

## ST. CHRISTOPHER'S SCHOOL CLASSROOMS EXTENSION PROJECT RESPONSE TO OBJECTIONS TO APPLICATION 2021/1327/NEW

FINAL 24 August 2021

Objections Summary comments are copied from Objections received and logged on the Camden planning website for this application. They have been grouped into the key topics. The Schedule aims to capture all the main points raised.

OBJECTIONS SUMMARY	RESPONSES [BY TEAM]																		
<b>PUPIL NUMBERS</b>																			
<p>1. <i>The school has already exceeded the permitted cap on pupils and the Conditions, set by Camden Council in 1995.....Within the accompanying documents submitted, there are inconsistencies of exactly how many pupils there are.</i></p>	<p>There are no inconsistencies in how the school numbers are presented, but they are easy to misunderstand. The school currently has 245 pupils. This is a maximum. With some pupils leaving and joining each term the number of pupils does vary yearly and of course there is seldom a day when all pupils are present due to illness. The current Reception class is 28 and the School would like to extend that to a maximum of 40. The School has an overall cap from DfE of 260 pupils across the year groups which it could not exceed. In accepting pupils, the School will need to have regard to the likely maximum number of potential pupils this could create, which should not exceed the DfE cap.</p> <p>There is attrition on school numbers as pupils go up the school. As an example, the current Year 6 group would have started with 40 in Year 1 but is currently 32 with families relocating or moving schools. While the School would find new pupils if a pupil moves away in the lower school years it is difficult to do so as the pupils move up the school and approach 11+.</p>																		
<p>2. <i>The application states the school would like to have 2 reception classes of 20 pupils each, as all other years have two parallel classes. This will enable 14 more children/siblings to stay at the same school for all their primary schooling. They state the school with then have a total of 260 pupils.</i></p>	<p>See response to 1.</p> <p>Of an intake of 40 pupils at younger years the school invariably loses some pupils through the upper years so this is reduced to 35 pupils per year</p> <table border="0"> <thead> <tr> <th>Current</th> <th>Proposed</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Reception 1 group 28</td> <td>2 groups 40</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Yr1 2 groups 40</td> <td>2 groups 40</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Yr2 2 groups 35</td> <td>2 groups 35</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Yr3 2 groups 35</td> <td>2 groups 35</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Yr4 2 groups 35</td> <td>2 groups 35</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Yr5 2 groups 35</td> <td>2 groups 35</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Yr6 2 groups 35</td> <td>2 groups 35</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total = 243</td> <td>255</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Current	Proposed	Reception 1 group 28	2 groups 40	Yr1 2 groups 40	2 groups 40	Yr2 2 groups 35	2 groups 35	Yr3 2 groups 35	2 groups 35	Yr4 2 groups 35	2 groups 35	Yr5 2 groups 35	2 groups 35	Yr6 2 groups 35	2 groups 35	Total = 243	255
Current	Proposed																		
Reception 1 group 28	2 groups 40																		
Yr1 2 groups 40	2 groups 40																		
Yr2 2 groups 35	2 groups 35																		
Yr3 2 groups 35	2 groups 35																		
Yr4 2 groups 35	2 groups 35																		
Yr5 2 groups 35	2 groups 35																		
Yr6 2 groups 35	2 groups 35																		
Total = 243	255																		
<p>3. <i>Going forward, however, there would therefore be 40 children per each year group, so that after only a few years, there could be a total of 280 children in the seven different year groups.</i></p>	<p>This is not correct. See response to 2.</p>																		
<p>4. <i>the classrooms would add another 50 children with the additional noise and pollution that would bring from the traffic</i></p>	<p>This is not correct. Moreover only a proportion of pupils come to school by car. See response to 1. To clarify the maximum pupils at the school will be 260 which would be an additional 15 pupils to the current number of 245.</p>																		
<p>5. <i>As they wish to expand the school to accommodate approx. 70 pupils.....</i></p>	<p>This is not correct. See response to 1. To clarify the maximum pupils at the school will be 260 which</p>																		

