

## Comment on a planning application

### Application Details

**Application:** 24/2117/VRC

**Address:** Hampton Pre-Prep And Prep School Gloucester Road Hampton TW12 2UQ

**Proposal:** Variation of planning approval 13/2102/FUL - Condition Number(s): 13 (U67172) - Restriction on pupil numbers to allow to increase pupil numbers from 144 to 176.

### Comments Made By

**Name:** Ms. Audrey MacKenzie

**Address:** 5 Scotts Drive Hampton TW12 2UN

### Comments

**Type of comment:** Object to the proposal

**Comment:** When the school was redeveloped, it was determined that 144 pupils was the maximum the site could comfortably accommodate without causing an unreasonable degree of disruption for neighbouring residents and highway users.

This application for an increase of 32 pupils presents no new evidence to mitigate the adverse impact on neighbouring amenity, highway safety or local transport network.

To state a worst case scenario of 18 additional car journeys is disingenuous and misleading. This is based on a hands-up survey of young children (eager to please their teacher) four years ago. When asked how they travel to school, 56% said they drive to school. In reality it is likely a lot higher. No catchment area and some kids travel considerable distances. Beyond the use of the school's private coach, it's not credible to state that the rest are regularly walking, in all weathers. Previous data has shown that very few pupils live within walking distance (not within an acceptable walking time of 20-30 minutes). Nobody said they took a train and only one pupil came by public bus. Only 3 pupils say they cycled which is not surprising given how busy and dangerous the roads are for young children. To claim that Carlisle Park offers safe cycle routes does not mean it is safe to cycle to and from Carlisle Park. The surrounding roads are too busy and narrow for two-way traffic let alone young children on bikes.

The truth is worst case could be 32 extra cars either end of the school day.

To base such a major decision, that would significantly impact neighbouring amenity, local traffic and highway safety, according to children's hands up survey would surely discredit and belittle the planning process. It would also be an insult to the neighbouring residents who have consistently provided lived experience that contradicts the school's case.

The data used to suggest there is sufficient parking capacity to accommodate an increase is misleading and is based on using the cul-de-sacs (Scotts Drive, Wensleydale Gardens and Carlisle Road) which have already been deemed unsuitable for school parking and turning.

Ref: 13/2102/DD15 the Planning Officer report 27/03/19 stated that the cul-de-sacs were not acceptable for school parking. The school has repeatedly disregarded this response from the Council and continues to include these cul-de-sacs in the parking survey. The presumption of available parking capacity on these narrow minor roads underpins the school's case for growth of pupil numbers.

Each Travel Plan repeated the same errors of calculations of actual car parking spaces. Scotts Drive residents have shown that the school overstated the number of "unrestricted" car park spaces by almost double. The school's assumptions took no account of the narrowness of the road, nor the two x 90 degree blind bends and dropped kerbs off

driveways. Any parking opposite these dropped kerbs causes obstruction and therefore cannot be “unrestricted”.

Why has the latest parking survey not been published? To say the latest figures “align with 2020 surveys” is not accurate. In 2024 there are demonstrably fewer available spaces on Scotts Drive. At least two houses have doubled the front driveway to accommodate another car, thereby reducing the kerbside parking.

The pedestrian entrance to the park is the opposite side to the footpath on Scotts Drive which is on a blind bend. Safety issue for children crossing from cars.

#### LBRUT – Air Quality Action Plan (2020-2025)

Any proposal that potentially increases the number of vehicle trips in residential areas (especially near schools) should include a monitoring survey of air pollution levels. Marginal increases in traffic create disproportionate impact on emissions, especially queues of cars making multiple turning manoeuvres. It can also have disproportionate impact on a small number of dwellings due to the confined design of the street, causing spikes of pollution.