public on 21 October 2019. The Mayor released the “Intend to Publish” version of the Draft London Plan in December 2019. This version can now be given a significant amount of weight in planning decisions. It will not be given full weight until the final version of the London Plan is published.

7.3 The LLP is currently under partial review to ensure it complies with amendments to changes in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and London Plan. The Council has consulted on a new Draft Revised Lambeth Local Plan which was published in October 2018 and will also eventually supersede the current Lambeth Local Plan once the final version is adopted (anticipated late 2020 / early 2021). The Draft Revised Lambeth Local Plan Proposed Submission Version (DRLLP PSV, January 2020) was approved by the Council’s Cabinet on 22 January 2020. The formal pre-submission publication is anticipated to take place between 31 January and 13 March 2020, prior to submission for examination. The Draft Revised Lambeth Local Plan is a material consideration in planning decisions but is currently afforded very limited weight.

7.4 The NPPF 2019 sets out the Government’s planning policies for England including the presumption in favour of sustainable development and is a material planning consideration in the determination of all applications.

7.5 The current planning application has been considered against all relevant national, regional and local planning policies as well as any relevant guidance. A full list of relevant policies and guidance has been set out in Appendix 3 to this report. This includes the draft Conservation Area Statement for the Streatham Park/Garrads Road Conservation Area (CA:12) (London Borough of Lambeth) and the Conservation Area Character Statements: 43 Garrads Road (London Borough of Wandsworth).
ASSESSMENT

8 Land Use

8.1 London Plan Policy 3.18 (Education facilities) supports ‘provision of early years, primary and secondary school facilities adequate to meet the demands of a growing and changing population and to enable a greater choice, particularly in parts of London with poor educational performance’. The Draft New London Plan Policy S3 (Education and childcare facilities) states that educational facilities should be located in areas of identified need and in accessible locations. It does not differentiate between state and private schools. The proposal relates to a private school and it would accord with the overarching aims of London Plan Policy 3.18 and the draft London Plan Policy S3.

8.2 Policy S3 of the LLP states that ‘proposals for new primary and secondary schools, or for the extension and expansion of existing schools, will be supported where they help to deliver the Council’s agreed strategy for provision of additional state-funded school places in the borough.’

8.3 The lawful planning use of the application site is in educational use (Use Class D1) and serves an independent preparatory school for children aged 4-8 years of age. Whilst consideration has been paid to policy S3 it is pertinent to establish that this policy, addresses proposals for new schools and their expansion where they help to deliver the Council’s agreed strategy for provision of additional state funded school places in the borough. In this regard it is considered this policy would not apply as the school is a private school.

8.4 The application states it is intended to open an independent secondary school at the site from September 2020. By 2024 it is anticipated the school would provide places for up 120 pupils aged 13-16 years of age and approx. 12 full time staff members. The school anticipates that it is not expected to operate fully in its first year as a secondary school. Rather, it anticipates there will be a gradual increase in the numbers of pupils attending over a five year timescale up to approx. 120 pupils.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>Total Number of Pupils</th>
<th>Number of Staff (FTE)</th>
<th>School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>September 2019</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Broomwood Hall Lower School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2020</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Northwood Schools' Senior School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2021</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Northwood Schools' Senior School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2022</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Northwood Schools' Senior School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2023</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Northwood Schools' Senior School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2024</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Northwood Schools' Senior School</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Anticipated pupil and staff numbers for the secondary school (Sept 2019 – Sept 2024)

8.5 The lawful planning use of the application site is in educational use (Use Class D1) and serves an independent preparatory school for children aged 4-8 years of age. The application states it is intended to open an independent secondary school at the site from September 2020. The proposed extension would serve the secondary school however the change to a secondary school does not require planning permission. The principle of land use is acceptable having regard to all other relevant development plan policies.
Design and Conservation

9.1 The beginning of the Agenda Pack contains a summary of the legislative and national policy context for the assessment of the impact of a development proposal on the historic environment and its heritage assets. This is in addition to Lambeth Local Plan and London Plan policies. The assessment that follows has been made within this context.

9.2 The context of the Site is given in the ‘Application Site’ and ‘Surrounding Area’ sections of the report.

9.3 What follows is an officer assessment of the scheme with regard to the design and appearance of the extension and the scoped heritage assets provided by the applicant as part of its submission. This includes the Conservation Areas and the non-designated locally listed host building.

Bulk, scale, massing, layout and appearance.

9.10 The application seeks to address concerns with the appeal scheme by incorporating design changes relating to its bulk, scale and mass as well as proposed facing materials. Primarily the proposed multi-purpose hall and kitchen would now be located at basement level reducing the height, scale and mass of the scheme. This is in addition to removing all cedar cladding board facing materials.

9.11 Under the appeal scheme the Inspector agreed with the Council that the proposed extension would not appear as awkward or incongruous. The Inspector, in his view considered that the design, scale, mass and fenestration proportions had an acceptable relationship with the host property. However the Inspector agreed with the Council that the cedar boarding is uncommon in this part of the CA and not present on the host building. Therefore it was considered it would be at odds with the character of the Conservation Area and locally listed building. The Inspector also shared the Council’s concerns that the cedar boarding requires regular maintenance and would not accord with the Council’s adopted supplementary planning guidance entitled ‘Building alterations and extensions (adopted 2015).

9.12 The revised proposals are reduced in size and scale compared to the appeal scheme and earlier refusal. Given its reduction in height, scale and bulk, particularly in respect to the roof officers consider that the scheme would read as a subordinate addition in response to the host building. This is because the host building is substantial in size, scale and resultant prominence. The design of the scheme would ensure primacy of the parent building and the extension would not appear awkward or incongruous in this location. It would not inappropriately unbalance the façade of the parent building due its suitable set back from the front elevation. Cumulatively it would read as two separate elements (western and eastern sections), breaking up the appearance of its mass and bulk. Given its acceptable size, the loss of the gap between the parent building and side boundary is considered acceptable as the scheme would include a subordinate hipped roof allowing glimpses to the rear of the site. The lift over run is of an acceptable size retaining a suitable amount of principle roof slope.

9.13 The inclusion of a basement would not be readily visible given its underground location. Officers consider that given context of the site and the acceptable design of the scheme the principle of a large basement is appropriate. The provision of a basement is considered as an acceptable design solution to provide a multi-use hall and reduce the scale of above ground development. There a draft Supplementary Planning Document on Basements 2017, however this document is not being progressed past the consultation stage because of emerging basement policy Q27 of the new LLP. Officers consider that the proposal would meet the requirements of the draft basement SPD. Officers acknowledge that the new LLP draft policy Q27 d (ii) states that basement extensions beyond the ground floor footprint of the building “will be supported where the proposal: (ii) has a roof treatment level
with ground level" and "(iii) has a floor area that does not exceed that of the ground floor footprint of the host building (as originally built). There is also the draft Urban Design Code Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). The scheme would not strictly conform to all of the requirements of the emerging draft policy Q27 and draft Design Code SPD however Officers consider that limited weight should be applied as the emerging policy and draft guidance both have limited weight because they are still in the course of preparation.

9.14 There are no objections raised to the contemporary design approach of eastern section above the basement given its high quality contemporary design. It would appear clearly distinct from the host building itself appearing as a lightweight structure in its garden setting.

9.15 Whilst the footprint of the proposal of the extension is broadly similar to the refused scheme, given the reduction in height and mass the proposed extension would overcome the concerns of earlier concerns for the reasons discussed above (para 9.12). As noted in the following 'Amenity for Neighbouring Occupiers' section of the report, the extension would have an acceptable amenity impact on neighbouring occupiers. The scale and massing of the extension is such that it would appear subordinate to the host building and would not unacceptably dominate or over the host building or appear discordant in accordance with LLP policy Q11 (b).

9.16 The proposal now includes brickwork and has omitted the use of cedar boarding which overcomes the Inspector's concerns with the appeal scheme. Its detailed design in terms of materiality and fenestration ensures that the extension responds to positive aspects of the original architecture of the host building and the local context, in accordance with LLP policies Q5 and Q11 (a).

9.17 Conditions are recommended to secure all external constriction detailing and fenestration as well as samples. Refer to conditions 3-7 of the draft decision notice – appendix 1. This would ensure the quality of design proposed is secured through to the detail design stage of the development.

9.18 Policy Q14 at part a) states that the Council does not consider gardens to be potential development sites and will resist proposals which would result in the loss of biodiversity, soft landscaping/permeable drainage or openness subject to the criteria contained in parts c-a-vii) of the policy. Part b) of the policy states front gardens and prominent corner/side gardens are not considered appropriate for development. The proposal is located to the side and rear of the host property and given the acceptable siting, design and appearance of the scheme and the appeal decision, the principle of development is accepted in this location.

9.19 Referring to part c-i) the application identifies that the footprint of the parent building excluding associated outbuildings would not exceed the 30% of development other than the existing garden, which officers agree with. Part c ii) goes on to state that development in rear gardens will only be supported where it is single storey and subordinate in form. As explained above the overall height and scale of the extension would read as a subordinate addition in the context of the prominent parent building. The two-storey element of the proposed western part of the extension is located to the side and rear of the host building. As discussed above (para 9.12) the western part of the extension would appear acceptable in design terms achieving compliance with policy Q14. The eastern part of the proposal comprises the hall which would be located in the rear garden and is single storey in height. It is also set back at least 1m from all site boundaries enabling access for the maintenance of boundary enclosures. On this basis the scheme would comply with the aims of this part of the policy by appearing subordinate.

9.20 Turning to part iv) there is a requirement for development in rear gardens to be well designed with visually attractive materials. As discussed above the proposed materials are now acceptable. Lastly, consideration has been paid to the cumulative impact of the scheme with other garden structures in the same block of gardens. It recognised that the adjoining site of No.1 Garrads Road includes a single storey structure located near to the shared boundary however there would be no adverse impact when
considered cumulatively with other garden structures in the same block of gardens. In summary, it is considered that the proposal would achieve compliance with LLP Policy Q14.

9.21 The introduction of the stand-alone cycle and refuse store by reason of its modest scale and discreet positioning beyond established boundary treatment appear acceptable. It would not appear unobtrusive and would not compromise the visual amenity of the front garden achieving compliance with LLP Policy 12 and 13.

9.22 The site would be accessible to all including disabled people noting it would include a lift from the basement to the first floor. Officers are satisfied that the proposals have a layout and design that includes full access achieving compliance with LLP policy Q1.

**Design summary**

9.23 In summary, it is considered that the proposal is acceptable in terms of height, scale, mass, detailed design, footprint and materials would overcome earlier concerns. In this regard the scheme would achieve compliance with policies LLP policies Q1, Q5, Q7, Q8, Q9, Q11, Q12, Q13 and Q14.

