
Report of the Head of Strategic Investment

HUDDERSFIELD PLANNING SUB-COMMITTEE

Date: 29-Mar-2018

Subject: Planning Application 2018/90336 Installation of additional bay to existing modular building Fixby Junior And Infant School, Lightridge Road, Fixby, Huddersfield, HD2 2HB

APPLICANT

Denise Armstrong,
Cowcliffe Pre-School

DATE VALID

31-Jan-2018

TARGET DATE

28-Mar-2018

EXTENSION EXPIRY DATE

Please click the following link for guidance notes on public speaking at planning committees, including how to pre-register your intention to speak.

<http://www.kirklees.gov.uk/beta/planning-applications/pdf/public-speaking-committee.pdf>

LOCATION PLAN



Map not to scale – for identification purposes only

Electoral Wards Affected: Ashbrow

No

Ward Members consulted

RECOMMENDATION:

DELEGATE approval of the application and the issuing of the decision notice to the Head of Strategic Investment in order to complete the list of conditions including those contained within this report.

1.0 INTRODUCTION:

- 1.1 The application has been brought to Sub-Committee and the request of Councillor Calvert with the following request:
- 1.2 Not enough information relating to this application is being shared and the effect to the residents with additional movements of traffic after the building size has been increased. There was a traffic management plan put in place in 2006 and this doesn't seem to have either worked or indeed be monitored so this needs looking at again. There have been numerous complaints both to Councillors, Police and Officers of the Council over the abuse received by residents from users of the school. Now is the time to sort this mess out.
- 1.3 The Chair of Committee has confirmed that Cllr Calvert's reason for making this request is valid having regard to the Councillor's protocol for Planning Committees.

2.0 SITE AND SURROUNDINGS:

- 2.1 Cowcliffe Pre-School comprises a detached portable building and associated play area and car parking located within the grounds of Fixby Junior and Infant School in an area behind, north east, of Nos. 26 and 28 Lightridge Road. The entire site is within an area defined as Urban Greenspace within the Kirklees Unitary Development Plan. Access to the building is via a gated entrance off Lightridge Road and the building itself is sited adjacent to the driveway to the main school. The staff car park is to the north of the building. To the south of the building a canopy with play area under. The wider area consists of mainly residential detached properties.

3.0 PROPOSAL:

- 3.1 Permission is sought for the installation of an additional bay to the existing modular building.

- 3.2 The proposed extension would be located on the side of the building lying flush with the existing front and rear elevations and projecting 3.05 metres to the north east. The proposed construction materials would match the existing being Plastisol steel coated external multi-pro boards for the walls, finished in a colour to match the existing and a mineral felt roof. The proposed openings would be uPVC.
- 3.3 The proposed accommodation would be a store, office, lobby and staff room with an external ramped entrance.
- 3.4 There will be no increase in number of children or number of staff as a result of the development.
- 3.5 The applicant has confirmed that the extension is required to provide additional space in the form of extra storage, a staff room and an office that will be slightly bigger than the currently one. It will also provide improved toilet facilities and disabled toilet facilities and an improved and safer kitchen.
- 3.6 The use of existing parking within the grounds will not change and is solely for staff and there is no access for parents.
- 3.7 The existing number of parking spaces is 40 and whilst 2 would be lost to accommodate the proposal it is proposed that a total number of 43 would be provided.

4.0 RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY (including enforcement history):

- 4.1 2001/93877 Erection of single storey classroom extension
Granted
- 2004/92305 Erection of portable building
Conditional Full Permission
- 2010/91608 Erection of canopy
Conditional Full Permission
- 2016/90333 Variation of condition 5 (management scheme for the arrival and departure times of children from the playgroup) on previous permission 2004/92305 for erection of portable building for pre-school playgroup, formation of secure outdoor play area and staff parking
Variation of condition approved
- 2016/92895 Variation of condition 3 (no of children) on previous application 2016/90333 for variation of condition 5 (management scheme for the arrival and departure times of children from the playgroup) on previous permission 2004/92305 for erection of portable building for pre-school playgroup, formation of secure outdoor play area and staff parking
Variation of condition approved

5.0 HISTORY OF NEGOTIATIONS (including revisions to the scheme):

- 5.1 No negotiations have taken place however further information has been submitted upon request from the Local Planning Authority with regards to a construction management plan for the extension and also confirmation of whether the resultant development would increase the number of staff or children for the pre-school.

