

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

Minutes of the meeting held at 7.30 pm on 13 December 2017

Present:

Councillor Peter Dean (Chairman)
Councillor Richard Scoates (Vice-Chairman)
Councillors Vanessa Allen, Eric Bosshard, Katy Boughey,
Lydia Buttinger, Nicky Dykes, Ellie Harmer, Charles Joel,
David Livett, Kate Lymer, Russell Mellor, Alexa Michael,
Neil Reddin FCCA, Michael Turner and Stephen Wells

Also Present:

Councillors Nicholas Bennett J.P. and Peter Fortune

42 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Douglas Auld and Simon Fawthrop; Councillors Stephen Wells and Ellie Harmer attended as their respective substitutes.

An apology for absence was also received from Councillor Kevin Brooks.

43 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Nicolas Bennett JP declared a non-pecuniary interest in Item 3 as he was a member of the London South East College Board.

44 PLANNING APPLICATION 17/00429/FULL1 - 1 WESTMORELAND ROAD, BROMLEY BR2 0TB (Bromley Town Ward)

Description of application – Demolition of existing office (Class B1(a)) building and erection of a part 4/part 10 storey building (inclusive of lower and upper ground floor levels) for education use (Class D1) for up to 1260 pupils aged 11-19 years, associated cycle and car parking, refuse and recycling provision, coach drop off zone and associated soft and hard landscaping.

Oral representations in objection to the application were received from Mrs Deborah Williams who spoke on behalf of approximately 70 local residents.

Mrs Williams considered the site as the worst place possible for a secondary school to be located. She was fully aware of the shortage of secondary school places and did not object to the SHaW Academy itself, just not at this particular site which was one of the busiest, most polluted junctions in the Borough and an extremely unhealthy site for a school. Concerns were raised

for the safety of children crossing Masons Hill and Westmoreland Road 'en masse' and the effect of vehicle emissions, together with the additional traffic generated with knock-on effects on Kentish Way and the A21. The planning report stated that the junction was already over capacity and the new school would increase the throughput of vehicles however, it still concluded that the impact of additional vehicles would not be significant enough to sustain a refusal of planning permission. Mrs Williams disagreed and voiced amazement that planners had recommended refusal of the Bullers Wood Boys application on the grounds of increased traffic, yet had not done the same for this incredibly busy junction. Moreover, the scheme removed future options for road improvements such as more extensive widening of the junction and improved provision for pedestrians and cyclists, possibly funded by TFL's Liveable Neighbourhoods programme.

There were four popular secondary schools nearby so many children would come from outside the immediate area, increasing pressure on public transport, particularly existing bus routes and Bromley South Station, which was already overstretched. The applicants' travel plan was wildly over-optimistic about the number of children cycling to school. Mrs Williams queried the reported estimate that 6% would cycle when the borough average was 1% and only 0.4% of pupils cycled to Ravensbourne. Mrs Williams also asked if any Members would allow their child to cycle down Westmoreland Road or Masons Hill during the rush hour. The junction would be chaotic as children left at the end of the day – even if times were staggered. Whilst the school proposed a 'no drop off' policy and would pay for a traffic warden to enforce it, this was like King Canute telling the tide not to come in. Speaking as an ex school governor, Mrs Williams acknowledged that parents would drop their children off at school no matter what and one traffic warden would have very little effect.

On this small site, there would be little access to open space and fresh air and children would have to be bussed to other schools for games which would waste time and add to traffic problems. The proposed school would be the tallest in the UK and in the event of a fire, getting over 1500 children and staff out of the building would be difficult enough however, the main concern was muster points. It was not feasible to get that many children safely across very busy roads into the Waitrose and St Marks Square car parks, which would be full of cars, or usher them 500 metres to Ravensbourne, line them up and take registers in time to save any child found to be missing.

The absence of parking on site for staff and visitors, given the lack of free on-street parking in the vicinity, was astonishing. To put this into perspective, 90 staff park in the Ravensbourne car park every day.

The proposed building was out of character with existing period houses in Sandford and Pinewood Roads and would badly affect some residents, with increased height and massing creating a loss of privacy and overlooking by thousands of "eyes in the sky". The drawings on the portal originally showed the building to be three times further away from houses in Pinewood and

Sandford Roads than in reality. Updated drawings conveniently now do not show the houses at all.

The planning report stated there would be a loss of daylight to flats in 2 Sandford Road and Mrs Williams asked if the residents concerned had been specifically warned of this.

