

Hi Jo

Sorry to bother you again but I have now had an opportunity to study all the supporting documentation for this application.

I had no idea a Pre-Application PREAPP/01/52/25 enquiry was made last year but was heartened to read your reply.

Your detailed response in January was very comprehensive, fair and highlighted the most important aspects for consideration.

I do hope the Committee can be provided with a copy of your January response as the supporting documentation for the current application is somewhat overwhelming.

Correct me if I am wrong but I understand this is a Full Application for Planning Permission for a change of use and Construction of outdoor classrooms etc. As such it will pass or fail in its entirety and I really hope not be approved with conditions covering the grey areas such as below.

Therefore, I have read all the documents and would like to highlight some serious concerns in the documents;

Educational and Operational Justification for Proposed External Classrooms and MUGA (4 pages)

The proposed wooden lodges would be used for therapeutic provision, including counselling, therapy sessions, and a small fitness suite, an outside gym area and regulation space.

Educational and Operational Justification for Proposed External Classrooms, **Retention of Existing Buildings** and MUGA (6 Pages)

The proposed wooden lodges would be used for therapeutic provision, including counselling, therapy sessions, regulation activities, a small fitness suite, outdoor gym provision and wellbeing support.

In this second document I note there is additional wording which presumably must be clearly to the existing shed and not its use as a storage facility.

Notably here, they call it a **large shed/lodge** which, as far as I can tell, was not the subject of the planning application.

I think this needs qualifying as it is ambiguous and I am convinced they seek to use the storage shed as build for educational purposes which was one of my original complaints

In that second document they state;

Justification for Maintaining Use of the Large Shed / Lodge

The existing shed/lodge forms an important part of the educational provision at Courtlands Independent Special School and supports the school's specialist approach to teaching and learning for pupils with additional needs. The building provides a flexible learning environment that complements the main school

accommodation and allows pupils to access educational opportunities in a smaller, less formal setting.

Retaining the shed/lodge also allows the school to deliver elements of the curriculum that are not always suitable within a traditional classroom environment. The facility supports practical skills development, creativity, independence, confidence building and emotional regulation.

For these reasons, the continued educational use of the shed/lodge is considered necessary, appropriate and beneficial to the operation of Courtlands Independent Special School.

The concern here is the school are attempting to gain approval to use the existing large shed, as built (without permission) to provide these facilities, no doubt if the new Classrooms are refused in part or in whole!

This is a real concern for me going forward and I thank you for reminding the Applicant in this regard and for detailing the necessary requirements.

Moving on, sorry!

I need to address the very serious Classroom issue and the effect it would have on our enjoyed amenity when the potential noise impact of a large number of children being taught in a 1000 sq ft industrial shed is built next to our property.

I do consider this to be almost a vindictive approach by the owners of Courtlands to attempt to cluster 4 new buildings around our property, (seemingly out of sight of Courtlands) without any regard to our privacy, amenity or the sensitivity of the setting. It should perhaps be noted we have lived here for 29 years and our house lies within the original grounds of Courtlands and as such should be given due respect.

If this is a full application then only the bare bones of a design have been laid out in terms of floor plans and elevations for these classrooms and are poorly designed in my opinion.

It is proposed that these Classrooms are of a single wooden skin construction (like the as build shed) without thought being given to insulation, heating, services, toilets etc

They are allegedly being provided as a quiet area but could have a fitness centre and a gym outside (as stated above), but no details are being submitted.

I feel this is ill thought out as these single skin wooden buildings are entirely inappropriate for classrooms and there is a complete lack of details including how they will be sound deadened.

Logically as the summers are getting warmer these buildings will be hot and require the windows to be open again causing noise pollution.

The applicants agent admits the necessity in their statement at 6.6.9

"In addition, any noise generated from teaching activities within the classroom buildings would be typical of a school environment and would be contained to a significant degree by the built form itself. Noise emanating from the classrooms can

be appropriately managed through normal school operation, including keeping doors and windows closed where necessary."

In your Pre-Application PREAPP/01/52/25 fully response, I really appreciate your comments to the Applicant and note you confirm that the new Classrooms required a full planning approval.

I also note the Council Heritage Advisor was concerned to avoid "piecemeal and peppering of ancillary buildings" and called them sizeable structures with a strong visual presence, impossible to mitigate through siting and context

I note your opinion this Classroom 2 would be insensitive and have an unneighbourly impact on our property and the blank black rear elevation of this shedlike building (similar to the shed as built) would be immediately seen from our front garden and by our neighbour whose house front elevation faces that way.

Lastly

ECE PLANNING STATEMENT

I refer to the numbered paragraphs of their statement,

3.8 and 4.4 Lodge Placement amendments - I assume this means repositioned to the current application

6.3.4 Disagree - these Lodges/sheds will be highly visible IMHO

6.3.6 Disagree and object

6.6.1 I think this is important there will be unacceptable impact on our property and life here.

6.6.2 Again your comments stating that this is fundamental to our lives here with the huge increase in children either at play or in a "lodge" and the siting and effect we would be unneighbourly.

6.6.5 I wholeheartedly disagree with this statement.

6.6.8

6.6.9

6.6.10

These last three statements are in my opinion entirely wrong and the agents seek to suggest that there will be no loss of amenity or harm to neighbouring property and that the council should condition the methodology to achieve this by way of Planning Conditions.

I would respectfully suggest for the above reasons that this Planning Application is badly flawed and should be refused.

I realise that the Change of Use is a different matter but the Applicants chose to include all matters on the site and probably will lobby hard for overall approval.

I do hope you can guide the Committee as per your Pre-Application advice and not allow the application to succeed.

I am available at - if you wish to discuss this further or via email

Kind regard

Tony howard