6.0 PLANNING POLICY:

- 6.1 Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that planning applications are determined in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The Development Plan for Kirklees currently comprises the saved policies within the Kirklees Unitary Development Plan (Saved 2007). The Council's Local Plan was submitted to the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government on 25th April 2017, so that it can be examined by an independent inspector. The Examination in Public began in October 2017. The weight to be given to the Local Plan will be determined in accordance with the guidance in paragraph 216 of the National Planning Policy Framework. In particular, where the policies, proposals and designations in the Local Plan do not vary from those within the UDP, do not attract significant unresolved objections and are consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework (2012), these may be given increased weight. At this stage of the Plan making process the Publication Draft Local Plan is considered to carry significant weight. Pending the adoption of the Local Plan, the UDP (saved Policies 2007) remains the statutory Development Plan for Kirklees.

Kirklees Unitary Development Plan (UDP) Saved Policies 2007:

- 6.2 D3 – Urban Greenspace
BE1 – Design principles
BE2 – Quality of design
T10 – Highway safety
T19 – Parking provision

Kirklees Publication Draft Local Plan:

- 6.3 PLP1 – Achieving sustainable development
PLP2 – Place shaping
PLP21 – Highways safety and access
PLP22 – Parking
PLP24 – Design
PLP61 – Urban Greenspace

National Planning Policy Framework.:

- 6.4
- **Chapter 7** – Requiring good design
 - **Chapter 8** – Promoting healthy communities

7.0 PUBLIC/LOCAL RESPONSE:

7.1 Final publicity date expired 13th March 2018 – 5 letters of representation received. The principal objections relate to highway safety and parking issues.

- Parked cars along the road create difficulty for residents exiting their drives because cannot see the road either uphill or downhill because of parked cars
- At times drives cannot be used as cars parked both sides of the road
- Crossing the road on foot can be dangerous because of the amount of traffic. Don't wish to see an increase in traffic usage or parking, not just at the 'school run' times but by cars picking up and dropping children off for the nursery and out of school activities
- It can also be dangerous for children crossing the road, not all of them being controlled by a parent. It could be considered an accident waiting to happens
- If there is a police presence, everyone behaves themselves
- If the application is granted request it be subject to no increase in the number of places in the nursery
- Parking by parents of both the nursery and school causes problems every day
- The bridle path is always blocked by indiscriminate parking
- Object to proposed application, to increase the size of the playgroup would exacerbate further the safeguarding issues caused by illegal parking along Lightridge Road and the bridle path
- The plans show an increase in the size of the current build by 25% and the numbers of children have increased. Ofsted report in 2014 shows 32 children on the roll, three years later there were 43 children on roll (playgroup newsletter September 2017) an increase of over 34%
- Children, parents and residents have to negotiate drivers reversing into the main road from Jilly Royd Lane and residents have to tolerate drivers using their property for reversing. All this activity while children are walking up the Lane
- The manager of the Playgroup and Head at Fixby School are sympathetic to the problem. However, they also acknowledge that other than request parents not to park in this way they are unable to enforce
- The management team at the playgroup have been met with verbal abuse when asking parents to move
- The local PCSO has advised not to challenge parents but to pass details on to the Police
- The Police, highways, local PCSO team as well as local councillor have been contacted and acknowledge the problem however there continues to be no sustained support nor prevention put in place to ensure parking can't take place
- In summary, the reality of passing details to the police for them to action is unrealistic; however the problem remains and will continue unless a permanent solution is implemented and believe the development will impact yet further on the safety of all, unless measures are in place to ensure parking illegally in this area isn't an option

