



The School House, 32 Cross Street, London, SW13 0PD

Planning Statement

02 December 2020

DP9 Limited

DP9 Ltd
100 Pall Mall

London

SW1Y 5NQ
Tel: 020 7004 1700
Fax: 020 7004 1790

CONTENTS

1.	INTRODUCTION	3
2.	SITE CONTEXT	4
3.	PLANNING HISTORY	5
4.	APPLICATION PROPOSALS.....	6
5.	PRE-APPLICATION DISCUSSIONS AND CONSULTATION	7
6.	PLANNING POLICY FRAMEWORK	9
7.	PLANNING POLICY ASSESSMENT.....	11
8.	CONCLUSIONS	19

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 This Planning Statement is submitted on behalf of Richmond and Wandsworth Councils (hereafter referred to as 'the applicant') in relation to an application at 32 Cross Street, London, SW13 0PD (hereafter 'the site'). Planning permission is sought for the following description of development:

Demolition of the existing caretaker's dwelling and erection of a two-storey building to accommodate Special Resource Provision (SRP) in connection with Barnes Primary School, plus associated fences at front and rear, minibus parking, landscaping, bin store and plant enclosure, together with associated works.

1.2 This Planning Statement has been prepared by DP9 Limited and details the planning case for the proposed development. It assesses the development in the context of adopted and emerging planning policy and guidance at national, regional and local level. The statement should be read in conjunction with other information submitted with the planning application, comprising:

- Planning Application Form and Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Form
- Site location plan
- Existing and proposed plans, elevations and sections (McBains, November 2020)
- Design and Access Statement (McBains, November 2020)
- Public Consultation Report (McBains, November 2020)
- Heritage Statement (AOC Archaeology Group, August 2020)
- Daylight, Sunlight and Overshadowing Assessment (Herrington Consulting, August 2020)
- External Noise Intrusion Report (Cole Jarman, August 2020)
- Plant Noise Assessment (Cole Jarman, December 2020)
- Transport Statement (Patrick Parsons, November 2020)
- Tree Survey, Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Arboricultural Method Statement (Martin Dobson Associates, October 2020)
- Ecological Appraisal (JFA Environmental Planning, July 2020)
- Bat Survey (JFA Environmental Planning, October 2020)
- Flood Risk Assessment (AGB Environmental, September 2020) and proposed drainage layout plan (McBains, November 2020)
- Sustainable Construction Checklist (McBains, November 2020)
- BREEAM Pre-Assessment (McBains, November 2020)
- Energy Assessment (McBains, November 2020)
- Contamination Assessment (Albury S.I. Ltd., August 2020).

1.3 The following documents have been provided for background information:

- Review of Education Provision for Special Educational Needs and Disabilities in Kingston and Richmond (Achieving for Children, May 2017)
- London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames School Place Planning Strategy (Achieving for Children, December 2019).

1.4 This Planning Statement is structured as follows:

- Section 2 provides a review of the site location and its surrounding context;
- Section 3 sets out the background and planning history of the site;
- Section 4 details the proposed development;
- Section 5 provides an overview of pre-application meetings and public consultation;
- Section 6 sets out the relevant planning policy and guidance;
- Section 7 assesses the proposed development against relevant planning policy; and
- Section 8 provides conclusions.

2.0 SITE CONTEXT

- 2.1 The application relates to a caretaker's dwelling located on the north eastern side of Cross Street, to the west of the Key Stage 2 wing of Barnes Primary School. The existing building on the site is a two-storey detached house constructed circa 1975, with a front and rear garden and off-street parking. The site lies between the rear gardens of residential properties on Westfields Avenue to the north and Railway Side to the south. The properties on Westfields Avenue are separated from the site by a public footpath, and in between the site and Railway Side there is a narrow alley affording access to the rear gardens of those properties.
- 2.2 The area surrounding the site is residential in character. To the north and east of the site there are multiple rows of two-storey terraced dwellings arranged in a tight, formal street pattern. To the east and south, the townscape is more varied – to the east lies the single-storey Key Stage 2 wing of Barnes Primary School and a higher density housing estate containing blocks of up to four storeys. To the south, on the other side of the Cross Street, lies the Key Stage 1 building and a large allotment and, beyond that, the railway line.
- 2.3 The site is approximately 500 metres from Barnes Bridge Railway Station. Two further railway stations, Barnes and Mortlake, are also within a 15 minutes' walk from the site. The nearest bus stops are located on Mortlake High Street, with services offering good links to Barnes, Richmond and Central London.
- 2.4 The application site is located within the Thorne Passage Conservation Area (CA16) and lies opposite the Brown Dog Pub at 28 Cross Street, which is designated in the Richmond Local Plan as a Building of Townscape Merit.
- 2.5 The existing caretaker's dwelling is wholly within Flood Zone 1. However, it is immediately adjacent to land which lies within Flood Zone 3a.