**Impact on heritage assets: Conservation Areas and the Locally Listed Building.**

9.24 The site is located in the Streatham Park Garrards Road conservation area (CA12). The Conservation Area is characterised by generous suburban development which began in the 1880’s on the Streatham Park Estate and continues through the interwar period. Broomwood Hall School was formerly known as ‘Normancroft’; a detached property set in generous grounds. This is a substantial house, which conservation officers consider an attractive Arts and Crafts property - reflected by its inclusion on the Local Heritage List (undesignated heritage asset). The site demonstrates good spatial standards from the spacing around the property making a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area. The conservation area is characterised by domestic properties which have been largely sympathetically extended.

9.25 The draft Streatham Park/Garrards Road Conservation Area Statement (2016) addresses Garrards Road and states that:

‘Forming the spine of the conservation area, this road runs north-south following the eastern edge of Tooting Bec Common. It gently slopes down towards the north. It was named after the goldsmith and Crown Jeweller, Robert Garrad (1784-1881), who lived at the former Woodfield House. It has a leafy and expansive feeling owing to the open space of the Common on one side. It is characterised by an assortment of fairly large detached houses dating from the early 20th century; set in spacious grounds, they reflect the street’s prestige status in suburban Streatham’.

‘Generous spatial standards combine to give the street a consistent rhythm, lessened slightly by later infill developments of inferior quality. At its southern end a large and busy traffic junction dominates to ill effect. Moving northwards is a row of impressive large houses set comfortably back from the road and enclosed by walls and railings; of varying design, stylistically they generally share a vernacular inspiration with rich details and high levels of craftsmanship. Despite disruptions to the street’s rhythm caused by a 20th century infill development, there is yet a strong sense of townscape complemented by an avenue of trees on the Common that help define the street edge’. Paragraph 4 states “The biggest threat to the character and appearance of the area are incremental ones, such as the introduction of discordant building alterations and extensions”

The draft statement also considers that the application site is worthy of local listing and describes it as a ‘large symmetrical Arts and Crafts house asymmetrically placed within a generous garden plot’.
9.26 Conservation Officers have advised that the draft conservation area statement has been through public consultation but that the final version has not been issued as there will be changes to the local list.

9.27 Broomwood Hall School is a locally listed detached villa (built in 1920) set in generous grounds overlooking Tooting Bec Common. This host building is a large symmetrical Arts and Crafts house to include a slated mansard on a central projecting bay and either side are two storey clay tiled canted windows and entrance bays. It includes hipped roofs, decorative ridge tiles and tall chimneys. Materials comprise a red brick ground floor and pebbled dashed first floor with stone quoins. Conservation Officers note that the building is largely intact, with only large front and rear roof lights intruding onto the roof. A large garage runs alongside the villa which has been extended at the rear to single storey height with slated hipped roof. Conservation Officers note the building was locally listed in 2016 for its architecture, history and townscape value.

9.28 The site is also located adjacent to the eastern boundary of the Garrads Road Conservation Area in the London Borough of Wandsworth. There is a Conservation Area character statement produced by Wandsworth Council is entitled: - 43:Garrads Road. The conservation area is centred on the south eastern part of Tooting Bec Common, an open and well treed landscape, with a number of tracks running through it and a bridle path running around three sides of the common. It is surrounded on three sides by housing in an Arts and Crafts style which are located within the Streatham Park and Garrads Road Conservation Area.

9.29 The proposal has been reviewed by the Conservation and Design officer who considers it is a suitable response to the heritage context and Officers agree with this view. The overall height and scale of the extension would read as a subordinate addition in the context of the prominent parent building. Discordant extensions relate to unsympathetic and jarring alterations to historic properties in the Streatham Park and Garrads Road Conservation Area. The proposed extension is sympathetic in scale and design and would not unduly unbalance the appearance of the front elevation. The stair and lift core is set back from the front elevation appearing visually lightweight separating the new addition to the locally listed building, but responding to the fenestration of the host building and modelled so that it positively responds to its architecture. To the rear the above ground structure is a simple design brick construction with green roof with glazed curtain walling facing into the garden, it is not visually obtrusive and appears as a contemporary glazed garden structure.

9.30 Conservation Officers consider the locally listed building would not be harmed by the extension as it does not affect its significance which is clearly discernable from the proposed sympathetic additions.

9.31 In terms of the Streatham Park Garrads Road Conservation Area, Conservation Officers state that the additions fronting onto Garrads Road would not harm the character or appearance of the conservation area. This is because the extension subordinate in appearance with hipped roof, domestic in scale and largely concealed by a tall timber fence. The new lift and stair core is a sympathetic addition to the building.

9.32 In terms of the Garrads Road Conservation Area located in the LB of Wandsworth, the additions fronting onto Garrads Road would not harm the character or appearance of the conservation area. The housing along Garrads Road forms the backdrop to the common; the new building is domestic in scale with hipped roof, largely concealed by a timber fence and the new lift and stair core is a sympathetic addition. Therefore the proposal would not harm the setting of the Conservation Area and the open nature of the common.

9.33 There are a number of locally listed buildings (undesignated assets) in the vicinity of the application site comprising 19 Garrads Rd, 25 Garrads Rd, 2 Saxoncroft House - Fishers Close, 38 Tooting Bec Gardens (presents onto Garrads Rd) and 57 Mount Ephraim Lane. They are sufficiently set away from the proposed development that it will not affect their individual setting. The application site is sufficiently set away from all the locally listed buildings in around Garrads Road as to not impact on their setting.
Impact upon Heritage Assets: Summary

9.34 As established the Development would not harm any heritage assets. It would preserve the character and appearance of the conservation areas and the setting of the non-designated heritage asset. It would preserve the significance of the designated and non-designated heritage assets identified. The proposal would therefore accord with the LLP Policy Q22 and Q23 and the statutory duty of the Local Planning Authority.

Assessment of Harm versus Benefits

9.35 No assessment is required in terms of harm to heritage assets versus the public benefits of the proposal given that officers have identified no harm to heritage assets.

10 Amenity for Neighbouring Occupiers

Daylight, Sunlight and Overshadowing

10.1 The beginning of the Agenda Pack contains a broad contextual overview of the assessment framework within which BRE compliant sunlight and daylight studies are undertaken. This includes an explanation of the key terms and targets contained within the BRE guidance. The applicant has submitted a Daylight and Sunlight Assessment (DSA) to accompany their application. This has assessed the impact of the development in respect of daylight, sunlight and overshadowing on surrounding properties by way of an addendum to the 2016 appeal scheme. The following assessment has been made in the context of this information. The context of the site is given in the ‘Application Site’ and ‘Surrounding Area’ sections of the report.

10.2 As established elsewhere in this report the proposed extension is lower in overall height, scale and bulk in comparison to the appeal scheme. The Inspector concluded that the sunlight and daylight assessments demonstrated that the application site is capable of being extended in a manner that would not cause an unacceptable reduction in daylight and sunlight to the occupants of No. 1 Garrads Road. The addendum identifies that the occupiers at No.1 Garrads Road would experience an improvement to the appeal scheme. Further, the development would not result in other surrounding properties suffering losses beyond BRE guidelines.

Figure 6: Section through front extension (western element).

10.3 The report submitted has analysed the neighbouring flats contained in No.1 Garrads Road, flat No’ 1 and 4 - a scope that is considered proportionate and related to the scale of development and its location in response to neighbouring habitable rooms. The findings ascertain that there would be no noticeable loss of daylight to this neighbours habitable rooms. All of the windows assessed would meet the VSC test as their values relating to these windows would not be less than 0.8 times their former value. In
addition all of the rooms would meet the BRE Guidelines recommendations in respect of the No Skyline (NSL/NSC) form of daylight assessment.

10.4 In terms of sunlight, BRE tests are only required where an existing building has a ‘window wall’ (a wall with a window serving a habitable room) within 90 degrees of due south. The test for sunlight is met if the window wall faces within 90 degrees of due south and no obstruction measured in the section perpendicular to the window wall, subtends an angle of more than 25 degrees from the horizontal. The sunlight test requires that the minimum level of sunlight received by affected windows should not be less than 25% of the annual probable sunlight hours, of which 5% should be in the winter months.

10.5 The findings of the report show that the habitable windows contained within the neighbouring development at No. 1 - flats 1 and 4, would continue to receive sunlight that meets the APSH- BRE recommendations.

10.6 The report has assessed the overshadowing impacts of the development and it confirms that it would have an acceptable impact in this respect. The Sunlight Amenity Test quantifies the area of garden of No.1 Garrads Road that receives at least two hours of sunlight on 21st March in both existing and proposed situations and suggests that for a space to appear well sunlit it should receive two hours of sunlight to at least 50% of its area. The results of the analysis show that the areas assessed would continue to receive two or more hours of sunlight to at least 80% of its area. Under the appeal scheme the Council had concerns regarding the overshadowing of No 1’s garden in the winter months. However, the Inspector identified that the BRE Guidance does not contain any criteria to assess the transient shadow analysis and, as such must be made on a subjective basis. As other quantitative tests in the BRE guidance were achieved, the Inspector did not consider that the shadowing of No’1s garden during winter months would be a sustainable reason for the dismissal of the Appeal. On this basis and in response to the amendments of the proposal Officers do not raise any concerns regarding overshadowing impacts in winter.

10.7 The submitted report and the Inspector’s analysis of the appeal scheme demonstrates that any daylight and sunlight effect to habitable windows and overshadowing to gardens accords with the BRE Guidelines. Therefore, the proposal would achieve compliance with LLP Policy Q2.

Outlook

10.8 The site is located in an established residential area and relates to a rectangular shaped plot of land located between the properties of No.1 Garrads Road and No.7 Garrads Road. As identified by the planning history of the site the property most impacted by the scheme would be No.1 Garrads Road as this property shares a boundary with the application site.

10.9 Under the appeal scheme the Inspector agreed with the Council in that proposed extension would create an unacceptable and oppressive sense of enclosure. This was because of its position in close proximity to the boundary with No 1 Gerrads Road and extending a distance of approx. 30m with a height between approx. 3.9m - 6.2m. Owing to its length, the Inspector identified that there would be a considerable mass of flank wall and roof positioned in close proximity to the boundary. Consequently, the appeal scheme was considered to unacceptably dominate views from the south facing windows of the flats and from the garden. It was considered to considerably erode the current open gap that exists between the two existing properties and replace this with a substantial mass of built development that would effectively form an enclosing feature in close proximity to the property boundary. The Inspector identified this would be considerably higher than the intervening vegetation and would substantially eliminate views to the south from the windows of No 1 and its garden. Consequently, it created an unacceptable and oppressive sense of enclosure.

10.10 Whilst the Inspector identified harm caused by the appeal scheme it was acknowledged that there would be some scope for an extension to the school that may be positioned close to the boundary with No.1.
To address previous concerns of the Inspector and the Council the proposed extension has been amended. No.1 Garrads Road is sited approx. 8.7m away from the shared site boundary and the extension would be approx. 10m from this neighbour. The height of the scheme closest to the side elevation of No.1 Garrads Road would be 2.4m. It would be sited off the boundary by 1.3m - beyond boundary fence which would reduce the visual presence of the scheme to an acceptable degree. The rear section of the proposal would stand to a height of 2.68m to the flat roof. This rear section would be sited approx. 3.4 – 5.5m from the shared boundary with No. 1 Garrads Road. This would stand to a height of approx. 2.15m high.