Bromley's Area Action Plan designated the site for office space and a hotel. Use for such a large secondary school was a huge deviation from current planning policy, based on a draft local plan that had not yet been approved. Even if the site was ultimately designated for education, it may be suitable for a small primary or a UTC, as previously planned, but not a large secondary school.

Bromley Civic Society stated that the applicant's photographs were inaccurate and misleading as Keston Ridge was not shown in their visualisation. Keston Ridge was a protected view and residents considered the revised design did nothing to protect it.

The school would not be popular with Bromley parents, given the space and facilities available at nearby alternatives. There had been no visible support for the school from parents and only three supporting letters had been submitted compared with 190 objections and a petition of over 400 signatures. The school could end up with a large proportion of pupils from outside the Borough, which would not alleviate Bromley's place shortage.

Planners had taken 96 pages to justify what seemed to be a decision already taken to shoehorn a secondary school into a totally unsuitable site just because it was owned by the ESFA. Mrs Williams urged Members not to lose the opportunity to build the school on a safer site with a larger footprint and cleaner air, which would be an asset to the borough rather than an unpopular white elephant.

Oral representations in support of the application were received from Mr Alan Gunne-Jones, Managing Director, Planning and Development Associates, and Mrs Christine Whatford on behalf of the school sponsors.

Mr Gunne-Jones reported that the application site was located within the town centre and identified as an appropriate location for a tall building. Whilst the Adopted Plan allocated the site for a mixed use development, the replacement Local Plan had designated the site for education use. This was an unchallenged draft policy and not subject to objection in the Examination currently taking place. In principle, therefore, the proposed development was the right use in an appropriate location and in an acceptable format. An extensive review of alternative sites had been undertaken by the Education Funding Agency as well as the Council's planning department as part of the Local Plan review. However, getting the detailed aspects of the development right had been an extensive process involving engagement with Council officers, Planning, Highways, Drainage, Environmental Health, the GLA, TfL, the EA, CABE and other key stakeholders and the wider community at the

pre-application stages as well as post-submission. Much effort was made by all concerned to ensure that this was a technically sound proposal and one which was acceptable to technical agencies and consultees. Where mitigation was required this had been agreed to in the draft Heads of Terms contained within the agenda.

Mrs Whatford made the following representations:-

'Everyone was aware of the crisis the Borough faced with demand for secondary school places and also the skills crisis faced by the science and healthcare industries with many thousands of skilled employees needed in this sector over the next few years and beyond. The proposed school would help address all those issues to meet both local and national need. It would offer 11-19 year olds in the Borough an exciting and innovative technical education whilst helping science and healthcare employers to secure a pipeline of future talent. This project was well-supported with integral involvement of university and further education and employer partners including Kings College Hospital, Oxleas NHS Trust, MyTime Active and Canterbury Christchurch University and London and South East Colleges. This support would ensure that students learned the skills needed by industry and provide them with exceptional exposure to the real world of work thereby securing their chances of achieving successful and fulfilling careers via apprenticeships or higher education. Extensive consultation over the past year had been undertaken on plans for the proposed school, which were reshaped as a result of feedback from the local community. The consultation highlighted there was strong support for an innovative education that offered a clear line of sight to employment as the proposed school would and a guaranteed place at the sponsors university for all those who met the minimum entry requirements.

Bromley needed an additional 23 FE entry in the secondary sector by 2020 and the current application for SHaW Futures Academy alongside expansions already agreed, would increase the provision to an additional 22FE by 2020 when the school was scheduled to open.

Finding a suitable location for the school was extremely difficult. The Council, the sponsors and the EFA all worked together to find a site. As stated on page 51 of the report, this site was identified as part of the Council's search for sites and was placed in Group 1 of sites identified. The applicant had worked hard to develop plans for a unique and exciting school whilst overcoming any potential disadvantages relating to the small footprint of the site.

Students would have use of nearby sports and recreation facilities run by London South East Colleges and MyTime Active which would help mitigate concerns about the lack of outdoor space.

The proposals were all well developed, well thought out and workable. Mrs Whatford urged Members to help realise the vision to provide an outstanding education to local young people whilst helping businesses to manage their

future skills needs which, in turn, would support the local economy for many years to come.

