

Dear Councillors

I write this letter in response to the statement from the Headteacher and to briefly reiterate the local community's objections to this proposal ahead of the Planning Committee meeting on 16 October 2018.

At the outset, I note with some regret that the Head's position is that because the school has produced a report that estimates what the additional noise will be that there is 'no need for further neighbour consultation'. I am very disappointed that the school has been unwilling to try and resolve this matter by discussion, despite the Leader of the Council and this Committee being unanimous that this should be the case.

The Head says that she is 'committed to a scheme that does not unnecessarily impact on neighbours'- how can this be the case when she has refused to meet or even consider what those concerns are? The Head simply hasn't listened and now seeks to impose this development on the local community despite the fact that every resident affected by this development has objected.

If the Head had listened she would be aware that the concerns of the residents go way beyond the significant additional noise, an issue that is simply one strand of the objection. Neither the Head nor the architect have dealt with any of the other neighbour concerns, namely;

- The size, height, scale and over-dominant nature of the development on an already heavily and densely developed area with limited space;
- The appearance of the cheap, plastic materials to be used in construction;
- The impact on a Conservation Area recognised for special architectural and historic interest- the character or appearance of which is deemed to be desirable to preserve or enhance;
- The impact on a locally listed, 110+ year old beautiful Edwardian building constructed of red brick with significant heritage value as well as architectural and historic interest;
- Loss of light;
- Loss of privacy;
- An ongoing maintenance burden and issue with poor quality of materials and design. Material specifications state that they are expected to only last 10 years;
- The refusal to give any meaningful consideration to any other options to increase play space at the school, including measures that could achieve this through little or no building work.

These issues haven't been dealt with because the school has no answer to them.

The Planning Officer says that the development is justified because of a social benefit. The rationale of this aspect of the decision is not explained. There appears to be a presumption that this is the case because the applicant is a school. Any scrutiny of the proposal shows that the only social benefit is that a maximum of 30 pupils have an extra 70cm² in which to play for 20 minutes at a time. Is this really justifiable in light of the numerous and significant concerns raised?

The school and church are a central part of our local community in which we live and work. It is my firm desire that the school continues to develop and prosper and to continue to provide a safe and enjoyable environment for the children to learn and grow. This development, for all the reasons noted above, is simply not a viable way to achieve this and it should not be imposed on the local residents.

I ask that you give serious consideration to all the concerns of the local community affected by this proposal and kindly request that you reject this application.

Mr & Mrs Holmes