Figure 7: Proposed south elevation and outline of refused Appeal scheme.

Figure 8: Proposed ground floor plan (front element – western section)

10.11 The proposed reduction of the scheme is considered to address any issues of un-neighbourly development through its reduced bulk and massing. Officers acknowledge that the scheme would have a similar depth to the appeal scheme. However, in this case the proposal would read as two separate elements breaking up the appearance of its mass and bulk. Given the overall reduction in height and its pitched roofline sloping away from the boundary its design is considered to alleviate visual impact and prevent a sense of enclosure. The proposal would address the concerns of the Inspector and the Council achieving compliance with LLP Policy Q2.
Light spill

10.12 In order to safeguard against undue light pollution or light spillage from the predominantly glazed rear extension a solid brick façade is proposed on the boundary of No.1 Garrads Road. Concerns have been raised regarding the size of this structure and extensive glazed areas, light pollution impacts could be harmful to other surrounding residential occupiers. As this part of the proposal would be set in from the site boundaries, the resultant separation distances, together with its single storey height; an objection on light pollution is not considered sustainable.

Privacy

10.13 The proposed extension would not include any openings on its northern boundary facing No.1 Garrads Road apart from four roof lights in its roof facing north. Given the positioning and oblique angle of the roof lights they would not result in unacceptable overlooking or loss of privacy impact. The glazed element would not result in any undue overlooking impact to other adjacent properties given its siting, separation distances and presence of boundary treatment. A condition is however recommended securing the roof lights are obscure glazed and fixed shut. A further condition is recommended securing that the flat roof shall not be used as an amenity area. Refer to conditions 12 and 13.

Operations

10.14 The principle of an extension used in conjunction with the use of the school was not resisted either by the Inspector or the Council previously. The information made available from the applicant confirms that there is no intention to increase the number of the school roll above 120 pupils. This is in accordance with condition 7 attached to the 1998 permission which restricts numbers to no more than 140 pupils. This condition would be re-attached (refer to condition 19). Officers have also recommended a condition securing that the extension may operate only in conjunction with the use of the main building as a school. (Refer to condition 18). Officers do not consider it is reasonable to restrict the hours of operation of the extension given the school has un-restricted hours of operation.

Noise

10.15 LLP policy Q2 states that development will be supported if the adverse impact of noise is reduced to an acceptable level through the use of attenuation, distance, screening, or internal layout/orientation. The application is supported by an acoustic assessment with regard to the proposed mechanical plant serving the proposed extension. This has been reviewed by the Council’s Environmental Health (EH) Team who raise no in principle objections subject to conditions.

10.16 In terms of establishing potential noise impacts, it is noted that there are three noise sources proposed:

- Source 1: fresh intake for the kitchen
- Source 2: Kitchen Extractor Fan
- Source 3: 2x condenser units and an air handling unit

10.17 The three sources are located a minimum of 17m from the closest window at 1 Garrads Road (A) and a minimum of 24m from the closest window of 60 Mount Ephraim Lane (B).
Photograph 3. Aerial photograph of the proposed relationship of mechanical plant to neighbouring residential occupiers.

10.18 Source 1: fresh intake for the kitchen
Fan located at basement level – fitted with attenuator to reduce fan noise. Officers note that the calculations show the noise from the fan would not increase background noise levels and therefore would not result in an undue noise nuisance in nearby residential properties.

10.19 Source 2: Kitchen Extractor Fan
Extractor fan located at basement level with exhaust proposed through roof level chimney. Noise is reduced through ducting systems and submitted calculations show that the fan noise would not cause a noise nuisance in nearby residential properties. Furthermore, the sources would only operate up to three hours prior to lunch time to serve the kitchen – estimated between 9am to 12noon and would then turn off.

10.20 Source 3: 2x condenser units and 1x air handling unit
The three units would be enclosed within an acoustic enclosure, within a louvered compound. Officers note that the calculations show that the noise from these units would not be audible at nearby residential properties. The 1.8m high boundary fence further reduces noise to the adjacent residential gardens.

Odour and fumes

10.21 In terms of odour, the basement kitchen extraction system would discharge through a chimney stack located above the extension and located at approximately 17m from the closest sensitive receptor at 1 Garrads Road. The chimney stack is sited 2.95m above eaves level. The proposal would accord with the recommendations prescribed by Environmental Health (EH) officers.

Vibration

10.22 EH Officers have advised that whilst the report does not provide a vibration assessment, should any vibration occur due to ill-fitting of any mechanical plant, this would result in minimum local vibration and would not be noticeable outside the building envelope.
Summary

10.23 The proposed development is considered by EH Officers not to harm the amenity of the occupiers of neighbouring properties in terms of noise, vibration and odour, subject to a number of safeguarding conditions to prevent undue noise and odour impacts. These conditions include a noise barrier, restriction on operations and information to demonstrate that noise targets are met.

11. Transport

11.1 The proposed development site has a Public Transport Access Level (PTAL) of 2, on a scale ranging from 0 to 6b, where 6b represents the greatest level of access to public transport services. However it should be noted that the school is in close proximity to sites with PTAL outputs of 4 and 6a. A bus stop is located directly outside the site along Garrads Road that is served by the No.315 bus. This bus route provides access to Balham, Streatham and West Norwood. The site is located approx. 1.1 miles from Balham Underground station serving the Northern Line and Balham Over-ground station serving Southern Trains. A school mini-bus also operates transporting a small number of pupils to and from site.

11.2 Transport Officers consider that pedestrian and cycle connectivity in the local area is generally good, with a zebra crossing to cross Bedford Hill at the junction with Abbotswood Road, and LCN 5 and the proposed Quietway 5 cycle routes providing quiet cycle conditions close to the site.

Access

11.3 With regards to access and on site car parking there is currently one vehicular entrance adjacent to No 7 Garrads Road and a pedestrian gate opposite the main entrance. A second pedestrian gate is proposed opposite the new building, together with pedestrian access from Garrads Road to the new bin store. There are no changes proposed to the existing vehicular access arrangements and there are no changes proposed to the existing on-site parking arrangements. One minibus parking bay will be retained on site.

Trip Generation

11.4 The existing school is currently a two form entry pre-prep school consisting of 112 pupils and 28 staff. The most recent ‘Hands Up’ surveys from the school Travel Plan found that 29% of pupils are driven to school, 12% car share, and 14% Park and Stride. This equates to some 39 pupil car arrivals at the start and end of the school day (29% x 112 car + 6% x 112 car share, assuming two car sharers per car). However, the morning and evening peaks are staggered to some extent by morning clubs and afterschool clubs.

11.5 The most recent staff travel survey found that 38% of staff drive to school, equating to 11 staff.

11.6 It is proposed that the school will become a senior school from September 2020 for children aged 13-16. For the proposed Senior School, the number of pupils on the roll is expected to start at around 20 pupils in 2020 and gradually increase each year to reach a target of 120 in 2024. Transport Officers consider that the change from primary to secondary school will mean there will be fewer support staff required so it is likely that the number of staff on site will fall.

Traffic & Parking Impacts

11.7 The site is not currently within a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ). There are areas nearby within the borough of Wandsworth where CPZs are in operation, and within Lambeth to the north of the site
where CPZs have recently been implemented or are due for implementation soon (e.g. Streatham Hill West and Streatham Hill East). They are approx. 1km from the site so are unlikely to contribute significant amounts of displaced parking. However, plans to consult on new CPZs in St Leonards and Streatham Vale West have recently been approved and consultation will go ahead in 2019-20. St Leonards covers the site and surrounding roads. Transport Officers acknowledge if the St Leonards CPZ were implemented school staff who currently park on surrounding roads would have to park further from the site and/or use alternative modes of travel.

11.8 Transport Officers advise that the proposed change from primary to secondary school is expected to result in a larger proportion of pupils using active travel or public transport to reach the school, as older children are less likely to be driven to and from school. The submitted Transport Statement (TS) compares the modal split of nearby secondary schools and found on average 13% of secondary school pupils are driven to school. However, the schools used (Dunraven and Bishop Thomas Grant) are not necessarily considered comparable.

11.9 As an independent school, Transport Officers note that it will have a larger catchment, resulting in a larger proportion of pupils being driven to school than at Dunraven or Bishop Thomas Grant for example. However, in the event of a secondary school it is accepted that the level is likely to fall from the current level of 29% by car, and therefore local traffic and parking conditions are likely to be relieved to some extent by the proposals. For example even if car use were only to drop from 29% to 20% the number of pupil car arrivals at the start and end of the school day would fall from 39 to 31 (20% x 120 car + 6% x 120 car share, assuming two car sharers per car bays).

11.10 There are a number of other schools in the vicinity, including Henry Cavendish Primary School on Woodfield Avenue some 450m from the school, and Streatham and Clapham High School on Abbotswod Road some 250m from the school. It is noted that there is a current planning application under consideration for Streatham and Clapham High School (ref 19/02374/VOC), which would extend the permitted size of the school from 505 pupils to 650 (although Officers understand the actual school roll is around 560 pupils). While the Transport Statement submitted with 19/02374/VOC demonstrates that parking impacts would be unlikely to extend to Broomwood School, the combined impacts on local public transport have been considered by Officers. Given that the proposals are expected to increase the number of pupils using the bus to reach the school, the capacity of public transport provision is considered acceptable. The site is served by bus route 315 which links St Julian’s Farm Road to the east to Balham Station. There are other bus routes located on Tooting Bec Road approx. 475m from the application site. Officers are awaiting further comments on the capacity of the 315 bus route which will be reported by way of an addendum.

Cycle Parking

11.11 The proposals include improved cycle parking by way of a 28-space cycle shelter and two visitor cycle parking spaces and include staff lockers and showers. This level of cycle parking exceeds new London Plan standards and is welcomed by both Transport Officers and TfL. Further details of the cycle parking provision, including plans and elevations at a scale of 1:20, are to be secured by condition (refer to condition 5).

Servicing, waste and recycling

11.12 In terms of waste and recycling, this would be located to the front on the site with access from Garrads Road. The council’s waste contractor (Veolia) has confirmed that enough waste and recycling storage facilities are proposed, in accordance with the requirements of LLP policy Q12.

11.13 There would be no changes to the existing servicing strategy and the proposed additional floorspace would not result in any noticeable uplift in servicing requirements.
Construction Management

11.14 A temporary vehicular access is proposed to the north of the site to accommodate heavy vehicles during construction. This proposed access is adjacent to a bus cage and is on the exit zig-zags for the adjacent zebra crossing. Vehicles would have to reverse in or out of the site, and if a bus were at the bus stop there would not be sufficient visibility to the south. Therefore the use of banksmen is to be secured which is requested by both Transport Officers and TfL. To minimise the impacts of construction on the school and wider area, TfL requests that deliveries are arranged during the off-peak hours of 10am-3pm. TfL have requested that idle vehicle routes for construction vehicles accessing the site is provided. A condition is recommended securing a Construction Management Plan (CMP) which addresses the above.

