

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2018/1968P	Berry Casey	10/10/2018 16:34:49	OBJ	<p><b>RESPONSE TO HEADMASTER STATEMENT WPRA</b></p> <p>While we commend the headteachers response to the concerns of the schools near neighbours, the statement itself affords us little comfort.</p> <p><b>Usage of the barge</b></p> <p>Several months ago, after learning of the plans for the floating classroom from a newspaper article, we arranged a meeting with the school during which we were assured that the barge would be used solely for educational purposes, in essence an extension to the existing teaching facilities. We did not oppose this initiative on that basis.</p> <p>However, subsequent publicity and the recent statement from the school, (anything beyond the day to day purposes of the barge as an educational facility is not our priority. However, we cannot say that we would not consider using the barge outside of hours at some point in the future) is not what was agreed at the initial and subsequent meetings with the school, and prompts serious concern.</p> <p>To have additional late activity on the canal, which is already affected by increasing levels of unsocial behaviour, (eg only last night the London Fire Brigade was called to deal with two separate fires on the canal towpath at the rear of Waterside Place), would fill residents with dread. The towpath is becoming an increasingly dangerous place to be after dusk, and the overwhelming majority would be strongly opposed to the commercial use of the school barge.</p> <p><b>Hours of activity</b></p> <p>The period of operation between 8.45am and 4pm is acceptable, but it is hard to understand how these hours can be adhered to if activities unrelated to the school are permitted.</p> <p><b>Location of the barge</b></p> <p>The first designated position of the barge was directly at the rear of numbers 7, 8, 9 and 10 Waterside Place. Having experienced the nightmare of barges being moored immediately at the rear of our homes, an agreement was reached with the school that the barge would be positioned no less than 3.5 metres from the end of our houses. The school's statement that 3.5 metres cannot be consistently guaranteed by events beyond our control is alarming, and in the light of possible lack of strict guidelines, the association would like to revert to their original request that the barge should be positioned exactly outside the school's rear gate. This would afford the children a much higher level of safety wherein they dont have to walk any distance along the towpath to the barge, thus avoiding the crowds of visitors and numerous cyclists.</p> <p>It transpires that CRT is not able to issue a licence to the school before planning permission is granted by Camden Council. We therefore urgently request the school amends their application to site the mooring to the immediate rear of the school, rather than 3.5 metres from Waterside Place.</p> <p><b>Noise and Disruption</b></p> <p>Many of the schools residential neighbours have lived in the area for many years and there have never been</p>

Application No:    Consultees Name:    Received:

Comment:

Response:

any objections to the sound of children coming from the school. On the contrary, it is lovely to hear and there are few concerns relating to the additional noise from pupils from neighbouring schools, on the understanding there will be restrictions to the schools working hours of 8.45 to 4pm. However increased numbers of children reinforces our view that the mooring should be immediately next to the school rear gate.

Community use.

Again, the majority of neighbours support sharing this facility with neighbouring schools, (although it has to be pointed out that there are individuals who remain vehemently opposed; principally on safety grounds), there remain significant suspicions relating to an obvious agenda in the statement;

However, we do want to make sure the classrooms use for Primrose Hill School is established first as an enriching educational not a commercial venture).

It is clear from this statement that commercial usage at some point is part of the agenda of the school. This does not reflect the agreements reached with the school and its next door neighbours who remain strongly opposed to the commercial use of this barge.

Consultation

While there has been improved engagement with neighbours; certainly when compared to the total lack of communication during last year's new classroom planning process, where the concerns of neighbours were completely ignored and/or dismissed without any dialogue. This of course is not relevant to the barge planning application, but it heightens concerns regarding the true agenda and tactics of the school.

It has been a continual source of dismay that items agreed during these meetings have consistently not been reflected accurately in subsequent statements of intention.

While the time spent in issuing this statement is appreciated, it affords us, as next door and near neighbours little in terms of dispelling the impression that the schools real agenda is to let this barge out as a commercial venture with all the attendant questions and disruption this will implicate, and we remain determinedly opposed to the commercial use of this barge in any form.