In response to Member questions, Mrs Whatford advised that sponsors were involved in the development of the curriculum and helped with the planning of the school; it was not a financial sponsorship. The employer sponsors would provide work experience places and placements at work. They would also come into the school and assist with the delivery of the curriculum. The University sponsor would also make an input into the curriculum and provide a guaranteed place for any students who met the minimum entry requirements. The aim was to ensure that the skills required by the industries that the employers represent were on the curriculum of the school.

Having studied the drawings, Councillor Joel could not identify the parking for the two mini-buses nor could he locate the zone in which the two 33-seater coaches would come onto the site for turning and manoeuvring purposes. There were only two proposed disabled bays and in an age of equal opportunities this was not adequate. Page 62, paragraph 4 of the report stated that provision should be given for 10% of wheelchair spaces and again, Councillor Joel could not identify these on the plans. At this point, the applicant's architect approached Councillor Joel and identified the parking for mini-buses and the coach drop-off zone.

Councillor Dykes considered the earlier points made about site analysis and selection to be disingenuous as the ESFA had refused to make the site analysis available to Councillors. There was, therefore, no supporting evidence to back the agent's statement that this was a perfect site for education use. The agent could not mitigate the negative impact of the proposal on residents because of the requirements for a secondary school of this size. In regard to site selection, Mr Gunne-Jones reported he had referred to two sources of site selection - one was what the ESFA had done themselves and the second was the process that the Council's planners had gone through as part of the Local Plan review and the report that was submitted to the Education Policy in 2015 where a number of options were considered. 1 Westmoreland Road was included as an allocated site for education use.

With regard to mitigation, Mrs Whatford reported that the school was required to be of a certain size in order to deliver the proposed curriculum. Whilst the building could be narrower and higher, there were a number of reasons why this should not be done. Mitigation of the original design had to be as explained in the report which was around the appearance of the building and attempts to make it less monolithic. The building could not be heavily stepped back as this would not work for a school design. However, the applicant had listened to the GLA and the Council's planning officers and a meeting was held with CABI in order to try and make this a more attractive and acceptable building which did provide some mitigation.

In response to questions by Councillor Reddin, it was reported that at the Council's request, the school's admission policy would be the same as all

other schools in the Borough so the catchment area would be based on distance to school and local children would have priority. How far that boundary went would depend on how many people applied.

In relation to precedent, Mr Gunne-Jones reported that no two schools or sites were the same and although there were other high education buildings in town centre locations, there were no replica of the proposals currently before Members.

Councillor Michael acknowledged the requirement for technical vocational type education for less academic young people and the need for apprenticeships and support for industry. Referring to the current financial status of Kings College Health Trust she queried whether that could have an adverse impact on what the applicant was trying to achieve with the new school. Mrs Whatford responded that whilst the two health trusts involved were not financially well-off since, it was not a question of asking them for money; they had given their support regardless of that and there was no reason to believe that they would not continue to do so.

The Planning Development Control Manager reported that additional letters of objection had been received since the report was published which reiterated comments already summarised. A letter in support of the application had also been received from the Council's Director of Education; this was circulated to Members. An updated drawing had been submitted showing a revised layout of the Masons Hill frontage which took into account the safeguarding line. The only change from the previous drawing were minor changes to the stepped area in front of the site.

Oral representations from the Executive Portfolio Holder for Education, Councillor Peter Fortune, in support of the application were received at the meeting. Councillor Fortune stated there were not sufficient places in the Borough for children to go to school. As discussed many times, elected Members had a responsibility to the Borough's children to ensure there were a suitable number of school places available. This was a statutory responsibility, clearly set out in the Education Act 1996. Since 2010 the Council had added nearly 3,000 permanent places through the expansion of local Bromley schools. Over 3,500 places were added in Free Schools already open such as Eden Park, Harris Primary Beckenham, Harris Primary Shortlands, La Fontaine, Langley Park, not to mention Bullers Wood which was approved just a few months ago. However, in terms of secondary provision and calculating for both this and the ESFA approved yet still homeless Harris Sydenham (being awarded planning permission), the Council were still approximately 7FE short to meet projected demand for 2021/22. Councillor Fortune highlighted the planning process undertaken by academy trusts for school applications and it was clear that a wider appreciation of the relationship between local authorities and academy trusts was not fully understood. The London Borough of Bromley did not apply or build new schools. Whilst Councillors dealt with applications, listened and acted on residents' concerns, it was not they who applied. Previously, when schools were under local authority control, the LEA, would balance all views and