3.0 PLANNING HISTORY

- 3.1 Planning permission was granted for the caretaker's house in 1974 along with the Key Stage 2 building (Ref: 73/0069). Since then, there have been no planning applications for the caretaker's dwelling, other than applications to discharge conditions attached to permission 73/0069.
- 3.2 There are several historic planning applications recorded for the two main school buildings, including applications for various extensions, external alterations and the erection of temporary classrooms. Most recently, permission was granted for construction of new nursery extension at the Key Stage 1 building (Ref: 19/2239/FUL).
- 3.3 There is no planning history on either the application site or either of the main school buildings that is considered relevant to the determination of this application.

4.0 APPLICATION PROPOSALS

- 4.1 The proposal involves the demolition of the existing two-storey caretaker's dwelling and the erection of a two-storey building to provide additional accommodation for Barnes Primary School. The building will house Specialist Resource Provision (SRP) for up to 14 pupils with a variety of Autistic Spectrum Disorders (ASDs), as well as 6 members of staff. Places in the proposed SRP would be allocated by Achieving for Children (AfC), who provide children's services for the Council. All 14 places would be reserved for children and young people with Education, Health and Care Plans (EHCPs) or, rarely, who are undergoing assessment for an EHCP.
- 4.2 The building has a floor area of 191m². The two main classrooms are located on the first floor, along with a quiet room, soft room and toilet facilities. There is also a covered balcony at first floor level which faces onto the main school playground. On the ground floor, there is a therapy room, sensory room and group room, along with a staff office and toilet and shower facilities.
- 4.3 The proposed building is of a modern chalet-style design with a pitched roof. The front and rear elevations are London stock brick with a large proportion of glazing, and the side elevations and roof are proposed as zinc standing seam. Nine roof lights are proposed – four in the north west facing roof slope and five in the south east facing roof slope – to provide adequate lighting to the first floor. There are two frosted glass windows proposed at ground level in the north west elevation providing natural light to the therapy room and circulation space on the ground floor. A green wall is proposed on the south east elevation.
- 4.4 The main vehicular access to the building remains on Cross Street, where there is an entrance lobby and a designated off-street minibus bay accessed via a new crossover and sliding gate. Pedestrian access will be via a gate off St Ann's Passages. A bicycle rack and bin store are also proposed at the front of the property. A covered external space is provided to the rear of the site, along with a ramp and single width gate providing pedestrian access to the mainstream school. A platform lift is also provided in the rear external space, affording step-free access to the first floor.
- 4.5 At the rear of the site, two trees are to be removed to make way for the new railings, along with a small group of willow trees. A small plant room housing an Air Source Heat Pump (ASHP) unit will be located in the main Key Stage 2 playground.
- 4.6 The proposal is shown on the following drawings submitted with this application:

LOND01-MCB-XX-00-DR-A-210-A2-C12	Proposed site layout
LOND01-MCB-XX-ZZ-DR-A-0110-A2-C14	Proposed ground and first floor plan
LOND01-MCB-XX-02-DR-A-0111-A2-C9	Proposed roof plan
LOND01-MCB-XX-ZZ-DR-A-0120-A2-C12	Proposed elevations Sheet 1
LOND01-MCB-XX-ZZ-DR-A-0121-A2-C12	Proposed elevations Sheet 2
LOND01-MCB-XX-ZZ-DR-A-0130-A2-C6	Proposed sections
LOND01-MCB-XX-ZZ-DR-A-0211-A2-C7	Proposed site elevations

5.0 PRE-APPLICATION DISCUSSIONS AND CONSULTATION

Pre-application discussions with the local planning authority

- 5.1 On 6th March 2020, the applicant attended a pre-application meeting with planning officers, which was followed up by written advice dated 11th March 2020 (Council Ref: 20/P0016/PREAPP). Officers' advice was that there was no objection in principle to the demolition of the existing building and its replacement with an appropriate facility, and that a less traditional design was likely to be acceptable, given that the site did not form part of a row of properties.
- 5.2 Other comments received by the officer, and how these have been addressed in the current submission, are summarised below.

