

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/2042/L	Eleanor Engle	Flat 3 33 Hampstead Hill Gardens	24/04/2016 00:16:19	OBJEMPER	<p>I would like to object to the proposed school on the following grounds:</p> <p>1.The impact on traffic and parking would be huge in Rosslyn Hill a main road but a very narrow one, where the traffic is often already blocked</p> <p>To see the kind of problems that would be caused, one only has to see the traffic chaos in Hampstead Hill Gardens morning and afternoon, when small children attending the school in Pond Street opposite are brought to school and collected again. There are constantly minor shunts because cars are parked too hastily, and double parking is commonplace with daily arguments with traffic wardens , because parents have no choice but to leave their cars somewhere to take their children over the road..</p> <p>2. The proposed rooftop playground would surely project an unreasonable amount of noise in a quiet residential area. Small childrens' high voices, loud at playtime are very noisy even at ground level.</p> <p>3 The design and size and of the proposed building seems out of keeping - and bears no relation to the character of the old police station building, which is an attractive building, set back in its garden. Surely many a good use could be found for this current building as it stands.</p> <p>There were proposals to demolish St Stephens too but the church was kept and a new uses found, in order to preserve the architecture and the character of the area.Especially given that it is a conservation area, it seems inconsistent to preserve some old buildings only to change others radically, a few roads away.</p> <p>4. To build a new school on this site would be a huge construction project, causing more traffic congestion and noise for a year or two, when there seems to be a lot of debate about whether a further school is necessary in Hampstead anyway.</p>

2016/2042/L	Eleanor Engle	Flat 3 33 Hampstead Hill Gardens	24/04/2016 00:15:57	OBJEMPER
-------------	---------------	--	---------------------	----------

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/2042/L	Abigail Levin	1 Hornby Close London NW3 3JL	24/04/2016 22:55:40	SUPPRT	<p>I would like to register my strong support for the proposals to convert the former Police Station into a new home for Abacus Belsize Primary School.</p> <p>I am the parent of a child now in Year One at the school. We live within the current catchment area for the school, in the southwestern part of Belsize ward, and directly experienced the lack of places available for parents who want a secular state education for their child.</p> <p>Had our daughter not been offered a place at Abacus - or had the school not existed - we have no idea where she would have been educated. We do not have a Christian faith (the ethos of the other schools in the area) and in any case we know that we are well outside their catchment areas.</p> <p>Our experience at Abacus Belsize has been entirely positive, and we are delighted with the education the school is providing for our daughter and the diverse intake of students since the school opened. The school serves the local community and provides her with an outstanding education alongside children from the nearby area with a wide range of social and cultural backgrounds.</p> <p>We are well aware that local residents close to the Police Station site are concerned at the potential that the school will generate traffic. In our experience, it is the private schools in our area that are the primary generators of traffic, and in all the time that the school was located in the former Town Hall, we never once used a car to take her to or from school. We live at the furthest extreme from the future school location and - like all the parents we know - will be using foot, scooter or bus to make the journey to the new site. We are well aware from friends whose children attend the location independent schools that there are many families who live well outside the area and travel by car to Belsize and Hampstead, and this is a completely different situation for Abacus, which serves only local families.</p> <p>We know there is a complete lack of suitable locations within the Belsize area, and although we would obviously have preferred the school to be permanently situated in a central location that would have been more closely located to our home, are delighted that a civic building is being retained for a use that serves all members of the community. The historic features of the building's original functions will be preserved in the new proposals and we are sure that the school will be a good custodian of the building for the future.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/2042/L	nicky shinder	9 Hampstead Hill Gardens London NW3 2PH	23/04/2016 18:27:26	OBJ	<p>The school is acting as if this is “done deal “ and that the Council would not wish to challenge this initiative from a central government department. It is accepted that more primary schools are needed in general but as someone who lives nearby the proposed development I have scrutinised the plans closely and they don’t stack up.</p> <p>One’s inclination is to support a new local free school and on the face of it using a large disused excellent example of an Arts and Crafts building must be attractive. However, sadly the plans fail on a number of counts to meet acceptable planning criteria. Although the loss of amenity is a sufficient reason to reject the application you might indulge the developers by examining on the one hand the benefits of a new local school and to weigh this up against the loss of amenity. Even if you looked at it in this way and I don’t think you should I believe the case for rejection is nevertheless compelling and that you have the power to stop this and should.</p> <p>First and foremost whatever the school’s own publicity machine says – this is not a local school. The school at the moment draws half its pupils from the Belsize Park catchment and half from beyond and none from Hampstead. It is a primary school and although it aspires to be car free as do many other schools - it won’t be just as they are not. The idea of 5 year olds with younger siblings in push chairs cycling to this school from a number of miles away and from down the hill in Adelaide Road is clearly nonsense. Part of the real concern here is that the school is attempting to pull the wool over your eyes to convince you it is local. This lacks integrity. Even its chair of governors lives in Brighton; The school is not even in the catchment and it would not be lawful to change the catchment retrospectively to alter this. The school is in CA-H by Camden’s own definition not CA –B. A free school is local and this is not a local school. If the catchment was a circle around the school’s location there would be no case for a school as there are enough in the area already.</p> <p>The result is a lot of incremental car traffic in an area which is already congested by the school run (55 schools already in Hampstead with 12X the number of places as there are children living in the area). I estimate that there may be 100 to 200 cars in use here as a result of the school and with no car parking this will result in mayhem. Ambulances already stopped by gridlock going to and from the Royal Free will have even longer waiting times for critical needs.</p> <p>The traffic issue here is not limited to cars but footfall. Every day numerous people walk past the police station to one of the many neighbouring medical and dental practices or to attend or drop off or collect from school or just to attend to their business in Hampstead Village or Belsize Park. This is to say nothing of the large Royal Free daily traffic which when the Pears Building goes up will increase further. Part of the plan is also to reduce the pavement size and remove the sun facing benches that are an important local amenity.</p> <p>Then there is the pollution level: already twice the recommended limit and this will increase not just from vehicular traffic but the school itself that will require its own electricity sub-station to run. How long can this serious green factor be ignored? The school will also be run out of hours to make sure the asset has the fullest utilisation.</p> <p>Noise is also a form of pollution and the proposal to put a playground on the roof will make the more or less noiseless back gardens of numerous properties far from noiseless. The developer has said that the playground is to be on the roof as noise diffusion is better that way. This is a very convenient way of saying that there is nowhere else to fit the playground and by the way it breaches space requirements for anything other than an inner city school. Hampstead being “inner city” is the first time I have heard of it. It is a village and as such the criterion for space fails.</p>