Travel Plan

11.15 It is understood that the school Travel Plan achieved Gold STAR accreditation in September 2017 and the latest version of the Travel Plan is valid until August 2020. There are three levels of STARS accreditation: bronze, silver and gold. The level a school achieves depends on:- how successful they have been in reducing car use and increasing sustainable travel and how many travel activities are completed. TfL have advised that this accreditation should be retained. However, given the proposed change in the age of pupils on site, the Travel Plan will need to be updated to reflect the change in pupils travel patterns, for example the initiatives used should be targeted at secondary age pupils. This will be secured by way of condition. TfL have commented that due to the site’s proximity to cycle routes, the applicant should update their mode share targets to reflect more aspirational cycle targets.

Transport Conclusion

11.16 In summary TfL and the Council’s Transport Team have reviewed the proposed development and raise no principle objections. It is noted that as the application does not seek an increase in the number of students the only transport impacts being assessed are those that may arise as a result of the proposed extension. The proposal is not considered to result in unacceptable transport impacts. It would not harm conditions of on street parking or prejudice conditions for the free flow of traffic and highway safety. The extension would operate in conjunction with the main building as a school and pupil numbers would be capped; both to be secured by way of condition. Transport Officers and TfL raise no objections to the proposal subject to conditions. Refer to conditions 18-20 of the draft decision notice. Appendix 1.

12 Environmental Matters

Trees

12.1 The submitted tree survey in the arboricultural report recorded 30 individual trees within the site. The proposal would involve the removal of five trees (one category B Tree (T14) and four category C Trees (T6, T7, T15 & T16) and pruning of five trees (two category B Trees ( T11 and T13) and three category C trees (T8, T9 & T10). None of the trees with TPOs are adversely affected by the proposal. The Council’s Tree Officer has commented that the submitted arboricultural report is fit for purpose and its conclusions are agreed with. The tree officer agrees with the removal and replacement of the trees, provided that the methodology and Tree Protection Plan detailed are implemented which would be secured by way of a planning condition. A further condition is proposed to secure the planting of suitable replacement trees.

12.2 The proposal would include hard landscaping to the form of permeable paving, brick paviours, tarmac areas and Breedon gravel. The soft landscaping would include grassed play areas and planting. Officers are advised that there would be no change to the existing sports pitch at the rear of the site.
Full details of the hard and soft landscaping is requested by condition. Officers consider the proposed landscaping to be acceptable, subject to conditions (refer to condition 9).

**Ecology**

12.3 The proposals would not encroach onto or impact upon the Tooting Bec Common Metropolitan Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC). Given this and that submitted ecology appraisal indicates there is limited impact upon any protected habitats and species the Parks and Open Space Officer raises no objections. The provision of a green roof on the extension is welcomed, subject to a condition securing a green roof of high biodiversity value (refer to condition 11). The proposals would therefore comply with LLP Policy EN1.

**Sustainable Design and Construction**

12.4 LLP Policy EN4 requires all development to meet high standards of sustainable design and construction, having regard to the scale, nature and form of the development proposal. Proposals should demonstrate in a supporting statement that these standards are integral to the design, construction and operation of the development. Non-residential developments are required to show how the development would meet the BREEAM target credit rating of at least "Excellent". In this regard the supporting documents demonstrate compliance which will be secured via condition as recommended by the Councils Sustainability Officers. (refer to conditions 25 – 29).

**Flooding, Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems and Basement Accommodation**

12.5 The application site is located not located within the Environment Agency's Flood Risk Zone. There is a surface water flow route that reaches the location of the proposal. The depth of flooding is between 0.00m and 0.30m for a medium risk event. LLP Policy EN5 requires that basement proposals "incorporate appropriate mitigation measures to ensure the development is safe from all forms of flooding and does not increase flood risk elsewhere". The accompanying text of the policy states that:

"In determining proposals for basement and other underground development, the council will require an assessment of the scheme's impact on drainage, flooding, groundwater conditions and structural stability".

12.6 The LLFA has raised no objections subject to the imposition of conditions (refer to conditions 23 and 24).

12.7 The submission is supported by a Basement Impact Study (BIA) and has been referred to internal Council specialists who raise no objections to its scope and findings. Building Control Officers have sought further information regarding the nature of construction which can be secured by condition (refer to condition 22).

13 **CONCLUSION**

13.1 Upon full assessment of the submitted material supporting the application, taking into account all material considerations, officers consider that the objectives of the development plan have been met.

13.2 The lawful planning use of the application site is in educational use (Use Class D1) and serves an independent preparatory school for children aged 4-8 years of age. The application states it is intended to open an independent secondary school at the site from September 2020. The proposed extension would serve the secondary school however the change to a secondary school does not require planning permission. The principle of land use is acceptable having regard to all other relevant development plan policies.

13.3 The application under review seeks to overcome the concerns of earlier refusals and an appeal which was upheld on 11th October 2016. Whilst the appeal scheme was considered by the Inspector to cause harm, it was acknowledged there would be scope for an extension to the school that may be positioned
close to the boundary with No.1 Garrads Road. The provision of a basement is considered an appropriate design solution to reduce any harmful design impacts of the multi-purpose hall.

13.4 The current proposal would be reduced in size and scale compared to the appeal scheme and earlier refusals. Given its reduction in height, scale and bulk, particularly in respect to the roof and northern boundary height; officers consider that the scheme would read as a subordinate addition. The reduction of the gap between the parent building and side boundary is considered acceptable as the scheme would include a subordinate hipped roof and stand at single storey in height. The detailed design and proposed materials would respond to the positive aspects of the original architecture of the host building, appearing sympathetic to that building. Given the context of the site and the acceptable design of the scheme the principle of a basement is accepted. Therefore the proposal would preserve the character and appearance of the conservation areas and the setting of the locally listed building.

13.5 The reduction of the scheme is considered to address issues of un-neighbourly development through its reduced bulk, massing and height. The proposal would read as two separate elements breaking up its appearance. Given the overall reduction in height and its pitched roofline sloping away from the boundary its design is considered to alleviate visual impact and prevent a sense of enclosure. In terms of noise, vibration and odour the scheme is considered acceptable subject to conditions to prevent un-neighbourly impacts.

13.6 The proposal is not considered to result in unacceptable transport impacts. It would not harm conditions of on street parking or prejudice conditions for the free flow of traffic and highway safety. The extension would operate in conjunction with the main building as a school and pupil numbers would be capped; both to be secured by way of condition.

13.7 Officers consider that the development would comply the development plan for the Borough, would overcome previous concerns and there are no material considerations of sufficient weight that would dictate that the application should otherwise be refused. Officers are therefore recommending approval of the scheme, subject to conditions in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development conferred upon local planning authorities by the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

14 EQUALITY DUTY AND HUMAN RIGHTS

14.1 In line with the Public Sector Equality Duty the council must have due regard to the need to eliminate discrimination and advance equality of opportunity, as set out in section 149 of the Equality Act 2010. In making this recommendation, regard has been given to the Public Sector Equality Duty and the relevant protected characteristics (age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex, and sexual orientation).

14.2 In line with the Human Rights Act 1998, it is unlawful for a public authority to act in a way which is incompatible with a Convention right, as per the European Convention on Human Rights. The human rights impact have been considered, with particular reference to Article 1 of the First Protocol (Protection of property), Article 8 (Right to respect for private and family life) and Article 14 (Prohibition of discrimination) of the Convention.

14.3 The Human Rights Act 1998 does not impair the right of the state to make decisions and enforce laws as deemed necessary in the public interest. The recommendation is considered appropriate in upholding the council’s adopted and emerging policies and is not outweighed by any engaged rights.

15 RECOMMENDATION

15.1 Resolve to grant conditional planning permission.
APPENDICES

Appendix 1: Draft Decision Notice (see below)
Northwood Schools
c/o Mr Tim Byrne
30 Warwick Street
London
W1B 5NH

DRAFT DECISION NOTICE

Dear Northwood Schools

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990.

PERMISSION FOR DEVELOPMENT

The London Borough of Lambeth hereby permits under the above mentioned Acts and associated orders the development referred to in the schedule set out below subject to any conditions imposed therein and in accordance with the plans submitted, save in so far as may otherwise be required by the said conditions.

In accordance with the statutory provisions your attention is drawn to the statement of Applicant’s Rights and General Information attached.

Application Number: 19/02496/FUL Date of Application: 10.07.2019

Proposed Development At: Broomwood Hall School 3 Garrad’s Road London SW16 1JZ

For: Erection of a part two-storey (plus basement), part single-storey (plus basement) side extension to provide a multi-purpose hall, kitchen, classroom, lift and ancillary facilities and new pedestrian and refuse access, cycle and refuse storage, associated landscaping and ancillary works.

Approved Plans

Lambeth Planning
PO Box 734
Winchester
SO23 5DG

Telephone 020 7926 1180
Facsimile 020 7926 1171
www.lambeth.gov.uk
planning@lambeth.gov.uk
Conditions

1. The development to which this permission relates must be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning from the date of this decision notice.

Reason: To comply with the provisions of Section 91(1)(a) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans listed in this notice.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

3. Prior to the commencement of development above ground level and notwithstanding the details shown on the drawings hereby approved, detailed construction drawings of all external elevations (at scale 1:10) including the following items shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall not be carried out other than in accordance with the approved unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

1. Detailed elevations
2. Details of windows and rooflights (including technical details, elevations, reveal depths, plans and cross sections, cills, materials)
3. Details of entrances, canopies and doors and glass void (including technical details, elevations, surrounds, reveal depths, plans and sections)
4. Details of roof treatments, cills and parapets
5. Details of rainwater goods (including locations and fixings)
6. Details of boundary treatments including fences and gates
7. Vents, extract, flues and ducts
8. Details of frameless glazing construction system of the rear extension
9. Details of the construction of the lift and stair core of the front extension
10. Details of Photo Voltic panels.

Reason: To ensure an adequate quality of detailed design so as to safeguard and enhance the visual amenities of the locality (Policies Q7, Q8, Q11, Q22 and Q23 of the Lambeth Local Plan 2015)

4. Prior to the commencement of the relevant development above ground level, a schedule of all materials to be used in the external elevations, including samples and the invitation to view a brick sample panel with pointing on site, shall be submitted and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall not be carried out other than in accordance with the approved materials unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: To ensure that the external appearance of the building is satisfactory so as to safeguard and enhance the visual amenities of the locality and the Conservation Area (Policies Q7, Q8, Q11, Q22, and Q23 of the Lambeth Local Plan 2015).

5. Prior to the occupation of the development hereby permitted, details of the provision to be made for cycle parking, including plans and elevations at a scale of 1:20, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The cycle parking shall thereafter be implemented in full in accordance with the approved details and shall thereafter be retained solely for its designated use. The cycle parking must be secure and covered and all spaces should be horizontal.

Reason: To ensure adequate cycle parking is available on site and to promote sustainable modes of transport and maintain the character and appearance of the conservation area and setting of the locally listed building. (Policies T1, T3, Q13, Q22 and Q23 of the Lambeth Local Plan 2015).