Officer comment	Applicant response
Evidence should be submitted to illustrate that the conversion of the existing building would not be appropriate and that there is an identified need for the facility.	Please refer to paras. 7.1 - 7.10 of this statement, the submitted Design and Access Statement (page 13), the Review of Education Provision for Special Educational Needs and Disabilities in Kingston and Richmond (Achieving for Children, 2017) and the London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames School Place Planning Strategy (Achieving for Children, 2019).
The height and scale currently proposed would not be supported and should be reduced to be more in keeping with surrounding development.	The building has been 'sunk' approximately 300mm and the height of the eaves has been decreased to the absolute minimum possible. The highest part of the roof is now level with the chimney stacks of neighbouring properties. It is not possible to sink the building any lower or reduce height further without compromising the viability of the project or the building's functionality (please refer to para. 7.16 of this statement).
The building would be higher than neighbouring properties and the proposed building would result in an unacceptable sense of enclosure.	The applicant has added a green wall to reduce the sense of enclosure. The previously proposed external stair enclosure has also been removed from the proposal to reduce the overall depth of the building (please refer to paras. 7.24 - 7.25 of this statement).
Adequate light should be provided to neighbouring homes and gardens.	Please refer to the Daylight and Sunlight Assessment prepared by Herrington Consulting and paras. 7.21-7.23 of this statement.
BREEAM very good rating should be improved.	It has not been possible to achieve BREEAM 'Excellent'. A detailed justification for this has been provided in the BREEAM Pre-Assessment Report and Energy Report prepared by McBains (please see also paras. 7.41 - 7.43 of this statement).
The application should include transport details, a Tree Survey, an Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan and a Flood Risk Assessment.	All included as part of this application.

Public consultation

- 5.3 The applicant held a public consultation event on 14th September 2020 at Barnes Primary School. Although feedback was generally positive, objections were raised by some residents living in close proximity to the site. Concerns related primarily to the impact of the proposal on daylight, sunlight and outlook, the height of the building and its impact on nearby heritage assets, the loss of trees and parking. Residents were also concerned about the impacts of the construction process.
- 5.4 Where possible, the applicant team has attempted to address these concerns by altering the scheme prior to submission (please refer to the submitted Design and Access Statement for details of scheme evolution). The above concerns are also directly addressed in this statement.

6.0 PLANNING POLICY FRAMEWORK

- 6.1 Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires planning applications to be determined in accordance with the Development Plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The purpose of this Section is to identify the key national, regional and local planning policy and guidance relevant to the determination of the planning application, and against which the proposals have been considered during design development.

National Planning Policy

- 6.2. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) provides planning policy guidance at a national level and is a material consideration in the determination of planning applications. An updated version of the NPPF was published in February 2019 (with a further revision made in June 2019). The framework is supported by online Planning Practice Guidance. The NPPF sets out the Government's approach to planning matters and is a material consideration in the determination of planning applications.

Statutory development plan

- 6.3 The site is located within the administrative boundary of London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames. The relevant statutory development plan documents at the time of submission, for the purposes of Section 38 (6) above, comprise of:

- The London Plan (consolidated with alterations since 2016)
- The Richmond Local Plan (adopted 2018).

Emerging planning policy

- 6.4 The Draft New London Plan was subject to a formal Examination in Public (EiP) between January and May 2019, and the Mayor submitted a revised 'intend to publish' plan to the Government in December 2019. The Secretary of State for Housing considered that the plan was inconsistent with national policy and issued directions relating to its adoption. Dialogue between the Mayor and the Secretary of State is ongoing, but policies to which the specific directions do not apply – which includes the policies referred to in this statement - can be considered to carry significant weight.

Other relevant policy documents

- 6.5 The Council has adopted a number Supplementary Planning Guidance/Documents (SPGs/SPDs). Those considered relevant to this planning application are:

- Transport (2020)
- Sustainable Construction Checklist Guidance Document (2020)
- Development Control for Noise Generating and Noise Sensitive Development (2018)
- Buildings of Townscape Merit (2015)
- Refuse and Recycling Storage Requirements (2015)
- Barnes Village Plan (2015)
- Design Quality (2006)

6.6 The GLA has also produced several Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPGs) documents which expand upon the policies in the adopted London Plan. Those considered relevant to this planning application include:

- Social Infrastructure (2015)
- Accessible London: Achieving an Inclusive Environment (2014)
- Character and Context (2014)
- Planning for Equality and Diversity in London (2007)