suggest a suitable way forward and would suggest sites and push the planning process through themselves. However, the fundamental shift in the education landscape had altered that option. Residents often asked why the Bromley Education Department or Ward Councillors put a school at certain sites or why when another solution was so apparently obvious nothing else had been done. It was important to understand that the local authority were not the applicants in these school construction cases - that was the individual trust with the support of the ESFA. If Members offered up suggestions for alternative sites, it must be realised that they do not control where autonomous trusts may wish to locate and the suggestion of alternative sites was rarely forthcoming. Various Members would have helped build and construct the Local Plan and would be aware there were a limited number of sites available in the Borough for new school builds at which point the Green Belt and other options would need to be looked at to find appropriate sites.

It was for Members, with guidance from officers, to decide whether the school should be sited elsewhere. Councillor Fortune's role and responsibility was to advise Members that if the school did not progress there would be an increased possibility that the Council would not meet its statutory responsibility on school places – a responsibility which Members were elected to achieve. There would always be opposition to school applications regardless of site location and traffic would always be an issue. As opposition and infrastructure capacity would always be a factor, it was inevitable that in order to meet responsibilities, Members would have to make decisions that displease some people. The number of children in primary schools across the borough had increased massively in recent years and in order to manage that, over the past five years, expansions had been undertaken at various schools across the Borough, excluding the new primary schools in Beckenham and Shortlands. The Borough's children will need a place to go to school. As Councillor Fortune travelled around the Borough visiting primary schools he saw the demand coming down the line which was the Council's responsibility to manage. Members must look to provide future opportunities for those young people who were already growing up in a difficult and challenging world.

Committee Member and Ward Member Councillor Dykes reported she and her Ward colleagues were fully aware of the need for school places in the Borough.

The site had seen many uses over recent years but fundamentally, it was identified as a mixed use development site in the Bromley Town Area Action Plan. Education use was therefore a deviation from the Council's preferred designation for this site. Unfortunately, the ESFA had purchased the land and therefore the Council had no control over the site. The applicant's argument that this was an appropriate site for school development was completely disingenuous. Previous plans for a UTC at the site were deemed suitable and the existing building would only have required refurbishment; this would have gone some way to meet the secondary school need. Then there were plans for a primary school and whilst this would probably have resulted in an increase in traffic, it did not require an increase in the scale, height and

massing of the current building. Therefore, both these proposals would have been more appropriate on this very small and restrictive site and whilst not ideal, education could have been established here. However, Members were now faced with an application for a ten storey cramped development for over 1200 secondary school students. How this came to be would probably remain unknown as the ESFA would not make public their site analysis despite Members' direct requests to do so. Councillor Dykes wished to highlight that the site analysis was in fact incorrect.

The issue of residential amenity was also raised. Alluding to her earlier reference to the mitigation for this application, Councillor Dykes stated that the 2013 application and officer report made it very clear that stepping back of the building was required to reduce the very significant impact on residents in Pinewood Road. Pictures of Pinewood Road were circulated to Members which showed how overbearing the current building was let alone what residents would be faced with should permission of the application be granted. The highest point of the proposed building faced the residential element and Councillor Dykes queried why the previous applicants were required to step back their proposed building but the same had not been requested of the present applicant. There should be a parity on how applications are dealt with. Whilst acknowledging the need for school places in the Borough, Councillor Dykes reminded Members they also had a duty to mitigate the impact of proposals on local residents.

Ward Councillors received many complaints about this particular area and were constantly informed by Highways officers that, being the entrance to the town centre, it was one of the busiest junctions in the borough. Councillor Dykes therefore queried why the application was deemed to be acceptable by officers, despite these impacts being acknowledged. The report stated the comfort level of pedestrians would be compromised; Westmoreland Road was already busy throughout the day with large volumes of traffic and pedestrians. The proposed school would push the junction at Westmoreland Road and Masons Hill to well over capacity in the afternoon and it would impact on the surrounding road network and parking capacity in the vicinity. Parents would very likely cause congestion in wanting to get as close as possible to the school despite excellent transport links. The B228 Masons Hill/Westmoreland Road/High Street was already over capacity and there was a possibility that the proposed school would push all three arms to over capacity. Drop offs and pick ups would block traffic on Westmoreland Road which is a bus route for over 50 bus services.