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2018/1968P	David Adams	15/10/2018 17:40:59	SUPPRT	<p>As a Governor at the school I am strongly in support of this application. As governors we are required to (a) oversee financial performance of the school, (b) hold the headteacher to account and (c) ensure clarity of vision, ethos and strategic direction. It is on these bases that I support the application to provide the school with a floating classroom.</p> <p>Speaking as a governor, I think the barge project perfectly compliments the school's ethos of providing an inclusive, creative, stimulating and above-all successful education to young people of the borough. This project meets all the criteria for full and unwavering governor support and the planning application should be granted in order that the project proceed for the benefit of the children of the school.</p> <p>Beyond the above position, as a member of the community rather than as a governor I would like to provide further insight into the process that brings us here. I believe the staff at the school are constrained in their ability to do this. I have no such constraints and wish to point out the utter hypocrisy of those who have objected.</p> <p>The school barge will be of no more consequence to the local residents than any other single barge, but will be a tremendous asset to the school in its role of serving hundreds of local people.</p> <p>The school have made extensive efforts to engage with local residents concerning this planning application, when ultimately they were under no obligation to do so.</p> <p>It is disingenuously self-serving, at best, to claim that the headteacher has sprung the possibility of commercial lettings on residents at the last moment. This possibility has been stated all along, for example, in a pamphlet distributed to local residents in July 2017, discussed in meetings with residents at Waterside Place and in writing by email, for example (amongst others) to Gideon Kasfiner and Berry Casey as representatives of Waterside Place on 20th April 2017 (copy on request). As such their objections on the basis that they weren't informed of this should be rejected.</p> <p>It would appear from the objections thus far lodged that some of the very people with whom the headteacher has spent considerable time communicating have chosen to not support the project. As a local resident I would be concerned that such an outcome may make further advanced communication and consultation (where it is not legally mandated) less likely in future.</p> <p>The local cluster of schools - Rhyl, Carlton, Fleet and Gospel Oak - have all offered their full support to the project. This is because it will bring valuable educational benefits to hundreds of children not just at Primrose Hill School but across the borough. However, it is only viable if it can generate a modest income to defray the cost of upkeep of the vessel. It will not generate a profit, but by the same token the boat needs to pay its own way.</p> <p>However, the notion that it will become a party boat, blighting the sound and light scape of the towpath and adjacent buildings, is hysterical nonsense. The school has offered consistent assurances that it will not. Alcohol would not be permitted on the barge any more than it is in the schools classrooms. Whilst the idea that occasional events might occur has been stated all along, the only kind of party that would be held on the boat would be a child's birthday party and a small one at that, given the small size of the vessel. Any right minded individual can see that these will be occasional - how many off-site brainstorming sessions do local</p>

Application No:    Consultees Name:    Received:

Comment:    Response:

estate agents really need? But it needs to be clear that without the ability to do very occasional commercial lettings the project is not viable.

Furthermore, to object, as some have done, specifically on the basis of a difference between what is in the final planning application and someone's interpretation of a long-ago-held conversation shows a fundamental misunderstanding of the planning process - the very purpose of the planning application is to have the plans laid out in a clear and unambiguous way to allow for responses. To claim that the application should be rejected on this basis is ludicrous.

Some residents seem to have misunderstood how the site of the mooring has been determined and think that the school could move it away from their property (towards someone else's presumably?). The position of the mooring is something over which the school has no control - the Canal and River Trust chose the spot for the mooring, and insisted that the mooring could not be closer to the middle of the school because that would result in the loss of a public mooring space which are in such short supply. The CRT manage the waterways and have shown unprecedented levels of support for this project by the exceptional granting of a permanent mooring. The CRT did move the mooring away from its initial location, and reduced the size of vessel it could accommodate to the detriment of the school, in response to requests from residents. Its called compromise. I note also that the police see no negative issues and support the project.

Lastly, and I wonder if this really even needs to be said given how patently obvious it is, in my view it simply beggars belief that anybody would choose to buy a house DIRECTLY ON THE CANAL and then object to the use of the canal by a single, small barge, to be occupied for a small amount of time, by very small people. The canal has been there for over 200 years, did they not notice it when choosing to live there? Of course, this extends to the school in general - some residents object to each and every thing the school does. Why buy a house near a school built in 1885 if you're going to be so easily offended by the normal comings and goings of young children and their parents and carers?

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2018/1968/P	John Burgess	17/10/2018 18:59:07	COMMENT	<p>[REDACTED], which is the property directly alongside the Regent's Canal footpath after it has crossed under the bridge over Regent's Park Road. In addition the back of our garden looks over the school. We are probably therefore more directly affected by the proposed barge on the canal than almost any other resident.</p> <p>To date, having lived there for 20 years, we have had no significant problems with the barges alongside the footpath, since those living in them have been discrete and well ordered, and we have no objection in principle to the school using a barge for lessons during normal school hours. However, we would object very strongly to the barge being used for commercial purposes, and in particular for parties, meals or alcohol consumption of any sort. As soon as it becomes let commercially, control over the behaviour of those renting it becomes virtually impossible in real time, and it is therefore highly likely that we will be subject to unacceptable behaviour and noise without much in the way of recourse. It seems to me not dissimilar from a request that we might make to use our garden for commercial purposes on a permanent basis, which would surely be refused.</p> <p>WE THEREFORE OBJECT IN THE VERY STRONGEST TERMS TO THE PROPOSAL THAT IT SHOULD BE LET COMMERCIALY FOR ANY PURPOSE WHATSOEVER - EVEN IF NARROWLY DEFINED, IT WOULD BE THE START OF A SLIPPERY SLOPE, AND SHOULD THEREFORE BE RESISTED ENTIRELY AS A CONCEPT.</p> <p>I am not familiar with all the legal and planning considerations that go with an application such as this, but I am reliably informed that the proposal to use any barge commercially is forbidden, and indeed that the type of planning permission requested excludes commercial use.</p> <p>WE THEREFORE REQUEST YOU IN THE STRONGEST TERMS TO REFUSE PERMISSION FOR COMMERCIAL USE OF ANY DESCRIPTION, BOTH NOW AND IN THE FUTURE.</p> <p>Sincerely, John Burgess</p>