7.0 PLANNING POLICY ASSESSMENT

Principle of development – loss of existing dwelling house

- 7.1 Policy H8 of the 'intend to publish' London Plan and Policy LP38 of the Richmond Local Plan seek to resist the loss of existing housing. Policy LP38 provides that such development should normally only take place where the existing building is incapable of improvement or conversion to provide an equivalent scheme and, if this is the case, where the proposal does not have an adverse impact on local character and provides a reasonable standard of accommodation. Para. 9.5.4 of the supporting text to Policy LP38 clarifies that whilst there is a presumption against the loss of housing, exceptions may be considered '*if other policy priorities are met and wider benefits provided such as... provision of health facilities, or infrastructure*' (p118). Officers have agreed in principle that the loss of the dwelling would be acceptable in the context of Policy LP38, providing evidence were submitted to illustrate that the existing building could not be converted.
- 7.2 The existing building has a gross external floor area of only 115m². In order to comply with the recommended area guidelines for specialist school accommodation, and to provide the additional facilities required for ASD pupils such as therapy and quiet rooms, the existing building would need to be substantially extended. Structurally, there are certain requirements that non-residential buildings must meet that the existing dwelling cannot provide, and these are set out in detail in the submitted Design and Access Statement (p13). Additionally, the costs and logistical considerations associated with extending and retrofitting the existing dwelling so that it complies with modern standards is disproportionate and would affect the timely delivery of this important educational use. It is therefore considered that there can be no objection to demolition of the existing dwelling and its replacement with a building constructed to more modern, sustainable standards that better fits the needs of the end user.
- 7.3 The requirements of Policy LP8 in respect of design and character and standard of accommodation are addressed elsewhere in this statement (see paras. 7.11 – 7.19).

Principle of development – proposed school accommodation

- 7.4 Paragraph 94 of the NPPF states that it is important that a sufficient choice of school places is available to meet the needs of existing and new communities, and that local planning authorities should take a proactive, positive and collaborative approach to meeting this requirement, and to development that will widen choice in education. It also provides that '*great weight*' should be given to the need to create, expand or alter schools (p28).
- 7.5 Policy S1 of the 'intend to publish' London Plan provides that proposals for high quality, inclusive social infrastructure that addresses a local or strategic need and supports service delivery strategies should be supported, as should proposals that seek to make best use of land, including the public sector estate. Policy S3 provides that education facilities should be provided in accessible locations, easily accessed by walking, cycling and public transport, and that the use of shared services should be encouraged.
- 7.6 Policy LP29 provides that the Council will support the provision of new facilities where this meets educational needs. In particular, the policy encourages the maximisation of existing educational sites through extensions, redevelopment or refurbishment, as well as co-location with other social infrastructure.
- 7.7 In 2017, AfC conducted a thorough review of provision for children and young people with special education needs and disabilities (SEND) within Richmond and Kingston. One of the review's key findings was that the number of local places for children with SEND should be increased so that

children could be educated within their community, rather than having to travel out of borough. At that time, it was estimated that the demand for SEND provision would grow by 300 places in the three years from 2020/21, with 246 of those places being required in maintained and academy special schools and SRPs. In December 2019, AfC adopted its School Place Planning Strategy which continued to forecast a significant increase in the number of pupils with special education needs, with the greatest need being in the ASD category (please refer to pages 28-30 of the Richmond School Place Planning Strategy, which has been submitted with this application for reference).

- 7.8 AfC plans to cater for this increasing demand through extending existing and creating new SEND provision, largely within the grounds of existing schools. The anticipated growth in primary places for SEND pupils rises from 77 places in 2020 to 94 places by 2025, and this proposal would allow for 14 additional SEND Primary places by 2024, covering 82% of the increase amongst primary-aged SEND children. The proposal therefore represents a key component of the Council's strategy to ensure adequate provision of facilities for children with special educational needs and meet the objectives set out in the 2017 review.
- 7.9 In addition to helping the Council to deliver its education strategy, the proposal to locate the new facility on the site of the caretaker's dwelling has several additional benefits. Locating the SRP on a previously developed site makes the best use of underutilised, public sector land, in accordance with Policy S1 of the 'intend to publish' London Plan. It means that the facility can be provided without any substantial reduction in play space for the existing Key Stage 2 school, and that certain services such as contracts for supplies and staff CPD can be shared, again meeting the objectives of strategic and local policy in terms of efficiency and co-location. Perhaps most importantly, there are significant social and educational benefits to co-locating the SRP in the grounds of the existing Ofsted 'Outstanding' Barnes Primary School, as it enables pupils to be educated within their home communities, gives them access to a wider range of facilities, encourages them to interact with mainstream pupils and allows them to participate in mainstream lessons where appropriate for them.
- 7.10 In summary, the proposed use would respond to the need for additional SEND places in Richmond and is a substantial component in the delivery of AfC's School Place Planning Strategy. The location of the site directly adjacent to and functionally connected with the existing primary school has a range of benefits, including the fact that it optimises the use of public sector land and significantly improves the educational offer for SEND pupils. The use is therefore fully compliant with policies in the NPPF, the 'intend to publish' London Plan and the Richmond Local Plan.