- Have a common shared boundary with the site but not received any notification of the two applications made in 2016 or indeed the current one
- In March 2016 an application was made (2016/70/90333) for a variation of Condition 5 to the application made in 2004 regarding start and finish times. These were increased from a start time of 9.15 am – 3.15 pm finish to a start time of 8.00 am – 5.00 pm finish. As a result of the original application in 2004, and the comments from Highways, entrance markings were extended along Lightridge Road and signage erected in six places. The signage advises motorists that no stopping can take place between the hours of 8.00 am – 9.30 am and 2.30 pm – 4.00 pm Monday to Friday. As the opening hours have increased significantly by 3 hours per day I would suggest restriction times along the markings should also be increased and the signage amended to reflect this extension.
- Condition 5 of the original planning permission in 2004 stated that a Traffic Management Scheme should be in place by the preschool to ensure onsite parking is managed and also to *“safeguard the free and safe flow of both vehicles and pedestrians on the adjacent public highways.....”* The scheme was implemented in August 2006 and states management of Cowcliffe Preschool will monitor the scheme and address any problems which may arise.
- As the scheme is now almost 12 years old I believe it needs revisiting to address the increase in illegal and inconsiderate parking by parents. However, both staff at the school and preschool group acknowledge the problem, but seem powerless to halt it in case they put themselves in danger
- The same application 201690333, made in March 2016 also states: *“As part of the previous permission (2004/92305) the maximum number of children using the Playgroup at any one time was limited to 26. No increase in the number of staff or children at the Playgroup is proposed.* Yet less than 6 months later an application was made and approval was given (2016/92895 to vary Condition 3 (number of children) from 26 to a maximum of 32 per session.
- The latest application, is to increase the current build by 25% to house a staff room, office and store. There is already an office and staff room (as shown on the original plans of 2004), therefore the relocation of these rooms to the proposed extension will free more space in the existing build. Therefore the potential would be there to increase numbers once again.
- In conclusion I would ask Officers to consider very carefully before making any decision. The relaxation of 2 Conditions contained in the original plan has increased considerably the problems for residents and exposed us to vile abuse, both verbal and physical and denied us the freedom to access our property. The preschool group’s own traffic management scheme is not effective to safeguard everyone and the current restrictions around the school are not enforced by the authorities.
- I would also request that in future, I am advised in writing, of any further planning applications or relaxation of conditions to the original and subsequent application made in 2004 to Cowcliffe Preschool Group and also to Fixby School in order that I may make any comments.

- Since further developments started on the site over 10 years ago, the size of the school and playgroup site has increased, this has meant over extra teachers and pupils and classes and thus extra traffic by teachers and parents and no end of parking issues for the neighbouring property to endure
- It has had a bad knock on effect on the neighbourhood and has alongside road resurfacing which resulted in one side of the Lightridge Road being altered from wasteland which was used by parents as parking, to a path, reducing parking.
- It made the parking even worse and reduced the road width which is very narrow and down to a single lane in one direction when parking for the school run is on
- It has resulted in numerous accidents, including a child being run over outside the school, many knocks and mumps involving cars, when whilst parked in their own driveways which involved the police attending.
- Difficulty in leaving my property already, as many parents and visitors to the school regularly block driveways, obstructing homeowners' access to their own property and any visitors they may have
- Also many parents and visitors to the school park on pavements and pedestrian footways, which around children and a school is dangerous, children can regularly be seen walking around the vehicles parked on footpaths
- Lightridge Road is a main road and a bus route which again at the school run times the bus cannot get through sometimes and has on several occasions been blocked and been forced to stop and wait for returning parents to come to their vehicle
- Fire engines and ambulances would not be able to get through at school run times
- Illegal parking is a major issue for any further expansion to either the school or playgroup on this site
- If any neighbour confront parked cars owners' we are often met with abuse
- More expansion would create more problems and chaos
- We as residents are the ones affected by too much re-development without any further provisions for traffic and parking
- Are the school going to provide extra parking on site within the school? Maybe where the field is to help ease the problems that they have created by over-expansion of this site
- There is no further room for expansion regarding traffic and parking

8.0 CONSULTATION RESPONSES:

8.1 **Statutory:** Highways Development Management – following submission of a Construction Plan, no objections

8.2 **Non-statutory:** None required

9.0 MAIN ISSUES

- Principle of development
- Visual amenity
- Residential amenity
- Highway issues
- Representations
- Other matters

10.0 APPRAISAL

Principle of development

- 10.1 The principle of the development will be assessed under Policy D3 of the UDP and paragraph 74 of the NPPF (as D3 is not in full compliance with the NPPF) which states that development on Urban Greenspace is only appropriate if is necessary, inter alia, for the continuation or enhancement of an established use (D3).
- 10.2 The NPPF (paragraph 74) states existing open space, sports and recreational buildings and land, including playing fields, should not be built on unless an assessment has been undertaken which has clearly shown the open space, buildings or land to be surplus to requirements. Furthermore, in all cases the proposals must protect visual amenity, wildlife value and opportunities for sport and recreation.
- 10.3 This is also reflective in the Publication Draft Local Plan which states within emerging Policy PLP 61 that development will not be permitted, except (amongst other things) that the development relates to the continuation or enhancement of the main use of the site and maintains the quality and function of the green space.
- 10.4 Paragraph 72 of the NPPF states that local planning authorities should give great weight to the need to create, expand or alter schools. This application would provide further accommodation for the pre-school without harming Urban Greenspace or the existing open space in which the pre-school is sited.
- 10.5 There will be no increase in the number of children or number of staff to the preschool and the extension is required to provide room for extra storage, staff room and slightly larger office.
- 10.6 As such, the proposal is, in principle, considered acceptable and in accordance with the aims of Policy D3 of the UDP, the aims of Chapter 8 of the NPPF and emerging Policy PLP61 of the Publication Draft Local Plan.