	would be an additional 15 pupils to the current number of 245.
6. <i>This school extension will lead to possibly an extra 60 pupils attending the school.</i>	This is not correct. See response to 1. To clarify the maximum pupils at the school will be 260 which would be an additional 15 pupils to the current number of 245.
7. <i>The existing number of pupils have a significant impact on all neighbours as it is, yet this application proposes an addition of around 50 pupils over the following years.</i>	This is not correct. See response to 1. To clarify the maximum pupils at the school will be 260 which would be an additional 15 pupils to the current number of 245.
<b>TRAFFIC &amp; PARKING</b>	
8. <i>The transport Statement is just a wish-list, without positive actions being proposed</i>	<p>There are two documents</p> <p>(1) The Transport Statement sets out the existing situation and proposed situation and indicates the associated transport and highways impacts on implementing the scheme.</p> <p>(2) The School Travel Plan however sets out a range of measures and initiatives that are widely used in schools in order to encourage active and sustainable travel by pupils and caregivers, as well as school staff.</p>
9. <i>Para 2.50 Table 2.7. claims there will be an increase of only 3 extra cars from an additional 14 extra pupils.</i>	<p>Table 6.1 of the Transport Statement (TS) does highlight the pro rata increase in pupils will generate just 5 additional car trips (2 as single pupil occupancy vehicles and 3 as car sharing vehicles – with more than one pupil passengers).</p> <p>At paragraphs 6.8-6.14 the TS sets out the schools' target, alongside provision of a School Travel Plan, which is to not increase the number of vehicles as a result of the proposal, i.e. the school will not exceed the existing 92 car or car share pick-up / drop-off vehicles.</p> <p>Additionally, the removal of the 5 on-site parking spaces for staff, this will result in a reduction in vehicles accessing the site on a daily basis, with staff traveling by alternative modes.</p>
10. <i>The Parking Beat Survey was carried out two days before the start of the Christmas break and not necessarily a typical school day.</i>	There is no reason to assume that the days of the Parking Beat Survey were abnormal. We had 94% attendance on that day which included some self-isolating children but that was a typical day in a COVID context.
11. <i>The number of total parking spaces of 107 which is claimed is totally unrealistic.</i>	We can confirm total amount of spaces, without the uncontrolled private parking originally included, is 82 car parking spaces in the vicinity of the site. Comprising of 76 permit holder spaces, 4 pay by phone spaces and 2 coach parking spaces.
12. <i>The report states that in Zone 1 only 41% of spaces in the morning and 45% of spaces in the afternoon pickup were 'utilised' - this flies in the face of the actual lived experience of all the residents in Zone 1</i>	The TS identifies 50% spare capacity in the AM peak and 45% spare capacity in the PM peak. These are calculated from data collected from CCTV video footage taken on that day.
13. <i>If every parking space, yellow line, pay by phone, residents bay etc. was occupied, Belsize Lane would be untraversable.</i>	The layout of car parking spaces is designed by the Council to provide adequate capacity. Narrow roads do sometimes mean (especially in areas like

	<p>Hampstead) that it is not possible to drive freely and without frequent stops. That is the nature of the area.</p> <p>As indicated in point 9 above, it is the intention to reduce the demand for parking during pick-up and drop-off periods. Additionally, the one-way operation of pupil vehicles assists with the flow of traffic on Belsize Lane.</p>
<p>14. <i>The impact of this on three households with disabled residences especially in Zone 1 is especially severe as they have been restricted by fears of not being able to park anywhere near their homes if they have been out on in their cars.....Parents parking for even 15 minutes in these resident spaces cause great misery.</i></p>	<p>It is quite normal for residents living close to or opposite a well-established school, as per the application site, to alter their travel habits in order to avoid school pick-up and drop-off periods.</p> <p>These occur during a short period of time in the morning and afternoons during weekdays. Avoiding use of motor vehicles at this time will also benefit travel times for residents, as they will also avoid the AM network peak travel period.</p>
<p>15. <i>The Parking Beat survey also did not see any cars parked on the western side of the street in Zone 1. Cars or vans frequently park there, thus severely impeding all vehicular movements at this narrow junction with Wedderburn Road</i></p>	<p>The data was collected from CCTV video footage taken on the survey day, which was a neutral weekday in December. Being a winter month, this is when we would expect driver mode to be at its greatest.</p>
<p>16. <i>I also dispute the accuracy of the findings for a normal school day of the total number of parking bays utilised in Zones 1 and 2.</i></p>	<p>The data was collected from CCTV video footage taken on the survey day, which was a neutral weekday in December. Being a winter month, this is when we would expect driver mode to be at its greatest.</p> <p>There is a propensity for caregiver vehicles to drop off in different locations within the zones identified. The decision will relate to the parking demands at the time of pick-up and drop-off and other factors such as inclement weather, where parents may seek to park closer to the school to reduce walking time in the rain.</p>
<p>17. <i>The Parking Beat survey also missed seeing the impact of the coach bay just below the north vehicular school gate.</i></p>	<p>All data for Zone 2's coach bay (labelled Bus Parking Bay in the survey results) was recorded, with both spaces and parking demands included in the assessment.</p>
<p>18. <i>most of this congestion takes place in front of our house at our crossover, which is directly opposite the school's vehicle entrance,</i></p>	<p>The school's vehicle entrance is not typically used as an entrance for the school but has only been used since the COVID restrictions have been in place. The School hopes to return to the pedestrian entrance only after restrictions on year group bubbles are lifted. Congestion is also arising because the School has to have staggered year group arrivals at 10-minute intervals – early arrivals therefore need to wait until their time slot arises. This will not continue once restrictions are lifted.</p> <p>The School's usual arrangements are for girls to arrive between 8 and 8.30 and the gate is therefore not overwhelmed with waiting parents.</p> <p>The School also usually has a door opening service for parents who have to drive to school so a member of staff opens the car door and admits the child ('meet and greet') – this has been forced to stop because of COVID restrictions and parents now need to park their cars and walk to school.</p>