6. Prior to the occupation of the development details of waste and recycling storage for the development including materials, plans and elevations at a scale of 1:20, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The waste and recycling storage shall be provided in accordance with the approved details and shall thereafter be retained solely for its designated use. The waste and recycling storage areas/facilities should comply with Lambeth's Refuse & Recycling Storage Design Guide (2013) or subsequent superseding equivalent, unless it is demonstrated in the submissions that such provision is inappropriate for this specific development.
Reason: To ensure suitable provision for the occupiers and users of the development, to encourage the sustainable management of waste and to safeguard the visual amenities of the area and the Conservation Area and setting of the locally listed building (Policies Q2, Q12, Q22 and Q23 of the Lambeth Local Plan 2015).

7 No plumbing or pipes, other than rainwater pipes, shall be fixed to the external faces of buildings.

Reason: To ensure an appropriate standard of design and to protect the character of the Conservation Area and setting of the locally listed building (Policies Q5, Q8, Q22 and Q23 of the Lambeth Local Plan 2015).

8 No demolition works or development shall take place until a specification of all proposed soft landscaping and tree planting has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The specification shall include details of the quantity, size, species, position and the proposed time of planting of all trees and shrubs to be planted, together with an indication of how they integrate with the proposal in the long term with regard to their mature size and anticipated routine maintenance and protection. In addition all shrubs and hedges to be planted that are intended to achieve a significant size and presence in the landscape shall be similarly specified. All tree, shrub and hedge planting included within the above specification shall accord with BS3936:1992, BS4043:1989, BS4429:1989, BS8545:2014 and current Arboricultural best practice.

Reasons: In order to introduce high quality soft landscaping in and around the site in the interests of the ecological value of the site and to ensure a satisfactory landscaping of the site in the interests of visual amenity (Policy EN1, Q2, Q9 of the Lambeth Local Plan 2015)

9 All planting, seeding or turfing comprised in the approved details of landscaping shall be carried out in the first planting and seeding season following the occupation of the development hereby permitted or the substantial completion of the development whichever is the sooner. Any trees, hedgerows or shrubs forming part of the approved landscaping scheme which within a period of five years from the occupation or substantial completion of the development die, 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 Local Planning Authority gives written consent to any variation.

Reasons: In order to introduce high quality soft landscaping in and around the site in the interests of the ecological value of the site and to ensure a satisfactory landscaping of the site in the interests of visual amenity (Policy EN1, Q2, Q9 of the Lambeth Local Plan 2015)

10 The completed schedule of supervision and monitoring for the arboricultural protection measures as agreed under the tree protection details and reports submitted as part of the approved plans (Arboricultural Impact Assessment dated 3rd July 2019) shall be submitted for approval in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to commencement of the development.

Reason: To ensure the retention of, and avoid damage to, the retained trees on the site which represent an important visual amenity to the locality (Policies Q2, Q10, Q11, Q22 and Q23 of the Lambeth Local Plan 2015).

11 Prior to the installation of the green roof, a detailed specification of the green roof should be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The specification shall include details of the quantity, size, species, position and the proposed time of planting of all elements of the living roof, together with details of their anticipated routine maintenance and protection for the lifetime of the development. The green roof shall only be installed and thereafter maintained in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure an appropriate standard of design in the interests of ecological value and in the interests of visual amenity. (Policies Q2, Q9 and Q10, Q22 and Q23 of the Lambeth Local Plan 2015).

12 Prior to the occupation of the development hereby permitted, the rooflights of the extension located on the northern boundary shall be fitted with obscure glass over the entirety of the glass, to a minimum level of obscurity equivalent to Pilkington Texture Glass Level 3 to remain fixed shut and shall be retained as such for the duration of the development.

Reason: To protect the amenities of adjoining occupiers (Policy Q2 of the Lambeth Local Plan 2015).

13 No roof of the development shall be used as a roof terrace, sitting out area or other amenity space.

Reason: To protect the amenities of adjoining occupiers (Policy Q2 of the Lambeth Local Plan 2015).
14 Noise from any mechanical equipment or building services plant shall not exceed the background noise level L90B(A) 15 minutes, when measured outside the window of the nearest noise sensitive or residential premises.

Reason: To protect the amenities of adjoining occupiers (Policy Q2 of the Lambeth Local Plan 2015).

15 Within one month of the date of commissioning all equipment and plant hereby approved, noise measurements shall be carried out to confirm the noise target has been met. Any additional steps required to mitigate noise shall be detailed and implemented as necessary. The post installation noise levels shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The details as approved shall thereafter be permanently retained.

Reason: To protect the amenities of adjoining occupiers (Policy Q2 of the Lambeth Local Plan 2015).

16 No mechanical plant or building services plant hereby approved shall be operated on the premises before 8.30 on weekdays nor after 17.00 on weekdays, nor at any time on Saturdays, Sundays and Bank Holidays.

Reason: To protect the amenities of adjoining occupiers (Policy Q2 of the Lambeth Local Plan 2015).

17 The existing fence located on the northern boundary must be retained in perpetuity or if removed a new boundary treatment shall be built in a ‘like for like replacement’. Any boundary treatment shall be permanently retained and maintained for the duration of all equipment and plant hereby approved being in situ.

Reason: To protect the amenities of adjoining occupiers (Policy Q2 of the Lambeth Local Plan 2015).

18 The extension hereby approved shall be used in connection with the existing school use and for no other use including any other purpose in Use Class D1 of the schedule to the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 (as amended) or in any provision equivalent to that Class in any statutory instrument revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification.

Reason: To protect the amenities of adjoining occupiers and prevent unacceptable transport impacts (Policy Q2, T6 and T7 of the Lambeth Local Plan 2015).

19 The use of the school and extension hereby approved shall be limited to a maximum number of 140 pupils, unless otherwise agreed by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To protect the amenities of adjoining occupiers and prevent unacceptable transport impacts (Policy Q2, T6 and T7 of the Lambeth Local Plan 2015).

20 The existing School Travel Plan (STP) shall be continually updated in line with standard STP best practice, on an annual basis to reflect progress on the development, and shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This shall be implemented by the School in accordance with the details submitted and thereafter retained and/or developed to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To promote sustainable modes of travel and minimise the number of trips by car (Policies T1, T2, T6 of the Lambeth Local Plan 2015).

21 Prior to implementation of the development full details of the proposed construction methodology in the form of a 'Method of Construction Statement' shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The Method of Construction Statement shall include details regarding:

a) The scope and nature of notifying neighbours with regard to specific works;
b) Advance notification of any road closures;
c) Details regarding parking, deliveries, and storage;
d) Details regarding dust mitigation;
e) Details of measures to prevent the deposit of mud and debris on the public highway; and
f) Any other measures to mitigate the impact of construction upon the amenity of the area and the function and safety of the highway network.
g) Construction Logistics Plan (CLP), defining the timings and various activities to take place during the different phases of the construction periods.
h) Details of the use of a banks-man during construction
No development shall commence until provision has been made to accommodate all site operatives', visitors' and construction vehicles loading, off-loading, parking and turning within the site or otherwise during the construction period in accordance with the approved details. The development shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the details and measures approved in the Method of Construction Statement.

Reason: Development must not commence before this condition is discharged to avoid hazard and obstruction being caused to users of the public highway and to safeguard residential amenity from the start of the construction process. (Policies T8, G21, EN1 and Q2 of the Lambeth Local Plan 2015 and Policy 7.19 of The London Plan (2011).)

22 No development shall commence until a Basement Method Statement has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This statement shall include details regarding:

a) Details of measures proposed to mitigate any risks in relation to land instability, this is to include details on the basement structure proposal. This must include where the temporary support will be provided.

b) Demonstration of how cumulative effects have been considered;

c) A comprehensive non-technical summary document of the assessments provided and information submitted against (a) to (b) of this condition.

Reason: Development must not commence before this condition is discharged to avoid hazard in relation to land instability and increased flood risk caused by the basement excavation (Policy EN5 of the Lambeth Local Plan 2015).

23 No development shall commence on site until a detailed Sustainable Drainage System (SuDS) Strategy document has been provided for approval by the Local Planning Authority. The SuDS Strategy must include a detailed design, maintenance schedule, confirmation of the management arrangement. The SuDS Strategy must also demonstrate the technical feasibility/viability of the drainage system through the use of SuDS to manage the flood risk to the site for the life time of the development. The approved scheme for the surface water drainage shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details before the development is first put in to use/occupied.

Reason: To ensure the development is provided with a satisfactory means of drainage and in the interests of securing a more sustainable development and to reduce the impact of flooding both to and from the development and third parties in accordance with Policy EN5 of the Lambeth Local Plan 2015.

24 No development shall be brought in to use/occupied until a management and maintenance plan of the final surface water management system (i.e. Sustainable Drainage System - SuDS) and associated pipework has been provided for approval by the Local Planning Authority. The plan must consider the management and maintenance for the lifetime of the development which shall include the arrangements for adoption by any public authority or statutory undertaker and any other arrangements to secure the operation of the scheme throughout its lifetime. The approved plan shall be implemented in full in accordance with the agreed terms and conditions.

Reason: To ensure there are clear arrangements in place for ongoing maintenance over the lifetime of the development in accordance with Policy EN6 of the Lambeth Local Plan (September 2015).

25 Within six months of first occupation, a BREEAM Post Construction certificate and summary score sheet should be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority demonstrating that a rating of 'Excellent' has been achieved.

Reason: To ensure that the development makes the fullest contribution to minimising carbon dioxide emissions (London Plan Policy 5.2 and Lambeth Local Plan 2015 Policy EN3).

26 Prior to the commencement of above ground works the applicant should submit an overheating report showing that the risk of overheating has been reduced in line with the Mayor's cooling hierarchy and demonstrating compliance with CIBSE TM52 and TM49.

Reason: To ensure that the development makes the fullest contribution to minimising carbon dioxide emissions (London Plan Policy 5.2 and Lambeth Local Plan 2015 Policy EN3).

27 Prior to works commencing onsite, a finalized Sustainable Design and Construction Statement, showing how carbon dioxide emissions reduction will be achieved in line with the Mayor's energy hierarchy, should be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that the development makes the fullest contribution to minimising carbon dioxide emissions (London Plan Policy 5.2 and Lambeth Local Plan 2015 Policy EN3).
Prior to the commencement of above ground works Design Stage calculations under the National Calculation Method should be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority demonstrating that the development will achieve a maximum possible reduction in carbon emissions over that required by Part L of the Building Regulations 2013.

Reason: To ensure that the development makes the fullest contribution to minimising carbon dioxide emissions (London Plan Policy 5.2 and Lambeth Local Plan 2015 Policy EN3).

Prior to first occupation of the development As Built calculations under the National Calculation Method should be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority demonstrating that the development has achieved a maximum possible reduction in carbon emissions over that required by Part L of the Building Regulations 2013.

Reason: To ensure that the development makes the fullest contribution to minimising carbon dioxide emissions (London Plan Policy 5.2 and Lambeth Local Plan 2015 Policy EN3).

