

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/2430/P	Martin Baldry	20/07/2023 09:07:25	OBJ	<p>I am writing on behalf of Martin Baldry and Fiona Baldry of 46 Burrard Road. We object to this planning application by ESCP (application number 2023/2430/P) for the reasons set out below. In addition we have read all the objections submitted up to 20 July 2023 by other parties relating to this planning application and are in agreement with the points made.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. PROXIMITY. The new building will be right at the end of the short gardens we have in Burrard Road and will have a material negative impact on our outlook and sense of space. The Planning Statement document of the application states "...whilst the proposal will be slightly visible from surrounding properties it won't result in an overbearing or sense of enclosure to any neighbouring occupiers". We strongly disagree with that statement. The building will be approximately 3.5m high and it is 2m from the ground to the top of the wall backing on to the gardens of Burrard Road. Given how close the end of the building will be to our back walls the building will be a lot more than 'slightly visible' from the ground floor of our house and even more so from the upper floors of our property. 2. NOISE. We are very concerned about the additional noise when this new building is in use, particularly when students are moving to and from it. In addition we understand that the teaching times for the two classrooms in the new building will be staggered, thus increasing the frequency with which students are entering and exiting the building. There is also implicit acknowledgement of the noise impact in the planning application, where it is stated "The proposed new classrooms will be kept closed over the weekend to minimise any noise disruption to the neighbours". We don't want significant noise disruption from Monday to Friday either, as we are very frequently at home during the week as well as at weekends. I also noticed that the Application Form document states the hours of opening as including Saturday and Sunday, as well as starting/ending very early/late Monday to Friday – I assume this is an error but is of great concern to us if it is not. 3. STRUCTURAL. We did not see anything in the application that demonstrates there will be no structural impact on the properties in Burrard Road from this new building (either directly or indirectly (e.g. from the trees in the immediate vicinity)), particularly given how close it will be to these properties. Our houses are built on clay. This needs to be addressed. 4. APPEARANCE. The quality and look of the new building is poor (cheap pre-fab wrapped in vinyl, with a grey roof) and is not in keeping with the rest of the ESCP estate nor the surrounding area. And, due to the poor quality, over the 3 years the appearance of the new building will deteriorate. Also the new building will be right on the edge of the West End Green Conservation Area, and will have an adverse impact on that. 5. DISRUPTION AND PROCESS. Despite the modular nature of the proposed building there will still be significant disruption at the time of construction. In addition because it is only a temporary solution there will then be further disruption when it is removed and, if ESCP get their way, when work starts on a permanent solution. ESCP have known for at least 3 years that they want to expand, so we don't understand why they have not planned ahead and thus avoided the need for an interim temporary solution. We do not see why their neighbours should have to suffer unnecessary disruption just because ESCP have not organised themselves well. We also believe they are using this 'temporary' application as a 'back door' way into trying to get easier approval for a subsequent permanent application, and are trying to pressurise the council into a quick decision on this temporary solution. Furthermore, we are concerned that in future ESCP could potentially apply for use of the 'temporary' building to be extended beyond 3 years (e.g. to avoid the additional costs of a permanent

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Received:****Comment:** **Response:**

solution or because Camden Council rejects ESCP's subsequent permanent application). We believe that ESCP should simply have to submit an application for their permanent solution now.

6. COMMUNITY VIEWS. The Statement of Community Involvement document in the application states in the Conclusion: "It is clear from the consultation responses that there is no excessive opposition to the proposed extension on the site". We disagree. I attended the online webinar session, and I would characterise the mood of the residents that attended it as being extremely concerned about the proposals. The aforementioned document sets out a Q&A from the webinar, and it could be construed from that that our questions and concerns were addressed – they were not. There was also a limited amount of time to ask questions at that session. The document also describes in Section 3 the comments and concerns raised at the in-person exhibition. It also says only one feedback form was completed. I, for one, did not complete the form as I did not see why it was at all relevant to provide my age group in order for any comments to be included. I had also already made it clear at the online webinar and in-person exhibition that I had significant concerns about the proposed development.

7. RESTRICTIONS. There are restrictive covenants affecting building on the land to which this application relates. We trust that such restrictions will be properly investigated as part of the councils' review of the application.