	<p>This has increased the congestion around the school temporarily.</p> <p>However, the School seeks to re-introduce the 'meet and greet' operation once national guidance permits it. Alongside a range of other School Travel Plan measures to reduce travel by car.</p> <p>If this planning application is successful, the School Travel Plan will form part of planning permission. The School will have an obligation to provide the range of measures and initiatives to achieve the car capped target.</p>
<p>19. <i>There are frequently more than 20 vehicles at any one time along zones 1 and 2 collecting children at the same time</i></p>	<p>Conditions in the Covid period are not normal.</p> <p>Please see 18 above – the congestion has increased because of the COVID measures that the school needs to comply with. The School would hope that this will reduce significantly when possible to return to historic arrangements, and the proposed School Travel Plan measures are in place.</p> <p>A maximum accumulation of 8 drop-off vehicles was recorded during the AM peak in Zones 1 and 2, while up to 10 vehicles were recorded during the PM peak.</p> <p>However, in the event that 20 vehicles were to be present at any one time, this would equate to 41% utilisation of bays and yellow line spaces, thus there would still be a reasonable amount of unoccupied space to allow vehicle passing.</p>
<p>20. <i>In this application, the school has not even given thought to the residents of Belsize Lane who are at the receiving end of this each congestion and overcrowding every school day.....Our crossover and the pavement outside no 15 have thus become a public gathering space for at least a half hour each school morning and an hour or more each school day afternoon.</i></p>	<p>Please see 18 above.</p>
<p>21. <i>The Official Report of the Chief Engineer ....regarding "Proposed Minor Parking Changes on Belsize Lane..." ...published figures that prove the parking utilization percentages in St. Christopher's School application are totally inaccurate.</i></p>	<p>The Report which has been referred to includes the full extent of the east-west section of Belsize Lane (up to Rosslyn Hill), as well as the extent included in the survey for the development site, which is highlighted in the disparity between the number of permit holder bays – 117 resident permit bays referred in the referenced report, while just 25 of those spaces are included in the surveys for the development.</p> <p>Although unable to find the specific report referred to here, resident parking data typically refers to utilisation figures for the overnight period, where residents are most likely to be at home, with cars parked on-street.</p> <p>As with many London boroughs where parking demands are high for both resident parking, visitor parking and loading opportunities, multi-function use of on-street parking opportunities is widely operated in Camden. Therefore, the occupation and number of parking permits issued by Camden, does not reflect the available parking capacity for on-street parking or loading during the day, and</p>