Notes to Applicants:
In dealing with this application the Council has implemented the requirement in the National Planning Policy Framework (2019) to work with the applicant in a positive and proactive manner. The council has made available on its website the policies and guidance provided by Lambeth Local Plan (2015) and its supplementary planning documents. We also offer a full pre-application advice service in order to ensure that the applicant has every opportunity to submit an application that’s likely to be considered acceptable.

1. This decision letter does not convey an approval or consent which may be required under any enactment, by-law, order or regulation, other than Section 57 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

2. Your attention is drawn to the provisions of the Building Regulations, and related legislation which must be complied with to the satisfaction of the Council’s Building Control Officer.

3. Your attention is drawn to the provisions of The Party Wall Act 1996 in relation to the rights of adjoining owners regarding party walls etc. These rights are a matter for civil enforcement and you may wish to consult a surveyor or architect.

4. Your attention is drawn to the need to comply with the requirements of the Control of Pollution Act 1974 concerning construction site noise and in this respect you are advised to contact the Council’s Environmental Health Division.

5. You are advised of the necessity to consult the Principal Highways Engineer of the Highways team on dny@lambeth.gov.uk in order to obtain necessary prior approval for undertaking any works within the Public Highway including Scaffold, Temporary/Permanent Crossovers, Oversailing/Undersailing of the Highway, Drainage/Sewer Connections and Repairs on the Highways, Hoarding, Excavations, Temporary Full/Part Road Closures, Craneage Licenses etc. You are advised to contact the Highways team at the earliest possible opportunity.

Yours sincerely

Rob Bristow
Assistant Director Planning, Transport & Development
Growth, Planning and Employment Directorate
Appendix 2: List of consultees (statutory and Other Consultees)

Statutory and other consultees consulted

- TFL Road Network Development (non-referable)
- Bus Priority and Traffic Unit Bus Priority And Traffic Unit London Transport Buses
- Ward Councillors Lambeth
- London Borough of Wandsworth
- Streatham Society
- Streatham Action
- Friends Of Unigate Woods
- Twentieth Century Society

Neighbouring properties consulted

243 Bedford Hill London SW16 1LB
59 Mount Ephraim Lane London SW16 1JE
57 Mount Ephraim Lane London SW16 1JE
Parkside Mansions 9 Fishers Close London SW16 1JN
9 Wellington Mews London SW16 1UF
6 Fishers Close London SW16 1JN
4 Wellington Mews London SW16 1UF
11 Fishers Close London SW16 1JN
7 Fishers Close London SW16 1JN
8 Wellington Mews London SW16 1UF
5 Wellington Mews London SW16 1UF
4 Parkside Mansions 9 Fishers Close London SW16 1JN
5 Fishers Close London SW16 1JN
10 Fishers Close London SW16 1JN
2 Parkside Mansions 9 Fishers Close London SW16 1JN
5 Parkside Mansions 9 Fishers Close London SW16 1JN
3 Parkside Mansions 9 Fishers Close London SW16 1JN
7 Parkside Mansions 9 Fishers Close London SW16 1JN
4 Fishers Close London SW16 1JN
1 Parkside Mansions 9 Fishers Close London SW16 1JN
7 Wellington Mews London SW16 1UF
6 Wellington Mews London SW16 1UF
3 Wellington Mews London SW16 1UF
2 Wellington Mews London SW16 1UF
8 Fishers Close London SW16 1JN
3 Fishers Close London SW16 1JN
6 Parkside Mansions 9 Fishers Close London SW16 1JN
Saxoncroft House 2 Fishers Close London SW16 1JN
9 Saxoncroft House 2 Fishers Close London SW16 1JN
5 Saxoncroft House 2 Fishers Close London SW16 1JN
1 Saxoncroft House 2 Fishers Close London SW16 1JN
10 Saxoncroft House 2 Fishers Close London SW16 1JN
8 Saxoncroft House 2 Fishers Close London SW16 1JN
7 Saxoncroft House 2 Fishers Close London SW16 1JN
6 Saxoncroft House 2 Fishers Close London SW16 1JN
4 Saxoncroft House 2 Fishers Close London SW16 1JN
3 Saxoncroft House 2 Fishers Close London SW16 1JN
2 Saxoncroft House 2 Fishers Close London SW16 1JN
13 Fishers Close London SW16 1JN
12 Fishers Close London SW16 1JN

84 Woodfield Avenue London SW16 1LD
78 Woodfield Avenue London SW16 1LD
82 Woodfield Avenue London SW16 1LD
80 Woodfield Avenue London SW16 1LD
53 Woodfield Avenue London SW16 1LE
55 Woodfield Avenue London SW16 1LE
Flat 2 77 Woodbourne Avenue London SW16 1UX
Flat 2A 75 Woodbourne Avenue London SW16 1UX
Flat 1 77 Woodbourne Avenue London SW16 1UX
Flat 1 75 Woodbourne Avenue London SW16 1UX
Flat 3 75 Woodbourne Avenue London SW16 1UX
77 Woodbourne Avenue London SW16 1UX
Flat 6 75 Woodbourne Avenue London SW16 1UX
Flat 5 75 Woodbourne Avenue London SW16 1UX
Flat 4 75 Woodbourne Avenue London SW16 1UX
Flat 2 75 Woodbourne Avenue London SW16 1UX
Flat 7B 75 Woodbourne Avenue London SW16 1UX
84 Woodbourne Avenue London SW16 1UT
60 Mount Ephraim Lane London SW16 1JD
56 Mount Ephraim Lane London SW16 1JD
Flat 3 1 Garrad's Road London SW16 1JZ
Flat 2 1 Garrad's Road London SW16 1JZ
38 Ambleside Avenue London SW16 1qp
39 Kempshott Road London SW16 5LJ
123 Gleneldon Road London SW162BQ
Woodbourne Avenue London SW16
3 Aldrich Terrace Earlsfield SW183pu
8 Ullathorne Road London SW16 1SN
52 Mount Ephraim Lane London SW 16 1JD
1 Woodfield Grove London SW16 1LR
27 Hoadly Road London SW16 1AE
48 Mount Ephraim Lane Streatham SW16 1JD
59 Woodbourne Avenue LONDON SW16 1UX
41B Kay Road London SW9 9DF
The Lodge Woodfield Lane London SW161LF
22, Atria Road Middlesex HA6 3LS
37 Telford Ave London SW2 4XL
Flat 3 1 Garrads Road Streatham SW16 1JZ
4 Cornford Grove London SW12 9jf
50 Hearnville Rd London SW12 8RR
65 Woodbourne Avenue London SW16 1UX
24 Brancaster Road London Sw16 1nj
39 Abbotswood Road London SW16 1AJ
29 Webbs Road London SW11 6RU
22 Dornton Road London SW12 9ND
The Cottage London SW16 1LF
Lansdowne Road London W11 2LG
Woodbourne Avenue London SW161UP
47A Mount Ephraim Lane Streatham SW16 1JE
18 Dornton Road London Sw12 9nd
50 Brodrick Road London SW17 7DY
8 Fisher's Close Garrad's Road London SW16 1JN
64 Woodbourne Avenue London Sw161ut
62 Woodfield Avenue London Sw16 1LD
32A Church Rd Crystal Palace SE19 2ET
22 Atria Road Middlesex HA6 3LS
2 Fishers Close Streatham SW16 1JN
8 Birchlands Avenue London SW12 8ND
33 Hoadly Road Streatham London SW16 1AE
84 Woodbourne Avenue London SW161UT
66 Woodfield Avenue London SW16 1LD
1 Rydal Road London SW16 1QF
39 Abbotswood Road London SW16 1AJ
25 Hoadly Road London SW16 1AE
60 Mount Ephraim Lane Streatham London SW16 1JD
34 Ritherdon Rd London Sw17 8qf
77 Gosberton Road London Sw128IG
3 Wellington Mews London Sw16 1uf
94 DREWSTEAD ROAD LONDON SW16 1AG
60 Mount Ephraim Lane LONDON SW16 1JD
12 Burntwood Grange Road Wandsworth London
53 Lanercost Rd London Sw23dr
52 Drewstead Rd London Sw161ag
18 Tierney Road London SW2 4QR
13 Woodnook Road London SW166TZ
Flat 3 1 Garrads Road London SW16 1JZ
10 Rommany Road West Norwood SE27 9PX
11 Killieser Ave London SW2 4NU
7 Garrad's Road London Sw16 1jz
9 Fallow Court Argyle Way London SE16 3Jq
58 Mount Ephraim Lane London SW161JD
27 Woodbourne Avenue London SW16 1UP
50 Hearnville Rd London SW12 8RR
40 De Montfort Road London SW16 1LZ
18 Griffel Ave London SW2 4AZ
16 Hartswood House London London SW2 4AS
82 Woodfield Avenue Streatham London SW16 1LD
Woodbourne Av London Sw16
12 Woodfield Grove Streatham Sw16 1lr
64 Killieser Ave London Sw2 4nt
45 Thrale Road London SW16 1NT
58 Mt Ephraim Lane London SW16 1JD
79 Drakefield Road London SW17 8RS
11 Killyon Road London SW82XS
7 Hoadly Road London Sw16 1ae
2 Upper Tooting Park London SW17 7SW
29 Hoadly Road SW16 1AE
101 Drewstead Rd London SW16 1AD
32 Bushnell Road London SW17 8QP
4 Mount Ephraim Lane London SW16 1JG
55 Abbotswood Rd Streatham London SW16 1AL
Woodbourne Avenue London SW16 1UU
42 Woodfield Avenue Streatham London Sw161lg
50 Brudenell Road London Sw178dA
58 Mount Ephraim Lane London SW16 1JD
29 Woodfield Avenue Streatham London SW12 1LQ
4 Wellington Mews London SW16 1UF
60 Mount Ephraim Lane London SW16 1 JD
Flat 2 1 Garrad's Rd London SW16 1JZ
6 Crockerton Road London Sw17 7hg
Flat 3 No’ 1 Garrads Road Streatham London Sw16 1jz
22A Burnbury Road Balham London SW12 0EJ
153 Gleneldon Road London SW16 2BQ
7 Ashmere Grove London London SW2 5UH
56 Rtherdon Rd London Sw17 8QG
55 Woodbourne Ave London SW161UX
43 Woodfield Avenue London SW16 1LE
22 Briarwood Road Clapham London SW4 9PX
32 Scholars Road London SW120PG
86 Fern Side Rd London Sw12 8lj
63 Rodenhurst Road London Sw4 8ae
4 The Spinney London SW16 1LA
20 Rydal Road London Sw161qn
59A Abbotswood Road London SW16 1AL
22 Ramsden Road London Sw12 8qy
17 Abbotswood Road London London SW16 1AJ
44 Mount Ephraim Lane London SW16 1JD
39 Abootswood Road London SW16 1AJ
49 Woodfield Avenue London SW16 1LE
13 Huron Road London Sw17 8re
54 Abbotswood Road London SW16 1AW
24 Brancaster Road London SW16 1NJ
Olive Morris House London SW2
537A Old York Road Wandsworth Sw181tg
56 Woodfield Ave London SW16 1LG
59 Mount Ephraim Lane Streatham London SW16 1JE
34 Becmead Avenue London SW161UQ
38 Ambleside Avenue London SW16 1QP
85 Drakefield Road London SW17 8RS
72 Rtherdon Road London SW17 8QG
16 Hartwood House London SW2 4AS
23 Rosedene Avenue Street Ham Hill London SW16 2LS
Brancaster Road London SW16 1Nj
34 Ritherdon Road London SW17 8QF
79 Gleneagle Road Streatham London SW16 6ay
58 Mount Ephraim London SW161JD
71 Foxbourne Rd London SW17 8EN
128 Hydethorpe Road London SW12 0JD
59 Woodbourne Avenue London SW16 1UX
Flat 3 1 Garrads Road Streatham London SW16 1JZ
Flat 3 1 Garrads Road London Sw161jz
132 Thurleigh Road London Sw168TU
157 Mitcham Lane London SW16 6NA
Appendix 3: List of relevant policies in London Plan, Lambeth Local Plan. Reference to SPGs, SPD and other relevant guidance