Despite this category of complaints, the application was deemed to be acceptable. Councillor Dykes would like to have seen an independent analysis as she had with the application for Bullers Wood because during the initial stages of this application, TfL and the London Borough of Bromley raised concerns with the applicant's transport analysis which underestimated car use, bus use, the use of parking spaces and drop-off use. All these key elements had been underestimated and yet an independent study had not been requested.

Finally, the tallest part of the proposed building would partly obscure the view of Keston Ridge. In 2013, the previous applicant had been required to make changes to avoid any such impact. In this regard, Councillor Dykes again questioned why this application was being treated differently to the previous application for a mixed use development when the impact was the same?

Given the status of this application and the lack of sites, Members needed to be a little more flexible and possibly build schools that are appropriate for the sites rather than shoehorn schools into small sites. There was no reason why a smaller school could not be located at this particular site. With the average size of a school catering for around 900 pupils, this one would cater for over 1000. There were five FE schools in the borough, mainly grammar schools but as there were such a severe lack of places, then the Council need to be more creative in deciding what can be located at each site. Members should ask themselves what kind of learning environment they want for the borough's children and determine to do better than a ten storey block with no outdoor space and windows that cannot be opened due to noise and pollution.

It was also worth noting that the school would not be fully operational until 2024 so the impact of this school on the immediate school places need would not be realised for a long time.

Whilst they were aware of the urgent need for school places, Councillor Dykes and her Ward colleagues opposed the application due to the significant impact on the residents of Pinewood Road and Sandford Road and the fact that the applicant had not taken any measures to mitigate this. Councillor Dykes therefore put forward a motion for refusal on the grounds of over-development, impact on residential community, highways, traffic and the impact on the view of Keston Ridge.

Councillor Buttinger seconded the motion for refusal as she considered this to be an inappropriate development for schoolchildren mainly due to the lack of outdoor space and the fact that windows etc. would need to remain closed. The development would also be inappropriate for the residents who live in the nearby area. Whilst a tall storey building would be appropriate for the site, the design needed to have a more sympathetic approach by incorporating a clear stepping down to residential properties together with a reduction in the bulk and scale of the building. Councillor Buttinger also considered the application to be inappropriate for the road users of the junction. The development would impact greatly on traffic and she would expect any future development to have more amenity space for car parking. The statistics for people cycling to school was unrealistic, particularly on a dangerous junction like this one. Councillor Buttinger would be happy to see some form of education use at the site but would expect to see something around half the size of the current proposal.

Councillor Turner agreed this was not an appropriate site for a building of the bulk and scale currently proposed. Whilst he acknowledged the need for school places throughout the borough, Councillor Turner was not convinced of a need at this particular location. The report stated that Ravensbourne

School was 500 metres away and there were also other secondary schools in the vicinity of the site. The applicant made a case that this would be a specialist school catering for those who wish to enter science-related employment or medicine but this was not the case at all as the admissions policy would be the same as any other school with priority being given to those children who lived closest. Councillor Turner's main objection related to transport. It was utterly absurd for a school of this size to provide no parking whatsoever. It was a fact of life that people owned cars and would wish to travel to their place of work by car but there was no provision in this application for public parking in the area. The report stated that the transport assessment concluded there would be about seven additional passengers per bus, however with 1260 pupils, 110 FTE academic staff plus ancillary staff, many would need to travel to school other than by car and would do so either by bus or by train. It was therefore difficult to work out how the figure of seven additional passengers per bus was ascertained. As a result of this proposal, there would be a gross overload of the roads and public transport in the area.

Councillor Wells proposed a motion for permission of the application. This was a school designed to offer a particular kind of vocational education and its curriculum would be based around the sciences with the intention of leading pupils into higher education, apprenticeships and employment directly within the science and health industries. It would attract those who wished to be educated in those areas. It would not, therefore, be a normal secondary school. The requirement was that all secondary schools would have to operate under similar criteria in regard to accepting pupils and on that basis priority would indeed be given to those who applied in the closest proximity to the school. Pupils would come from quite a broad area across the borough. Councillor Wells questioned the assertion that there were four schools within the immediate area. He questioned the statement that there were other alternative local schools to what was proposed here. No-one would disagree that this was not an ideal location for a school however, the former FSA purchased this site and determined that it was acceptable and the Council had made some equivocation about the mixed use/education site because it had been approached with regard to the use of it for a UTC. Under those circumstances, Members found ourselves in the position where they had made it available in terms of educational use and was now being used in a similar way. The proposed school was central to the Borough as opposed to many schools which were built on the periphery of the Borough and because of the Greenwich decision many schools were taking vast numbers of children from outside the Borough. This school was less likely to be affected by that. The issue was around the nature of the school which simply could not function and could not offer the diversity of curriculum that is sought by parents and students unless it was a certain size. 3FE was simply not viable, 5FE at St Olave's only worked because it was a selective school. 6FE was a breakeven in terms of being able to offer the type of curriculum being sought. In recent years, a number of schools had been built higher. Many schools built over a decade ago were ground floor buildings only; the most recently built schools i.e. Shortlands, Harris Beckenham Primary and the new rebuild of Clare House Primary School were all two storey buildings and were a smaller footprint so they did not use a large amount of land. With regard to the parking

