

**ITEM 4.4 - CLARE HOUSE PRIMARY SCHOOL, OAKWOOD AVENUE,  
BECKENHAM**

**PLANNING OFFICER COMMENTS**

“1. Additional objections have been raised from local residents since the report was compiled. These include objections in respect of the Transport assessment data, car parking, traffic, the nature and scale of the proposal together with nature issues.

2. Additional information was received on 10<sup>th</sup> September from the agent which included an updated ecology report, specifically in regard to badgers. This document indicated no evidence of badger activity (although precautions are recommended in the construction phase and a construction management condition has been suggested).

In terms of the Transport document, the agent asserts that “*The Travel Survey reveals only an additional 37 and five extra members of staff would potentially travel to school in a car. It had been shown by the parking survey that the extra vehicles could be accommodated on street.*

*The above is considered very much a worst case scenario given the new pupil intake will be from the immediate area and it could be reasonably expected that the vast majority would actually walk to school from this short distance as can be demonstrated by the existing school survey. The school will aim to encourage users of the school to use more sustainable modes of transport, particularly those living nearby.*

*The site has reasonable access by modes of transport other than the private car, There is a bus service on Oakwood Road within a few minutes’ walk of the site giving convenient service to various destinations within the local residential area.*

*It is considered that by raising awareness of alternative modes of transport to the private car through the Travel Plan the number of car borne trips can be reduced.”*

3. The development proposed involves a scheme on a site of 1.2 hectares and therefore falls within the description of paragraph 10(b) of Schedule 2 to the Regulations. The view is therefore taken that, taking into account the selection criteria in Schedule 3 of the Regulations and the terms of the European Directive, it is likely the development would not have significant effects on the environment by virtue of factors such as its nature, size or location. This is taking into account all relevant matters including the information submitted and the scale of the proposed development on the site. Accordingly, the proposed development described is not “EIA development” within the meaning of the 2011 Regulations.

4. The agents have advised that they are willing to accept an hours of operation condition regarding the astro sports pitch if objections are raised to its use out of hours. Members would need to consider this as part of the debate.

5. Condition 27 needs to be substituted with “The targets for carbon dioxide emissions reduction detailed within the Sustainability and Energy Strategy Report hereby approved shall be achieved on site prior to occupation of the new school building. In order to achieve compliance with the Mayor of London's Energy Strategy and to comply with Policy 5.2 of The London Plan.”

6. In terms of parking measures such as yellow lines/ white lines or other traffic measures etc, these are outside of the application site and cannot be conditioned as part of this application. Although my Highways colleagues and the school will liaise locally to look at these issues. Indeed these can be retro fitted should they be required.

7. The application involves an increase in car parking at the school from 4 spaces to 11. It may be possible to increase the car parking on site further and a condition relating to the submission of the car parking details is suggested.”