Design, character and heritage

- 7.11 Policy LP1 of the Richmond Local Plan provides that the Council will require all development to be of a high architectural and urban design quality, and that development proposals must demonstrate an understanding of the site and how it relates to its existing context. This includes considerations such as local character, the relationship of the proposed building to the existing townscape, the scale, height and massing of the proposal, and its relationship with nearby heritage assets. Policy LP 2 of the Richmond Local Plan provides that the Council will require new buildings to respect and strengthen the setting of the borough's valued townscapes and that heights should reflect the prevailing building heights within the vicinity.
- 7.12 Policy HC1 of the 'intend to publish' London Plan provides that development proposals affecting heritage assets and their settings should conserve their significance by being sympathetic to the assets significance and appreciation within their surroundings. This is reflected at Local Level in Policy LP3 of the Richmond Local Plan, which provides that the Council will require development to conserve and take opportunities to make a positive contribution to the historic environment

- of the borough, and that proposals in Conservation Areas should preserve and enhance its character and appearance. Policy LP4 provides that the Council will seek to preserve and enhance the significance, character and setting of non-designated heritage assets, including Buildings of Townscape Merit.
- 7.13 Part B of Policy LP3 provides that the Council will resist substantial demolition in Conservation Areas and any changes that could harm heritage assets, unless it can be demonstrated that, *inter alia*, the building or part of the building or structure makes no positive contribution to the character or distinctiveness of the area.
- 7.14 The site sits between two rows of terraced properties and is one of few dwellings that face directly onto the southern part of Cross Street. As such, it is perceived as a single building with its own immediate context, much like the Brown Dog Public House opposite the site. An opportunity therefore exists to demolish the existing building, which is of little architectural merit, and replace it with a building of a high-quality, modern design. The proposed building is a simple rectangular building with a pitched roof, which more accurately reflects the dominant roof form in the vicinity. The building's shape gives it elements of residential character, whilst the modern, chalet-style design and materials palette distinguishes it from the more historic residential properties and ties it into the educational complex to the rear and to the south east.
- 7.15 In terms of scale, the proposed building would be taller than the existing building, but not substantially so. The pitched roof design helps to reduce the impact of the building; the eaves are lower than the highest point of the eaves of the existing dwelling. Due to the narrowness of surrounding streets, minimal gaps in between terraced buildings and the fact that the front elevation of the building is set back from the street edge, the new facility would only be minimally visible from surrounding townscape views. Where the building would be prominent – for example from Cross Street or when approaching from the footpath in either direction – views would be primarily of the front elevation only, and due to the modern design of the building and its location on a 'stand-alone' plot, it would not be read in the context of any other buildings.
- 7.16 Following concerns over height and scale from officers during pre-application discussions, several alterations have been made to reduce the height of the building, including 'sinking' it into the ground by 300mm and reducing the height of the eaves. The proposal now represents the smallest building that can possibly accommodate the proposed SRP, which requires more floor area per pupil than a mainstream school due to the need for greater personal space, higher levels of adult supervision, facilities such as therapy spaces and quiet rooms and the need for off-street minibus parking. The Department for Education's Building Bulletin 104 (BB104) sets out guideline floor areas in respect of the design and space requirements of SEND schools, and the spaces and internal facilities have now been reduced to such an extent that the proposed floorspace is now less than that recommended by BB104. Through consultation with AfC and multiple internal reconfigurations (as set out in the submitted Design and Access Statement), the applicant team has managed to achieve functionality for an SRP of this type, but the facility could not be delivered with further compromises in terms of floorspace or floor to ceiling heights.
- 7.17 The application is accompanied by a Heritage Statement prepared by AOC Archaeology Group, which considers the potential effects of the proposed development on the settings of designated heritage assets, including the Thorne Passage Conservation Area and the Brown Dog Pub, a Building of Townscape Merit. The Heritage Statement concludes that the proposal would not affect the setting, character or significance of the Building of Townscape Merit and would result in 'less than substantial harm' to the Thorne Passage Conservation Area. In accordance with the NPPF (para. 196), this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of this proposal, as set out elsewhere in this statement.