Urban Design issues

- 10.7 The proposed additional bay would be located on the north east side of the building which is to the rear when viewing from the pedestrian entrance to the school. The bay would be a continuation of the existing building in terms of elevations and roof height, projecting to the side by 3.05 metres with a window inserted into the front and rear elevations and a window, door and ramp within the side elevation.
- 10.8 The additional bay would be constructed from matching materials and would have an acceptable visual impact and would accord with Policy BE1 of the UDP, Chapter 7 of the NPPF and Policy PLP24 of the Publication Draft Local Plan.

Residential Amenity

- 10.9 In terms of residential amenity, the extended section of the building would be to the north of the site, separated from the closest residential property, Griff House, by a row of trees and bridleway HUD/383/10. Given that the extension would be separated from this property by 20 metres and whilst introducing a window into the rear elevation it is considered that the impact from harm from overlooking would be limited due to the existing screening on the boundary line. In light of this and that separation distances would not be decreased, it is considered that there would be minimal harm with regards to overshadowing and/or being overbearing. It is considered that the proposal is compliant with the aims of Policy BE1 and B2 of the UDP, Policy PLP24 of the Publication Draft Local Plan and advice within Chapter 7 of the NPPF.

Highway issues

- 10.10 As part of the application process and in light of objections to previous applications on highway safety grounds, Highways Development Management were formally consulted as part of the application process. The installation of the bay and resultant development would not increase the number of children or staff numbers and therefore the application itself is not expected to increase traffic generation. The addition module would be sited onto the car park which would result in the loss of two marked parking bays however it is proposed that there would be an increase overall of 3 spaces which will be provided elsewhere within the grounds. These spaces are for staff only with no parents able to use these spaces. Therefore, in terms of highway safety, the proposal is acceptable. It was requested however that further details were required in terms of a delivery/construction management plan to detail the number and type of vehicles to be used in delivery and construction of the bay, the route to the site, and the dates/times that the delivery/construction is expected to take place. This information was received stating that the works are planned to take place in the summer holidays, non-term time, therefore there will be adequate space within the site for contractor vehicles. Officers are satisfied with the details submitted and raise no concerns regarding the impact of the development on highway safety.
- 10.11 Significant objections have been raised from local residents and it is noted that these mainly refer to highway safety. A Traffic Management Scheme has been agreed via previous application and whilst the Local Planning Authority sympathise with the neighbouring properties regarding indiscriminate parking outside the school, the Local Planning Authority cannot control the parking of vehicles which block driveways. This would be a matter for the pre-school to consider if inconsiderate parking is taking place. If there are obstructions on the highway, this would be a police matter. Should the Traffic Management Plan not be adhered to, this would be a matter for the Enforcement Team to investigate. Details have been passed to the relevant highway and planning officers.
- 10.12 As there are no proposed variations of previous conditions in terms of child numbers, the development would not increase the traffic movement to and from the site. The extension to the building will provide staff facilities and a lobby. As such and taking into account Highways Development Management comments, it is not considered that this proposal would be detrimental to highway safety and therefore compliant with Policies T10 and T19 of the UDP and emerging Policies PLP21 and PLP22 of the Publication Draft Local Plan.

Representations

10.13 5 letters of representation have been received with the following Local Planning Authority response:

- Road outside our house can accommodate 3 parked cars which regularly happens during 'school run' hours
- Because of this we have difficulty existing our drive because we cannot see the road either uphill or downhill because of parked cars
- Also there are times when we cannot enter the drive because of cars parked both sides of the road

Response: This has been addressed within the Highways section of this report.

- Crossing the road on foot can be dangerous because of the amount of traffic which now uses this road so we do not want to see an increase in traffic usage or parking which will surely happen if this planning application is granted and not just at the 'school run' times which seem to get extended by cars picking up and dropping children off for the nursery and out of school activities

Response: The proposal does not seek to increase the number of children attending

- It can also be dangerous for children crossing the road, not all of them being controlled by a parent. It could be considered an accident waiting to happens
- If there is a police presence, everyone behaves themselves

Response: This is not a matter that can be addressed by the Local Planning Authority.