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2018/1968P	Fergal Quinn	10/10/2018 17:43:00	OBJ	<p>As a regular user of the canal towpath (as a jogger and pedestrian) and a father of a child at the applicant school, I object to this application, for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. I do not believe that the applicant has performed a proper risk assessment of the site, or a proper assessment of the future liabilities associated with the ownership and maintenance of a watertight vessel.</li> <li>2. The site is used constantly by vagrants and drug addicts and currently is home to at least two illegal encampments, one of which hosts a group of cider drinkers who panhandle from towpath users, particularly on sunny days.</li> <li>3. The grass verge that bounds one side of the site is used regularly as an open toilet by the persons mentioned above.</li> <li>4. The towpath at this site is narrow and speeding cyclists can be a real risk. This part of the canal has a large footfall, given its proximity to ZSL London Zoo, including significant cycle traffic. It is not appropriate, in my view, to ask children to cross the towpath at right angles to the oncoming cycle traffic in order to attend a floating barge.</li> <li>5. While the barge is being used, who will provide security for the children and staff using the barge, given the popularity of the site with vagrants? Will the teachers themselves be expected to perform this function? Have they agreed to do so? Do they understand the nature of the site and the encampments nearby? Teachers cannot reasonably be asked to teach and at the same time act as lifeguards and bouncers.</li> <li>6. The various references to the barge potentially being used for commercial purposes concerns me. The school is not a business. In no way can any vessel, other than a dedicated commercial carrier, be seen as a revenue raising asset. A floating barge will be a drain on school resources for years to come, particularly given that it will need to be fully compliant with applicable health and safety regulations and will require regular maintenance.</li> <li>7. While there is undoubtedly something whimsical about the idea of a floating barge, this is not some isolated, well secured site located well away from the challenges often presented by urban waterways located in close proximity to deprived areas. This is a location wholly unsuitable for such a resource.</li> <li>8. In these times of austerity, the funds that are being raised and that will be required for years to come to purchase and maintain this barge would be better spent on projects with more direct benefit to the pupils of the school. On-water activities could easily be arranged co-operatively with the pre-existing facility at the Pirate Castle, just a few hundred metres from the school along the towpath.</li> </ol> <p>I consider the thinking behind this project as well meaning but essentially misguided. School should be a haven for children, they should not find themselves being taught in classrooms juxtaposed with cider drinkers, drug takers and the like - and this is not to be elitist, it is simply to be realistic.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2018/1968P	Fergal Quirn	16/10/2018 16:02:25	OBJ	<p>By way of an update to my earlier submissions, at around 11:00am on Saturday 13th October 2018, while running along the towpath, I came across a fire raging in the illegal encampment positioned just under the bridge carrying Regents Pk Road across the canal. I checked to ensure there was no person trapped among the burning detritus and with the assistance of a builder working on a nearby property, I fought the fire with a discarded pot refilled from the canal, eventually to be joined by London Fire Brigade. Nobody was injured but the fire was a stark reminder of just how dangerous this part of the canal has become, anti-social behaviour having now become almost the norm on this part of the towpath. Anecdotally I have heard the fire was started as part of a dispute between rival gangs of vagrants.</p> <p>It is not sensible for it to be proposed that schoolchildren should be brought into such an environment for education or play. The school itself is a secure, safe place to teach and take care of children. The towpath is anything but.</p>
2018/1968P	Anne Robinson	17/10/2018 12:40:59	OBJ	<p>My husband, Laurie McFadden, and I live at [REDACTED]. Our garden adjoins the school playground. We are 2 houses away from the canal. We have no objection to the school using a barge for educational purposes between the hours of 08:00 - 16:00. We are however strongly opposed to a barge being used for commercial purposes as we are very concerned about noise out of working hours and increased demand for parking (there is only just enough parking for residents). We agree completely with letter of 29th September circulated by Princess Road and Neighbours group and in particular the details under the headings 1)Noise and Inconvenience, 2)The application does not mention and 3)General comments. I am emailing a copy of the relevant parts of that email to Matthias Genet, although I expect he is aware of the contents. Please notify me of the committee date.</p>