Inclusive design

- 7.18 Policy D5 of the 'intend to publish' London Plan provides that development proposals should achieve the highest standards of accessible and inclusive design. This is reflected at local level by Policy LP1, which lists inclusivity as a key component of good design, and Policy LP28, which requires social infrastructure to provide high quality and inclusive design which provides access for all.
- 7.19 In addition to addressing the specific requirements of BB104 (as set out in the Design and Access Statement), the proposed building will fully comply with Approved Document M: Buildings other than dwellings. The building will feature several inclusive design features such as level thresholds, corridor widths, clear openings for doors and accessible WCs. The proposal includes a platform lift at the rear, enabling wheelchair users and those with mobility difficulties to access the first floor of the property. Overall, the proposal represents a good standard of inclusive design and is compliant with Policies D5, LP1 and LP28.

Amenity of neighbouring occupiers

- 7.20 Policy LP8 of the Richmond Local Plan provides that development will be required to protect the amenity and living conditions of neighbouring properties. This includes ensuring that proposals do not have an adverse impact on levels of daylight and sunlight, have an overbearing impact or create a sense of enclosure, or harm the reasonable enjoyment of the use of buildings, gardens and other spaces due to increases in noise, vibration or other disturbance. Policy LP8 specifically refers to balconies, stating that they should not cause unacceptable overlooking or disturbance to nearby occupiers. Policy LP10 provides that the Council will require good acoustic design to ensure occupiers of new and existing noise sensitive buildings are protected.

Daylight, sunlight and overshadowing

- 7.21 This application is accompanied by a Daylight and Sunlight Assessment prepared by Herrington Consulting. The report assesses the impacts of the proposal against the criteria set out in the Building Research Establishment's *Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight – A Guide to Good Practice*. The assessment has identified thirteen properties (74-84 Westfields Avenue and 50-56 Railway Side) as potentially being affected by the proposed development and uses BRE-recommended testing to assess the impact of the proposal on the light received by windows at those properties. In relation to daylight, the Vertical Sky Component (VSC) and No Sky Line/Daylight Distribution (NSL/DD) tests have been used. For sunlight, the applicant has carried out Annual Probable Sunlight Hours (APSH) testing. All residential windows assessed fall comfortably within the levels recommended by the BRE guidance, so that the impact on daylight and sunlight received by these properties would not be noticeable.
- 7.22 The assessment has also considered the impact of the development on the external garden spaces of adjoining residential properties. The BRE guidelines recommend that for a garden or amenity area to appear adequately sunlit throughout the year, at least 50% of the amenity area should receive at least 2 hours of sunlight on 21st March. The BRE guidelines also indicate that if, as a result of new development, an existing garden or amenity area does not meet these guidelines, and the area which can receive some sun on the 21st March is less than 0.8 times its former value, then the loss of sunlight is likely to be noticeable. The assessment demonstrates that most rear garden spaces tested would meet these guidelines. However, the rear gardens of Nos. 76 and 84 Westfields Avenue would not receive 2 hours of sunlight on 21st March and would retain only 0.67 of their former values.

- 7.23 The BRE guidance, in para. 1.6, is clear that the targets in the document are not mandatory and should not be seen as an *'instrument of planning policy'*. Rather, the document should be viewed as a guide for designers and should be applied according to the context of each individual site and recognising that there may be factors, particularly in urban environments, to justify lower thresholds. As explained in the daylight and sunlight report, the low angle of sun in the sky at this time of year makes urban gardens very sensitive to any change in obstruction. The daylight and sunlight report also includes an overshadowing assessment run in June, which demonstrates that at this time of year, all rear garden spaces would meet BRE guidelines. It is therefore evident that these gardens will not experience significant overshadowing at the time they are most likely to be used, during the summer months.

Outlook

- 7.24 The proposed building is deeper than the building currently occupying the site and some occupants of adjoining residential properties would, as a result of the development, look out onto new or increased massing, particularly those that directly adjoin the rear garden of the existing property. However, these properties have good-sized rear gardens, and the distance between the main rear wall of these properties and the boundary of the site remains between 10 and 15 metres, which would still ensure a reasonable outlook from these properties. The elevation-to-elevation distances that would result from the proposal would not be abnormal or uncharacteristic for this area, which is tightly knit and often has properties backing onto one another at proximity. For example, the distances between elevations of properties on Archway Street and Throne Street are as little as 10 metres apart.
- 7.25 Notwithstanding the above, the applicant has taken every possible opportunity to reduce the impact of the proposal on the outlook received by neighbouring properties whilst still meeting the project brief for the SRP. This includes removing the previously proposed stair enclosure which reduced the depth of the building, sinking the building slightly to reduce its height and proposing a green wall on the side of the building to improve the outlook from residential properties.