London Plan (2016) policies

- 5.2 Minimising carbon dioxide emissions
- 5.3 Sustainable design and construction
- 5.7 Renewable energy
- 5.9 Overheating and cooling
- 5.10 Urban greening
- 5.11 Green roofs and development site environs
- 5.13 Sustainable drainage
- 5.15 Water use and supplies
- 5.18 Construction, excavation and demolition waste
- 6.3 Assessing effects of development on transport capacity
- 6.9 Cycling
- 6.10 Walking
- 6.13 Parking
- 7.3 Designing out crime
- 7.4 Local character
- 7.6 Architecture
- 7.8 Heritage assets and archaeology
- 7.14 Improving air quality
- 7.15 Reducing and managing noise, improving and enhancing the acoustic environment and promoting appropriate soundscapes

London Plan Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG)

- Accessible London: Achieving an Inclusive Environment (October 2014)
- The control of dust and emissions during construction and demolition (July 2014)
- Character and Context (June 2014)
- Sustainable Design and Construction (April 2014)

Draft New London Plan (2019) policies

- S1 (Developing London’s social infrastructure)
- S3 (Education and childcare facilities)
- D1 (London’s form and characteristics)
- D2 (Delivering good design)
- T5 (Cycling)
- T6 (Car parking)
- T6.5 (Non – residential disable persons parking)
- HC2 (Heritage conservation and growth)
- S112 (Flood risk management)
Other guidance

- BRE ‘Layout planning for daylight and sunlight: A guide to good practice’

Lambeth Local Plan (2015) policies

- D5 Enforcement
- S3 Schools
- T1 Sustainable travel
- T2 Walking
- T3 Cycling
- T6 Assessing impacts of development on transport capacity
- T7 Parking
- T8 Servicing
- EN3 Decentralised energy
- EN4 Sustainable design and construction
- EN5 Flood risk
- EN6 Sustainable drainage systems and water management
- Q1 Inclusive environments
- Q2 Amenity
- Q3 Community safety
- Q5 Local distinctiveness
- Q7 Urban design: new development
- Q8 Design quality: construction detailing
- Q9 Landscaping
- Q10 Trees
- Q11 Building alterations and extensions
- Q12 Refuse/recycling storage
- Q14 Development in gardens and on backland sites
- Q13 Cycle storage
- Q15 Boundary treatments
- Q22 Conservation areas
- Q23 Undesignated heritage assets: local heritage list

Lambeth Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs) and guidance

- Building Alterations and Extensions SPD (2015)
- Parking Survey Guidance Notes
- Refuse & Recycling Storage Design Guide
- Waste Storage and Collection Requirements - Technical Specification
- Air Quality Planning Guidance Notes

- Wandsworth Borough Council: Conservation Area Character Statement: 43 Garrads Road
Draft Lambeth Local Plan

- D5  Enforcement
- S3  Schools
- T1  Sustainable travel
- T2  Walking
- T3  Cycling
- T6  Assessing impacts of development on transport capacity
- T7  Parking
- T8  Servicing
- EN3  Decentralised energy
- EN4  Sustainable design and construction
- EN5  Flood risk
- EN6  Sustainable drainage systems and water management
- Q1  Inclusive environments
- Q2  Amenity
- Q3  Community safety
- Q5  Local distinctiveness
- Q7  Urban design: new development
- Q8  Design quality: construction detailing
- Q9  Landscaping
- Q10 Trees
- Q11 Building alterations and extensions
- Q12 Refuse/recycling storage
- Q14 Development in gardens and on previously developed rear land with no street frontage
- Q13 Cycle storage
- Q15 Boundary treatments
- Q22 Conservation areas
- Q23 Undesignated heritage assets: local heritage list
- Q27 Basement development

Other draft documents

- Streatham Park and Garrads Road Draft Conservation Area Statement (2016)
- Draft Lambeth Design Code SPD (Draft February 2020)
Appendix 3: Appeal Decision dated 26th June 2017 – Ref: APP/N5660/W/17/3170337
Appeal Decision
Site visit made on 5 June 2017

by Stephen Normington  BSc DipTP MRICS MRTPI FIQ FIHE

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 28 June 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/N5660/W/17/3170337
Broomwood Hall School, 3 Garrads Road, London SW16 1JZ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Broomwood Hall School Ltd against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Lambeth.
- The application Ref 16/05820/FUL, dated 11 October 2016, was refused by notice dated 14 December 2016.
- The development proposed is the erection of an extension to provide a multi-purpose dining hall, kitchen, three classrooms, lift and ancillary facilities.

Decision
1. The appeal is dismissed.

Application for costs
2. An application for costs was made by Broomwood Hall School Ltd against the Council of the London Borough of Lambeth. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

Main Issues
3. The main issues are:
   - The effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of the occupants of No 1 Garrads Road with particular regard to outlook and light.
   - The effect of the proposed development on heritage assets and in particular whether the proposed development would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Streatham Park–Garrads Road Conservation area and the effect on the setting of the host property which is a non-designated heritage asset.

Reasons

Living Conditions
4. The appeal site comprises a former Edwardian villa that has been converted into a private school and is set in substantial grounds that are used as playing areas. It is located within the Streatham Park–Garrads Road Conservation area and lies directly opposite Tooting Bec Common. The property has been designated on the Council’s Local Heritage List as a non-designated heritage asset. To the north of the site is No 1 Garrads Road which is a relatively large
property that has been converted into flats and is also set in substantial grounds with the boundary between the two properties being formed of a close boarded timber fence with hedging and mature trees.

5. The proposed development would involve the construction of a two storey extension, with the first floor accommodation being in the roof space, that would be attached to the northern flank wall of the host property and extend to within approximately 1.3m of the boundary with No 1. The proposed front (western) elevation would be positioned slightly behind that of the host building. The northern elevation would extend approximately 30m in length and would be positioned parallel with the boundary with No 1. There is some variation in the officer’s report regarding the height of the proposed extension, although the maximum height identified would be approximately 4.1m to the eaves. The apex would be approximately 7.7m high in the vicinity of the host building and would then reduce by approximately 1m for the majority of its length.

6. The appellant indicates that there would be approximately 10m between the northern façade of the proposed extension and the south façade of No 1 which contains habitable room windows to flats on the ground floor and first floor. The intervening garden area is shared by the occupiers of Flats 1 and 4. The Council has not drawn my attention to any adopted separation distances between existing and proposed buildings.

7. In order to consider the effect of the proposed development on the daylight and sunlight received at the windows in the south elevation of No 1, a Daylight and Sunlight Assessment has been provided. This accords with the Building Research Establishment (BRE) Report ‘Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight: A Guide to Good Practice’ which I accept, in the absence of any other planning policy guidance, is an established document to consider the impact of new development on daylight and sunlight. Consequently, I have attached moderate weight to this assessment.

8. The BRE guide recommends that new development should not cause the Vertical Sky Component (a measure of the general amount of light available on the outside plane of a window as a ratio of the total unobstructed sky viewable following the introduction of a barrier such as a building) to be no less than 80% of its former value. This information demonstrates that there would be no noticeable loss of sunlight or daylight to the windows in the habitable rooms of No 1 and that the requirements of the BRE Guidance are met.

9. In addition, a Sunlight Amenity Study and Transient Shadow Assessment, as recommended in the BRE Guidance, have been undertaken in respect of the garden areas to the south of No 1.

10. The Sunlight Amenity Test quantifies the area of garden that receives at least two hours of sunlight on 21st March in both the existing and proposed situations and suggests that for a space to appear well-sunlit it should receive two or more hours of sunlight to at least 50% of its area. The results of the analysis show that the areas assessed would continue to receive two or more hours of sunlight to at least 80% of the area.

11. The Transient Overshadowing Assessment requires the production of shadow diagrams for differing times of the year. The assessments for 21 March and 21 September are identical as they represent the sun’s midpoint through its
annual travel and show that the effects of the existing buildings are similar to that of the proposed development with a small amount of shadow being cast into the rear garden of No 1.

12. The conclusions of these assessments identifies that on 21 June a small area of shadow, approximately 1m deep would occur between the hours of 09.00 and 14.00. The 21 December assessment is when the sun is at its lowest angle in the sky and the conclusions suggest that there would be some shadowing but as the overall assessment easily complies with the Sunlight Amenity criteria and that the increase in shadows cast in the spring, summer and autumn months are shown to be minor, the overall impact of the proposed development would be minor.

13. There is some dispute between the appellant and interested parties as to whether the results of the Transient Overshadowing Assessment are correct. Interested parties have also produced an independent assessment which suggests that the gardens at No 1 will receive significant additional shadow as a consequence of the proposed development.

14. Whilst I have no conclusive evidence as to which assessment may be correct, the Council’s statement accepts that the proposed development would meet the requirements of the Sunlight Amenity Test but there would be some shadowing in the winter months. The BRE Guidance does not contain any criteria to assess the transient shadow analysis and, as such, consideration of shadow impacts has to be made on a subjective basis. Given that other quantitative tests in the BRE guidance are met, I do not consider that the shadowing of the garden during the winter months would be a sustainable reason for the dismissal of the appeal.

15. Therefore, the sunlight and daylight assessments demonstrate that the appeal property is capable of being extended in a manner that would not cause an unacceptable reduction in daylight and sunlight to the occupants of the flats at No 1.

16. I recognise that design has been developed with some consideration of the impact on outlook for the occupants of the flats and users of the garden at No 1. However, the proposed development would result in the provision of an elongated building positioned in close proximity to the boundary with No 1 and extending a distance of approximately 30m with a height between approximately 7.7m and 6.7 m. Owing to its length, there would be a considerable mass of flank wall and roof positioned in close proximity to the property boundary. Consequently, the proposed extension would unacceptably dominate views from the south facing windows of the flats and from the garden.