	<p>notably during school pick-up and drop-off times i.e. a number of residents with permits to park on-street will drive to a place work or education during the weekdays, at which time school pick-up and drop-off will occur.</p>
<p>22. <i>Belsize Court Properties in Wedderburn Road has private off road parking for its residents, yet parents seem to think it is acceptable for them to park there as and when they want. It is a current problem for us. The Transport Report appears to include parking on our private roads (both sides of Wedderburn Road) as being available for the school - it talks about "North Access" and "South Access", and calls it "unrestricted kerb".</i></p>	<p>The unrestricted kerb was erroneously included in the survey data. The changes to the results are as follows:</p> <p><b>Original conclusions for Zone 3</b></p> <p>(Para 2.43) Zone 3 considers “50 parking bays and single yellow line spaces. The parking beat survey recorded up to 31 cars parked in this Zone during the AM period, which equates to 62% utilisation (08:45). A maximum of 37 cars were parked in the Zone during the PM period, equating to 74% utilisation (15:45). “</p> <p>(Para 6.22) Zone 3 considers “maximum accumulation of 3 drop-off vehicles and up to 31 cars parked, of 50 available ... 19 unoccupied spaces can accommodate the maximum accumulation recorded, with a further 16 available spaces (spare 32% capacity) ... During the PM period drop-off accumulation was 2 drop-off vehicles and up to 37 cars parked. The 13 unoccupied spaces can accommodate the maximum accumulation recorded, with a further 11 available spaces (spare 22% capacity) “</p> <p><b>Revised conclusions for Zone 3</b></p> <p>Zone 3 considers 25 parking spaces. The parking beat survey recorded up to 14 cars parked in this Zone during the AM period, which equates to 56% utilisation (08:45). This is 6% less than when erroneously considering the uncontrolled spaces. A maximum of 23 cars were parked in the Zone during the PM period, equating to 92% utilisation (15:45). This is 18% more utilisation than when erroneously considering the uncontrolled spaces.</p> <p>Zone 3 considers maximum accumulation of 3 drop-off vehicles and up to 14 cars parked, of 25 available ... 11 unoccupied spaces can accommodate the maximum accumulation recorded, with a further 8 available spaces (spare 32% capacity) ... During the PM period drop-off accumulation was 2 drop-off vehicles and up to 23 cars parked. The available capacity can therefore accommodate the maximum accumulation recorded.</p> <p>Therefore, the parking summary can still be concluded as:</p> <p>“6.24 The drop-off / pick-up activity currently generated by the school on the local road network operates in an acceptable way at present and results in short periods of high parking levels at pick-up and drop-off times, reflecting the nature of the use. The proposal will include measures to reduce the use of cars, including the removal of 5 on-site car parking spaces, as well as management measures to discourage car use which are set out in the School's Travel Plan document. These</p>

	<p>measures will help to reduce parking demands during pick-up and drop-off periods experienced currently."</p> <p>It is pertinent to note that there were no school pick-up or drop-off activities recorded during the survey within the unrestricted kerb area.</p>
<p>23. <i>the additional two classrooms proposed will greatly increase the traffic flow during school drop off and collection times, as well as noise from the pupils, since the back of their building extends on to the back of Belsize Court.</i></p>	<p>Access for the school will remain via Belsize Lane only, as per the existing situation. Please refer to response to Question 9, regarding the number of vehicles generated by the proposal.</p>
<p>24. <i>the additional traffic will lead to more parents infringing on the private property of Belsize Court, parking while they wait to drop and collect their children</i></p>	<p>Please refer to answer to point 18. Parents have been asked to respect the boundaries of neighbouring properties.</p>
<p>25. <i>we would like to point out that some of the information forming part of this application is incorrect, the biggest problem being that the private parking of Belsize Court (on private land) has been included in the consideration for transport and parking.</i></p>	<p>This was erroneously included in the Zone 3 calculations, however, as highlighted in answer to Question 22, removal of these spaces does not impact the conclusions of the survey data. It is pertinent to note that there were no school pick-up or drop-off activities recorded during the survey within the unrestricted kerb area.</p>
<p>26. <i>The much reduced service area is likely to lead to more delivery vans, tradespeople and visitors needing to park in the road.</i></p>	<p>The proposed retained servicing area has been designed to allow all existing servicing activities to occur within the school. The school has confirmed that there will be adequate space for deliveries.</p> <p>Furthermore, during term, delivery vans and tradespeople and visitors do not park in the service area because we do not allow vehicle movements onsite when children are present. All contractors park outside currently and are only granted access if absolutely necessary. The School will retain one space for emergency access of tradespeople.</p> <p>Out of term the School does have more tradespeople who service the site and the plan is to allow access to the space as usual.</p> <p>Therefore the servicing activity associated with the school will operate as per the existing situation.</p>
<p>27. <i>The school has suggested that they will encourage children to scooter to school to reduce parents' car use. Having even more young children scootering along the pavements in his area will be hazardous for pedestrians, especial the elderly or disabled.</i></p>	<p>Scoters have been used for the school run for many years now and are acknowledged to contribute as a travel mode – albeit over short distances. The School already has a number of scooters that come to school and active travel to school is encouraged as part of Camden's Travel Plan.</p> <p>There will be some scooter training initiatives to ensure that children understand how to safely scoot to school.</p>
<p>28. <i>I believe they want to use the private parking on the Court. As it is, parking spaces are limited and we are troubled by delivery lorries racing through.</i></p>	<p>It was not the intention to divert school drop-off and pick-up activity to Belsize Court, the data was erroneously included in the results. The revised conclusions are set out in answer to Question 22.</p> <p>It is pertinent to note that there were no School pick-up or drop-off activities recorded during the survey within the unrestricted kerb area.</p>