Privacy

- 7.26 Two windows are proposed at ground level in the north west elevation. These are likely to sit below the level of any rear boundary fence to the gardens on Westfield Avenue and will, in any event, be frosted, as they will face the public footpath. There are no other windows proposed in the side elevations. Boundary walls at the front and rear of the site will ensure no overlooking from parents, pupils or staff using the outdoor spaces. The balcony is also wholly enclosed at the sides and would overlook only the existing playground of the Key Stage 2 school. The front windows would only overlook the public house opposite the site. Consequently, there will be no loss of privacy to residents surrounding the site.

Noise

- 7.27 The school will hold a modest number of pupils (14) and a maximum of 6 staff. Due to the proximity of the site to the flight path of Heathrow Airport, the building will feature high levels of insulation within the walls and roof and double glazing (see accompanying External Noise Intrusion Report prepared by Cole Jarman). The building will also rely on mechanical ventilation. These factors mean that noise emitted from the building itself will be minimal. Due to the small number of pupils, there would also be no material impact on noise levels when the children are outside.
- 7.28 The application proposes to install a single Air Source Heat Pump (ASHP) to serve the new SRP. The unit will be situated at ground level and housed in an acoustic enclosure, adjacent to the boundary wall between the main school playground and the public footpath behind Westfields

Avenue. A Noise Assessment has been carried out by Cole Jarman which has confirmed that, with the proposed acoustic enclosure in place, the calculated noise emissions from this unit will fall within acceptable levels.

- 7.29 During the consultation process, several residents raised concerns about the impact of construction management on their amenity, given the constrained nature of the site. This is understood and, should the Council be minded to grant planning permission, the applicant is willing to agree to a condition requiring a detailed Construction Management Plan (CMP) to be submitted prior to commencement of development.

Transport

- 7.30 Policy LP44 of the Richmond Local Plan provides that the Council will ensure that new development is designed to provide opportunities for walking and cycling and ensure that new development does not have a severe impact on the operation, safety or accessibility to local highway networks. Policy LP45 provides that new development should make provision for the accommodation of vehicles in order to provide for the needs of the development while minimising the impact of car-based travel.
- 7.31 The application is accompanied by a Transport Statement (TS) prepared by Patrick Parsons. This confirms that, as most pupils are expected to arrive at the school via minibus, trips to and from the SRP will be very low, both in the morning and evening periods. The TS assesses the site's accessibility by public transport and by walking and cycling, concluding that the site is easily accessible via all three modes of transport. Additionally, Barnes Primary School have a Gold Accredited STARS Travel Plan, details of which have been submitted with this application.
- 7.32 Based on the policy requirements contained in Appendix 3 of the Richmond Local Plan, the proposal would generate the need for an additional three car parking spaces for staff. However, due to site constraints and in accordance with national, regional and local policies which seek to reduce reliance on travel by private vehicle, it is not proposed to provide these spaces on site. Instead, in accordance with Barnes Primary School's Gold STARS rating, staff will be encouraged to travel to work via other means and, where car travel is required, these spaces can be accommodated within the staff car park of the main school. Cycle parking is provided on-site via a cycle rack outside the main entrance lobby.
- 7.33 A swept path analysis is provided in Appendix 6 of the submitted Transport Statement to demonstrate that minibuses can safely enter and exit the site. Overall, it is considered that the facility can be accommodated in this location without detriment to highway or pedestrian safety and without a significant impact on the local highway network.

Trees, landscaping and biodiversity

- 7.34 Policy LP16 of the Richmond Local Plan provides that the Council will resist the loss of trees, unless the tree is dead, dying or dangerous, causing damage to adjacent structures, or the tree has little or no amenity value. The policy provides that the Council will require an appropriate replacement for any tree that is felled 'where practicable'.
- 7.35 The proposed development will necessitate the removal of two individual trees (T2 maple and T3 cherry) and a small group of willow trees (G4). An Arboricultural Assessment has been carried out by Martin Dobson Associates which indicates that these trees are of low amenity value. Consequently, having regard to Policy LP16, there is no objection to their removal. One off-site tree, a birch (T1) will require protection during development. Details of proposed tree protection can be found in the accompanying Arboricultural Report.