- If the application is granted I would like it to be subject to no increase in the number of places in the nursery

Response: Previous application 2016/92895 has a condition attached that the maximum number of children that can attend the Playgroup at any one time shall not exceed 32. If the pre-school wished to increase this number an application would be required to vary that condition.

- Parking by parents of both the nursery and school causes problems every day
- The bridle path is always blocked by indiscriminate parking
- Nobody seems to address the problem of parking at Fixby

Response: This has been addressed within the Highways section of this report.

- Object to proposed application, to increase the size of the playgroup would exacerbate further the safeguarding issues caused by illegal parking along Lightridge Road and the bridal path

Response: This has been addressed within the Highways section of this report

- The plans show an increase in the size of the current build by 25%

Response: Noted

- Ofsted report in 2014 shows 32 children on the roll, three years later there were 43 children on roll (playgroup newsletter September 2017) an increase of over 34%

Response: Previous application 2016/92895 has a condition attached that the maximum number of children that can attend the Playgroup at any one time shall not exceed 32 and should this increase, an application would be required to vary that condition.

- The problem of illegal parking is ongoing and rising with the increased number of children on roll at the playgroup a contributing factor
- Children, parents and residents have to negotiate drivers reversing into the main road from Jilly Royd Lane and residents have to tolerate drivers using their property for reversing
- All this activity while children are walking up the Lane

Response: This is not a matter that the Local Planning Authority can address. Advice is given within the Highways section of this report. This application does not seek to increase the numbers of children at the pre-school.

- The manager of the Playgroup and Head at Fixby School are sympathetic to the problem
- However, they also acknowledge that other than request parents not to park in this way they are unable to enforce

Response: Should the approved Traffic Management Scheme dated August 2006 not be adhered to, this is a matter for the Council's Planning Enforcement Team

- The management team at the playgroup have been met with verbal abuse when asking parents to move
- The local PCSO has advised not to challenge parents but to pass details on to the Police
- The Police, highways, local PCSO team as well as local councillor have been contacted and acknowledge the problem however there continues to be no sustained support nor prevention put in place to ensure parking can't take place

Response: Noted

- In summary, the reality of passing details to the police for them to action is unrealistic; however the problem remains and will continue unless a permanent solution is implemented and believe the development will impact yet further on the safety of all, unless measures are in place to ensure parking illegally in this area isn't an option

Response: This has been addressed within the Highways section of this report.

- Have a common shared boundary with the site but not received any notification of the two applications made in 2016 or indeed the current one

Response: Both prior applications were advertised in accordance with Council's Statement of Community Involvement. The addressee of this objection was informed of the application by letter dated 6th February 2018.

- In March 2016 an application was made (2016/70/90333) for a variation of Condition 5 to the application made in 2004 regarding start and finish times. These were increased from a start time of 9.15 am – 3.15 pm finish to a start time of 8.00 am – 5.00 pm finish. As a result of the original application in 2004, and the comments from Highways, entrance markings were extended along Lightridge Road and signage erected in six places. The signage advises motorists that no stopping can take place between the hours of 8.00 am – 9.30 am and 2.30 pm – 4.00 pm Monday to Friday. As the opening hours have increased significantly by 3 hours per day I would suggest restriction times along the markings should also be increased and the signage amended to reflect this extension.

Response: This is a matter for the Highway Safety/Streetscene team to assess. It would not be reasonable to seek a TRO under this application for the additional bay to the building.

- Condition 5 of the original planning permission in 2004 stated that a Traffic Management Scheme should be in place by the preschool to ensure onsite parking is managed and also to “safeguard the free and safe flow of both vehicles and pedestrians on the adjacent public highways.....” The scheme was implemented in August 2006 and states management of Cowcliffe Preschool will monitor the scheme and address any problems which may arise.
- As the scheme is now almost 12 years old I believe it needs revisiting to address the increase in illegal and inconsiderate parking by parents. However, both staff at the school and preschool group acknowledge the problem, but seem powerless to halt it in case they put themselves in danger

Response: If the Traffic Management Plan is not being adhered to, this is a matter for the Enforcement team to investigate. The current application would not result in an increase in the number of children at the pre-school.