17. The proposed development would considerably erode the current open gap that exists between the two existing properties and replace this with a substantial mass of built development that would effective form an enclosing feature located in close proximity to the property boundary. In parts this would be considerably higher than the intervening vegetation and would substantially eliminate views to the south from the windows at No1 and its garden. Consequently, it would create an unacceptable and oppressive sense of enclosure.
18. I recognise that there is some scope for an extension to the school that may be positioned close to the boundary with No 1. However, as a consequence of its length and height, the proposed scheme this would result in a substantial mass of development extending along the property boundary that would appear unacceptably dominant and overbearing.

19. The Council has also expressed concern regarding the presence of the side dormer window on the north facing roof and indicates that this would also contribute to the bulk and dominance of the extension. I consider the design, scale and mass of the proposed dormer to be inappropriate in relation to the roof structure proposed. However, it would face directly towards the windows in the flats at No 1. Whilst I recognise that this dormer would be provided obscure glazing it would nonetheless contribute to a perception of overlooking. This further adds to my concerns regarding the impact on the living conditions of adjoining residents.

20. Although I have found that the proposed development would not cause any material loss of sunlight or daylight, as a consequence of its length and height it would cause an unacceptable sense of enclosure and overbearing outlook. This would harm the living conditions of the occupants of the flats in No 1 Garrads Road that have windows facing the appeal site and the users of the garden. The proposed development would therefore be contrary to Policy Q2 of the Lambeth Local Plan 2015 (Local Plan). This policy, amongst other things, requires that new development should not compromise visual amenity from adjoining sites and should provide adequate outlook, avoiding wherever possible any undue sense of enclosure.

*Heritage assets*

21. The design of the proposed extension would be reflective of many of the design elements of the host property and would be predominantly constructed of brick with a slate tile hipped roof, containing roof dormers. However, elements of render, cedar boarding and the use of powder coated doors are also proposed in the external materials.

22. The Council accept that the proposed extension would be subordinate to the existing building and that its design, scale, bulk and mass respond appropriately to the original architecture of the host property. I have no reasons to disagree with the Council’s view that the proposed extension would not appear as awkward or incongruous and would sustain the setting of the non-designated heritage asset. In my view, the design, scale, mass and fenestration proportions of the proposed development would have an acceptable relationship to the host property.

23. Due to the existing close boarded fence and substantial hedging along the frontage of the site, public views from Garrads Road would be limited to the upper parts of the proposed extension. Given its design relationship with the host building, in such views it would not appear as being incongruous or at odds with the character or appearance of this part of the Conservation Area.

24. The Council’s concerns relate to the use of render, cedar boarding and powder coated frames in the proposed construction materials and suggest that these would not be in keeping with the host building. In addition, the Council suggest that the use of the boarding and render would require continued maintenance to sustain an appropriate appearance. My attention has been
drawn to paragraph 3.26 of the adopted Supplementary Planning Document - Building Alterations & Extensions (SPD). This identifies that the predominant traditional construction materials in Lambeth are brick, natural slates and clay tiles and that render and timber cladding will generally be resisted on new work unless the host building is already finished in these materials as neither material weathers well in urban environments and they both require regular treatment or redecoration to maintain a smart appearance, placing an unnecessary maintenance burden on property owners. As a consequence of the proposed use of these materials, the Council suggests that the proposed development would not preserve the character or appearance of the Conservation Area.

25. Several properties in the vicinity of the appeal site, including parts of the host property, utilise render on the external facades. The proposed extension would have a small rendered band between the brick work of the ground floor and the eaves. The limited use of this material in the proposed development would neither be uncommon within the context of the Conservation Area as a whole nor be out of place with the host building. Consequently, its use would not be contrary to the guidance provided within the SPD.

26. Approximately half of the north elevation of the proposed extension in the vicinity of the boundary with No 1 is proposed to be formed of horizontal cedar boarding. This would extend from floor level up to the render band level. The appellant suggests that the use of this material would help to soften the appearance of the extension in views from the garden area of No 1.

27. From my observations of the properties in the vicinity of the appeal site I accept the Council's view that cedar boarding is uncommon in this part of the Conservation Area and is not a construction material that is present in the host building. Therefore, its use would be at odds with the character of the Conservation Area and the host building. Although views of the boarding would be limited to the garden area of No1, in such views it would appear as a stark contrast to the brickwork proposed on the remaining half of this elevation. I also share the Council's concerns that cedar boarding does require regular treatment if its appearance is to be maintained and as such its use would not accord with the guidance provide in the SPD.

28. The appellant has suggested that a condition could be imposed requiring the submission of details of alternative materials to be used on this elevation, although I note the Council’s views that this may represent a significant amendment to the scheme. Given the limited extent of the proposed cedar boarding relative to the overall extension and its limitation in views, a condition requiring the submission of details of alternative materials proposed on the north elevation would be appropriate, were I minded to allow the appeal. This would not represent a significant amendment to the scheme.

29. However, the application considered by the Council proposed the use of cedar boarding and no alternative material was suggested. The use of this material would not be representative of the predominant construction materials used in the area. It would appear as an incongruous material in contrast to the proposed use of brick on the remaining half of the northern elevation with the result that this flank would appear as being disjointed. The use of cedar boarding in this context would not preserve the character or appearance of this
part of the Conservation Area and would be contrary to the guidance provided in the SPD.

30. The proposed window frames would be constructed of hardwood which would be entirely consistent with those of the host building. The use of aluminium powder coat is proposed in the panels of the entrance doors and the doors that would extend almost the whole length of the south elevation. These panels would be fitted within a hardwood sub frame.

31. Public views of the doors would be limited to the proposed entrance door in the west (front) elevation which would form part of the joining feature between the host property and the proposed extension. Owing to the existing fence and proposed replanted hedge along the frontage of the site, views of this door would be limited. All of the other proposed doors would only be readily visible from within the existing play area of the school.

32. Given the limitation in views of the proposed doors and the fact that the frame would be of a hardwood construction, I do not consider that the proposed use of powder coating in the door panels would cause any demonstrable harm to the character of appearance of the Conservation Area as a whole of an extent that would warrant the dismissal of this appeal on that ground alone.

33. The Council has also expressed concerns regarding the location of the proposed cycle storage unit which would be positioned to the front of the west façade of the proposed extension. Although no detailed designs of the facility were submitted with the application, the appellant has provided an indicative drawing showing a simple lightweight glass and steel structure approximately 2.2m high and providing storage for 28 cycles. The structure would be positioned behind the close boarded fence and hedge to the frontage of the site.

34. Policy Q13 of the Local Plan requires, amongst other things, that cycle storage facilities should be conveniently accessed from outside the building, be covered and provide safe and secure storage and should not compromise the visual amenity of front gardens/forecourts. Owing to the proposed position of the facility, the Council indicate that it would create unnecessary clutter, be visually intrusive and be out of character with the setting of the site.

35. Given the extent of existing play paraphilia on the site, it would appear that wherever the cycle facility is placed it could be argued that it would add to clutter. However, I recognise that the site is part of an active school and cycle storage facilities are an integral part of encouraging alternative means of transport to the school other than by car. I also recognise the need for the cycle store to be located close to the point of access to the school thereby avoiding the need to bring these through play areas of the school grounds.

36. The appellant indicates that the cycle store would occupy 6.8% of the total front garden area of the site. The appearance of the remaining front garden would remain largely unchanged. The proposed cycle store would introduce a structure that would cause some change to the appearance of a small corner at the front of the site. However, given the small scale nature of the cycle store and the fact that the garden immediately to the front of the host property would remain largely unchanged, I do not consider that it would be visually intrusive or cause clutter to the extent that the setting of the non-designated heritage asset would be harmed.
37. The roof of the cycle store would be temporarily visible above the height of the frontage fence until the replanted hedge matures. However, given the small scale nature of the structure and the fact that in the longer term it would not be visible in public views, it would not cause any unacceptable harm to the character or appearance of the Conservation Area.

38. Taking the above factors into account, the proposed development would not unacceptably affect the setting of the non-designated heritage asset. However, the use of cedar boarding on the northern elevation of the proposed extension would fail to preserve the character or appearance of the Conservation Area.

39. In the context of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) great weight should be given to the conservation of a designated heritage asset. Although I consider the harm to be less than substantial, any harm should require clear and convincing justification. In this case I have taken into account the identified benefit of providing places at the private school and therefore the possibly freeing up public places at other schools in the area. However, I do not consider that this would constitute a public benefit of an extent that would outweigh the great weight that should be given to the designated heritage assets conservation. There are no other public benefits that would outweigh the harm.

40. Accordingly, as a consequence of the proposed use of cedar boarding, the proposal conflicts with section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and would not accord with paragraphs 131 and 132 of the Framework. It would also be contrary to Policies Q5, Q7, Q8, Q11 and Q22 of the Local Plan. These policies, amongst other things, require that development within a Conservation Area should preserve the character or appearance of the Conservation Area, that construction detailing is used that is maintenance free, that local distinctiveness is maintained and that it should positively respond to the original materials of the host building.

41. However, for the reasons identified above there would be no conflict with Policy Q13, relating to cycle storage or Policy Q23 which, amongst other things, requires development to protect the setting of non-designated heritage assets.

Other matters

42. Part of the Council’s third reason for the refusal of planning permission suggests that the proposed cycle store would erode the habitat value of the application site. However, no evidence is provided in the officer’s report or appeal statement to substantiate this matter.

43. The appellant has provided a Phase 1 Habitat Survey & Protected Species Scoping Assessment which demonstrates that the site is considered low in ecological value with minimal potential to support protected, priority or rare species. The assessment identifies that the proposed development would have minimal risk of harm or impact to protected, priority or notable species or habitats. In the absence of any other evidence to the contrary, I have placed considerable weight of the findings of this assessment. Given the low habitat and ecological potential of the site I conclude that the proposed development would not erode any habitat value that would be a significant material consideration in the determination of this appeal.
44. Local residents have expressed concerns that the proposed development would lead to increased parking pressure on the roads in the vicinity of the school. However, the proposal does not seek to increase the number of pupils attending the school. As the proposed development would not introduce additional pupil numbers there would be a neutral impact on parking stress in the area.

Conclusion

45. I have found that the proposed extension would unlikely cause any loss of daylight and sunlight to the windows in the flats at No 1 Garrads Road, would provide adequate arrangements for cycle parking and would not affect the setting of the non-designated heritage asset. I have also taken into account the advice provided in paragraph 72 of the Framework and the weight to be attached to the need to create, expand or alter schools. Notwithstanding the fact that the school is an independent preparatory school it does make an important contribution to education provision in the Borough. These are all matters that weigh in its favour.

46. However, none of them is sufficient, individually or cumulatively, to outweigh the harm identified in respect of its impact on the living conditions of the occupants of No 1 as a consequence of the loss of outlook and sense of enclosure that would be created by the extent of the mass of the building located in such close proximity to the property boundary and the failure to preserve the character or appearance of the Conservation Area as a consequence of the use of cedar boarding.

47. For the above reasons, taking into account the development plan as a whole based on the evidence before me and all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Stephen Normington

INSPECTOR