- 7.36 Policy LP16 provides that the Council will encourage planting, including new trees, shrubs and other significant vegetation where appropriate. Policy LP15 of the Richmond Local Plan provides that the Council will protect and enhance the borough's biodiversity and will support biodiversity enhancements on development sites and integrated within the design of buildings themselves where appropriate. Policy LP17 provides that the use of green/brown roofs and green walls is encouraged and supported in smaller developments.
- 7.37 The applicant commissioned JFA Environmental Planning to carry out an ecological assessment of the site. This concluded that the development will only result in the loss of habitats that are of widespread and common and of low ecological value. In this instance, most of the site will be required for the new facility, leaving very little opportunity for new planting. However, a green wall is provided on the south facing elevation in order to enhance the site's biodiversity value as much as possible within development constraints.

Climate change mitigation and flood risk

- 7.38 Policy SI4 of the 'intend to publish' London Plan and Policy LP20 of the Richmond Local Plan provides that new developments should minimise the effects of overheating as well as minimise energy consumption in accordance with the cooling hierarchy. This application has been submitted with an Energy Statement which estimates that a reduction of approximately 19% of carbon dioxide emissions over Part L of the Building Regulations (2013) can be achieved solely through 'lean' measures representing the top three tiers of the cooling hierarchy. Full details of the measures proposed can be found in the Energy Statement prepared by McBains.
- 7.39 Policy LP21 provides that developments should avoid, or minimise, contributing to all sources of flooding, taking account of climate change and without increasing flood risk elsewhere. Part C of this policy states that the Council will require the use of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) in all development proposals, and that applicants must demonstrate that their proposal results in a reduction in surface water discharge to greenfield run-off rates wherever feasible.
- 7.40 The application is accompanied by a detailed drainage strategy (see p22 of the submitted Design and Access Statement and drawing no. LOND01-MCB-XX-XX-DR-C-SK01-S1-P1). A Flood Risk Assessment has been carried out by AGB Environmental. This confirms that risk of flooding on the site is low, and that the proposed development would be acceptable in flood risk terms, providing the proposed surface water management measures are implemented to prevent water ingress.

Sustainable Design and Construction

- 7.41 Policy LP22 of the Richmond Local Plan provides that developments will be required to achieve the highest standards of sustainable design and construction and requires proposals for more than 100m² of non-residential floorspace to complete the Council's Sustainable Construction Checklist SPD. Policy LP22 also requires new non-residential buildings over 100m² to meet BREEAM 'Excellent' standard and achieve a 35% reduction in CO₂ emissions (regulated) against a Building Regulations Part L (2013) baseline, achieved by following the Energy Hierarchy (Be lean, be clean, be green).
- 7.42 The applicant has submitted with this application a completed Sustainable Construction Checklist, a BREEAM pre-assessment and an Energy Statement prepared by McBains. These indicate that the completed development would achieve 35 points when measured against the checklist, would be expected to achieve a BREEAM 'Very Good' rating and would result in a 32.3% reduction in carbon emissions.

- 7.43 A full and detailed justification for the development's failure to meet these policy requirements can be found in the Energy Statement and the explanatory note to the BREEAM pre-assessment document submitted with this application. In summary, the constraints of the site, the need to carefully consider the amenity of neighbours, cost restraints and the bespoke requirements of the end user have presented a complex set of conflicting demands which has limited opportunities to incorporate low and zero carbon technologies. This has had an impact both on the carbon reduction strategy and across a number of BREEAM credits.

Waste

- 7.44 Policy LP24 of the Richmond Local Plan requires all developments to provide adequate refuse and recycling storage space and requires such facilities to be sensitively integrated within the overall design of the scheme. A small bin store is proposed at the front of the property and will house waste and recycling provision in accordance with the Council's Refuse and Recycling Storage Requirements Supplementary Planning Document.

8.0 CONCLUSIONS

- 8.1 The proposed use would respond to an important and established need for additional SEND school places in the borough and forms a key part of Achieving for Children's School Place Planning Strategy. The use represents an efficient use of land in that it utilises a previously developed, public-sector owned site for a use of considerable public benefit. Importantly, it represents an opportunity for SEND pupils to maximise their potential within a mainstream educational setting, which strongly aligns with the policy objectives of the local and regional planning policy to ensure equality of opportunity for all Londoners, free of separation or segregation. The desirability of the use is a consideration which should be given significant weight.
- 8.2 This statement has acknowledged that there would be some impacts on the amenity of neighbouring properties, however these are not considered material and should not warrant refusal of the application. The local planning authority is urged to consider these impacts within the overall context of the scheme and its benefits. The applicant has been faced with the challenge of attempting to meet several conflicting objectives in developing this site to meet an important educational need. Several alterations have been made in order to bring the proposed building within the smallest envelope possible without compromising its functionality. Overall, having regard to the development plan and all other material considerations, it is considered that planning remission should be granted.

DP9 Ltd.