Application No: Consultees Name: Consultees Addr: Received:

Comment: Response:

Hampstead is also a village with exceptional architectural heritage with numerous listed buildings many of which are neighbours of the police station. Another claim of the developer is that the proposed extension can only “be seen either from a helicopter or Google Maps”- presumably aerial view. This quote was made at the Pax Lodge consultation meeting by the school’s architect at which your planning department were present. This is to ignore all the back gardens that look on to it and reflects either dishonesty or lack of thought either of which should be a concern. The only possible justification for a brutal block of this nature juxtaposed with wonderful red brick Victorian buildings would be that it could not be seen and that is no justification at all! Not only is the scale too large and the building ugly but the proposed extension goes right to the border of the adjacent property.

At the Pax Lodge meeting a number of the planning issues were raised and not a single one has been addressed in the plans submitted. So much for consultation! The application went in quietly during the Easter break and only contiguous properties were written to. What right does the school have to be so confident that nothing will stand in its way? The local community has been forced into action to oppose this vigorously as there will be a monumental change to a unique conservation area. Perhaps part of the confidence is based on the consultation with your planning department who have taken it upon themselves to see this monstrous scheme through? There is even a suggestion that the the catchment be altered to squeeze the school onto its edge. Well the parking zone is CA –H not CA –B so who would be fooled here? With all the fuss at the Pax Lodge how could Camden just have written to contiguous properties? This is a matter that concerns the whole area. The consultation is insufficient.

Why has there been no consultation either here about the use of the property? Would it not make eminent sense to make it part of the hospital? It would be an excellent outpatient clinic for perhaps adolescents? The building was never meant to be suited to the arrival and departure of hundreds of people at the same time. Is there nowhere else for the school? Does it need to be so big? – It is only 90 strong at the moment? What is unique about the site is that it is close to the hospital and some use by the hospital of it would make the most sense.

The application is partly to change the use from a police station. This is important because whatever the Department of Education suggests from a very aggregated and undetailed knowledge of the project, you can reject this and your constituents who are keen guardians of the heritage of this fine part of the borough wish you to do so. Moreover you are not dealing here with an applicant that is honest in its desperation to succeed. You are no doubt watching the debate about academies and if the applicant is uncontrollable now how will it behave as an academy?

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/2042/L	Eleanor Engle	Flat 3 33 Hampstead Hill Gardens	24/04/2016 00:16:19	OBJEMPER	<p>I would like to object to the proposed school on the following grounds:</p> <p>1. The impact on traffic and parking would be huge in Rosslyn Hill a main road but a very narrow one, where the traffic is often already blocked</p> <p>To see the kind of problems that would be caused, one only has to see the traffic chaos in Hampstead Hill Gardens morning and afternoon, when small children attending the school in Pond Street opposite are brought to school and collected again. There are constantly minor shunts because cars are parked too hastily, and double parking is commonplace with daily arguments with traffic wardens, because parents have no choice but to leave their cars somewhere to take their children over the road..</p> <p>2. The proposed rooftop playground would surely project an unreasonable amount of noise in a quiet residential area. Small childrens' high voices, loud at playtime are very noisy even at ground level.</p> <p>3 The design and size and of the proposed building seems out of keeping - and bears no relation to the character of the old police station building, which is an attractive building, set back in its garden. Surely many a good use could be found for this current building as it stands.</p> <p>There were proposals to demolish St Stephens too but the church was kept and a new uses found, in order to preserve the architecture and the character of the area. Especially given that it is a conservation area, it seems inconsistent to preserve some old buildings only to change others radically, a few roads away.</p> <p>4. To build a new school on this site would be a huge construction project, causing more traffic congestion and noise for a year or two, when there seems to be a lot of debate about whether a further school is necessary in Hampstead anyway.</p>
2016/2042/L	Matt Leach	34 Maryon Mews London NW3 2PU	22/04/2016 19:25:21	SUPPRT	<p>I would very much like to support this application, which meets a massive need for more primary school capacity, particularly in the area of South End Green, which at present sits outside of the regular catchment area of existing state and voluntary aided schools, providing real issues for parents of young children in the area. Whilst there may be arguments made about funding mechanisms and control over the school in question, in pure planning terms, this is an entirely necessary development, one that is appropriate to the site in question, and keeps it in a use that provides a significant public benefit, the site itself is suitable as it is situated close to good public transport and the development proposals themselves are sympathetic to and make good use of the building and surrounding land. I understand that the chair of the South End Green Association has registered an objection to the other application associated with this development. As a member of the SEGA committee, I can confirm that SEGA has not taken a collective view on the planning proposal and his (as is my) comments represent the personal views of individual residents in the area.</p>