- The same application 2016/70/90333, made in March 2016 also states: “As part of the previous permission (2004/92305) the maximum number of children using the Playgroup at any one time was limited to 26. No increase in the number of staff or children at the Playgroup is proposed. Yet less than 6 months later an application was made and approval was given (planning application number: 201692895) to vary Condition 3 (number of children) from 26 to a maximum of 32 per session.

Response: The applications were submitted as assessed with regards to highway safety with Highways Development Management being formally consulted.

- The latest application, is to increase the current build by 25% to house a staff room, office and store. There is already an office and staff room (as shown on the original plans of 2004), therefore the relocation of these rooms to the proposed extension will free more space in the existing build. Therefore the potential would be there to increase numbers once again.

Response: The Local Planning Authority can only assess the application submitted. The Local Planning Authority cannot prevent any further applications being submitted however any forthcoming application will be considered on their own merits.

- In conclusion I would ask Officers to consider very carefully before making any decision. The relaxation of 2 Conditions contained in the original plan has increased considerably the problems for residents and exposed us to vile abuse, both verbal and physical and denied us the freedom to access our property. The preschool group's own traffic management scheme is not effective to safeguard everyone and the current restrictions around the school are not enforced by the authorities.

Response: Noted

- I would also request that in future, I am advised in writing, of any further planning applications or relaxation of conditions to the original and subsequent application made in 2004 to Cowcliffe Preschool Group and also to Fixby School in order that I may make any comments.

Response: Any applications received for the site will be advertised in accordance with the Council's adopted procedures at that time.

- Since further developments started on the site over 10 years ago, the size of the school and playgroup site has increased, this has meant over extra teachers and pupils and classes and thus extra traffic by teachers and parents and no end of parking issues for the neighbouring property to endure

Response: Noted

- It has had a bad knock on effect on the neighbourhood and has alongside road resurfacing which resulted in one side of the Lightridge Road being altered from wasteland which was used by parents as parking, to a path, reducing parking.
- It made the parking even worse and reduced the road width which is very narrow and down to a single lane in one direction when parking for the school run is on
- It has resulted in numerous accidents, including a child being run over outside the school, many knocks and mumps involving cars, when whilst parked in their own driveways which involved the police attending.

Response: Noted

- Difficulty in leaving my property already, as many parents and visitors to the school regularly block driveways, obstructing homeowners' access to their own property and any visitors they may have
- Also many parents and visitors to the school park on pavements and pedestrian footways, which around children and a school is dangerous, children can regularly be seen walking around the vehicles parked on footpaths

Response: This is a matter for the Highway Safety/Streetscene and the Police. This cannot be requested under this application for the additional bay to the building

- Lightridge Road is a main road and a bus route which again at the school run times the bus cannot get through sometimes and has on several occasions been blocked and been forced to stop and wait for returning parents to come to their vehicle
- Fire engines and ambulances would not be able to get through at school run times

Response: Noted

- Illegal parking is a major issue for any further expansion to either the school or playgroup on this site

Response: It is not proposed to increase the number of pupils or staff numbers as a result of the proposed development

- If any neighbour confront parked cars owners' we are often met with abuse

Response: This is a police matter and not a matter under the control of the Local Planning Authority

- More expansion would create more problems and chaos

Response: It is not proposed to increase the number of pupils or staff numbers as a result of the proposed development

- We as residents are the ones affected by too much re-development without any further provisions for traffic and parking

- Are the school going to provide extra parking on site within the school?

Maybe where the field is to help ease the problems that they have created by over-expansion of this site

- There is no further room for expansion regarding traffic and parking

Response: This has been addressed within the Highways section of this report

10.14 Other matters

There are no other matters for consideration

11.0 **CONCLUSION**

- 11.1 The NPPF has introduced a presumption in favour of sustainable development. The policies set out in the NPPF taken as a whole constitute the Government's view of what sustainable development means in practice.

This application has been assessed against relevant policies in the development plan and other material considerations. It is considered that the development would constitute sustainable development and is therefore recommended for approval.

12.0 **CONDITIONS (Summary list. Full wording of conditions including any amendments/additions to be delegated to the Head of Strategic Investment)**

1. development to commence within 3 years
2. development carried out in accordance with the plans
3. works carried out in accordance with the Delivery and Construction Plan
4. details of 3 parking spaces for staff

Background Papers:

<http://www.kirklees.gov.uk/beta/planning-applications/search-for-planning-applications/detail.aspx?id=2018%2f90336>

Certificate of Ownership – Notice served on/ or Certificate A signed: