1. The requirements of LP 28 have not been met in full – lack of marketing evidence provided.

Response: see Council's Opinion in respect of the correct application of policy LP 28 in relation to Council disposal sites.

2. There were clear officer recommendations in the pre-app advice for information to be submitted, including links for a period of no less than 2 years demonstrating this is on the public disposal list, confirmation the disposal programme is necessary to ensure continued delivery of social infrastructure and related services, and confirm if there have been any discussions with partners regarding the re-use of the site for social infrastructure uses. Can you please provide this information / respond.

Response: See Appendix 1 of the planning statement (Cabinet Meeting report 15th March 2018); Justification for Change of Use of Strathmore Road Site submitted with the preapplication submission (attached); Counsel's Opinion from David Forsdick Landmark Chambers and; legal advice from Ashfords Solicitors.

3. There is reference in the Planning Statement to evidence from the Estates Department demonstrating that 'other alternative social or community uses have been explored and options discounted – can you please confirm where this is?

Response: This document was submitted as part of the pre-application submission.

- 4. It is noted the Planning Statement states that the proposal is meeting the needs of SCAMPS but can a statement from SCAMPS be provided expanding on this and setting out the following
 - Setting out their views of the application
 - clarification on whether/how the specific needs of SCAMPS is being met (including internal/external space)?
 - o Will the re-provided space be an improvement to the existing provision, if so how?
 - How many pupils does SCAMPS currently have and is the provision meeting this need?

Response: Scamps is not the applicant. The applicant and the Estates Department have been in consultation with Scamps throughout the design process to ensure that the scheme meets their needs. Existing and proposed provision in terms of layout and facilities is set out in the application drawings. Pupil numbers are set out in the Planning Statement.

5. The Planning Statement sets out the details of the existing use, in terms of age groups, wraparound care, and maximum occupancy – Can you please confirm whether this is the same for the proposed provision?

Response: The applicant has confirmed that the design of the new building seeks to provide sufficient capacity to meet the needs of the existing provision. Any limits on capacity or out of hours dual use would be a matter for the council to control by way of conditions.

6. Can you please clarify hours of use for SCAMPS

Response: Hours of use by each pupil age group is set out in the Planning Statement. Restrictions on hours of operation including non-nursery uses e.g. renting the hall for community use, is a matter for the Council to control by way of conditions.

7. Can you please also confirm the arrangements for SCAMPS during the construction works? Where will they be moving to etc?

Response: As agreed with the LPA, the Construction Management Plan including temporary accommodation for Scamps will be addressed by way of pre-commencement condition.

8. Affordable Housing - If approved, a legal agreement would be necessary to secure delivery of the affordable housing, including details regarding the tenure and affordability to accord with Policy LP36.A.b (for example affordable rents, nominations).

Response: agreed

9. Housing – scheme appears to largely meet relevant national and local requirements

Response: Noted

10. 10% wheelchair housing M4(3) is being provided - can you please clarify these are units are 18, 19 and 24?

Response: see response by Living Architects

11. All other units are said to be M4(2) 'accessible and adaptable dwellings'. However, M4(2) requires step free access and could not therefore be met for the units at first and second floor as lifts are not provided – can you please provide a response to this?

Response: see response by Living Architects