issues, Councillor Wells understood that St Marks Square area would include a rework of the Westmoreland Road multi-storey car parking facility. It was possible that a contract could be drawn up with the school to enable staff to park their cars.

Councillor Mellor acknowledged Members' responsibilities and duties as elected Councillors to provide educational places for the Borough's children. However, their duties needed to be weighed against the tertiary implications of their decisions, i.e. the residents, lack of adequate amenity space, intense increase of traffic at a notoriously busy junction. This application was totally unsuitable and after careful consideration, he could not support the recommendation for permission.

Councillor Joel acknowledged other Members' points in relation to the application. Referring to the design scheme and having seen the drawings and photographs, Councillor Joel considered it to be quite an impressive building. In regard to height, it should be borne in mind that in 2013, the DC Committee approved an application for a building of similar height at the same site. Other applications for the H G Wells Centre and the development at St Marks Square were also approved for higher buildings. So, as a general theme, Councillor Joel considered the Council had established a policy for higher buildings. The sports facilities and other usage referred to in the report would be used out of hours so any floodlighting and noise would have an impact on nearby residents. Referring to fire risks, the proposal included sprinkler systems and the whole design of the building would need to comply with the Building Regulation Acts and it was likely that the Fire Department would review this matter and make their comments available to officers and qualify any emergency assembly points.

With regard to drop-off and pick-ups, a number of statements encourage and discourage parents from doing this. Parents would drop their children off as close to the school as possible – the same as any other school in the Borough. Even if double yellow lines and controlled parking was established, the adjoining roads would still be used and the CPZ zones would then have to be expanded and additional parking meters with shorter parking periods would be required to lessen the impact on local residents.

Councillor Joel would like to have seen a more detailed circulation on where the two coaches would enter and exit the site and also showing the turning circles which looked to be very tight at the present time. Parking for two mini-buses was not shown on the plan. The two disabled bays would be restricted to two people with blue badges; this was not sufficient in regard to employment of disabled staff etc. Referring to page 62, paragraph 4, the report stated that provision for 10% of wheelchair spaces should be available for users within the building. Councillor Joel did not support the application.

Councillor Dykes referred to previous comments made in relation to the established height of a tall building at the site. Unlike the current proposed building, the previous application included a significant amount of stepping back and at no point was pushed further forward to residential properties on

Pinewood Road and Sandford Road. The 2013 report and the Inspector's report stated that fundamental to reducing the impact and the reason why it did not impact on residents was because of the stepping back element of the building. This applicant has not been able to do this for the current application so this was a very different application to that considered in 2013.

Councillor Michael was entirely mindful of the need to supply sufficient school places. The Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land should be preserved as much as possible and in the past Councillor Michael had argued for building schools higher. She was also aware that high street schools could work but there was always the question of how much could be put in a site – it was not always possible to expand sites. The provision of just four car parking spaces was totally inappropriate. This site had previously been used for Harris Primary School before it relocated to its permanent home in Shortlands but this was on a much smaller scale. The current proposed school would be too large for the amount of available space and most schools were considerably smaller. If this was half the size Councillor Michael would support the proposal. The lack of play facilities, the fact that windows could not be opened, the impact on residential amenity and the fact that 10 pay and display parking spaces would be removed, thereby placing additional pressure on parking in the locality, did not make the proposal feasible. Councillor Michael would like to see the applicant return with a moderated proposal but as it currently stood she could not support the application.

Members having considered the report, objections and representations,
RESOLVED (10 – 2 votes) that the APPLICATION be REFUSED on the grounds of over-development, impact on residential community, highways, traffic and the impact on the Keston Ridge.

The meeting ended at 8.35 pm

Chairman