<p>29. <i>Spaces for another 60 cars would be problematic to say the least.</i></p>	<p>As per response to point 18, the proposed 14 additional pupils will not generate the equivalent number of cars, as the School's catchment includes a significant number of residential properties that are within walking, cycling and scooting distance, as well as those which are within reasonable travel distances by public transport.</p>
<p>30. <i>I wonder if the school has considered what is called 'a walking bus', children being dropped off some distance away and escorted to the school.</i></p>	<p>The School has considered walking buses and, once COVID restrictions have lifted and cross-year group travel is allowed, hopes to encourage the parent body to put these in place for transport between the local boys schools. This will be employed through the School Travel Plan measures.</p>
<p>31. <i>Those who don't live here ignore the one-way system adding considerable danger to our children (as well as residents) who live in Belsize Court.</i></p>	<p>The one-way system is a self-enforced system that the school employs, there is unfortunately no regulations in place that require other road users to navigate local roads in this way.</p> <p>However, traffic flows in the reverse direction to that which is self-enforced will result in a reduction in traffic speeds in order to allow for vehicle passing, thus reducing collision risk.</p>
<p>32. <i>There's a dishonest and incorrect claim in the planning permission that St Christopher's submitted: that our private Belsize Forecourts can be used as parking options for school drop-offs. As you will no doubt get confirmation in an objection from our Block Directors - this is a cynical and false assertion.</i></p>	<p>Please see answer to point 22.</p>
<p>33. <i>The application also appears to suggest that the parking at Belsize Court is available for school drop offs, which is clearly incorrect.</i></p>	<p>Please see answer to point 22.</p>
<p>34. <i>The school has suggested that they will encourage children to scooter to school to reduce parents' car use. I was amazed at this idea, because my wife has already had the experience of being knocked down by a novice child rider on a bicycle,</i></p>	<p>Scooters have been used for the school run for many years now and are acknowledged to contribute as a travel mode – albeit over short distances. The School already has a number of scooters that come to school and active travel to school is encouraged as part of Camden's Travel Plan.</p> <p>There will be some scooter training initiatives to ensure that children understand how to safely scoot to school.</p>
<p>35. <i>Fifteen of the parking spaces indicated on the survey map (Appendix E) are on private property (Belsize Court) and only residents are allowed to park there.</i></p>	<p>Please see answer to point 22.</p>
<p>36. <i>I find it deliberately misleading to have done a parking survey only once at a quiet period of the year.</i></p>	<p>December, being a winter month, is typically when school parents and caregivers are more likely to travel to and from school by car, due to colder temperatures, shorter daylight hours and higher likelihood of rain or other inclement weather.</p> <p>Coupled with COVID restrictions discouraging use of public transport, it is anticipated that the survey results are a 'worse case' scenario for the school.</p>
<p>37. <i>The directors of Belsize Court would like to point out that some of the information forming part of this application is incorrect, the biggest error being that the private parking of Belsize Court (on private land) has</i></p>	<p>Please refer to response to point 22.</p>

<i>been included in the consideration for transport and parking.</i>	
38. <i>Fifteen of the parking spaces indicated on the survey map (Appendix E) are on private property (Belsize Court) and only residents are allowed to park there.</i>	Please refer to response to point 22.
<b>NOISE</b>	
39. <i>Clearly this application has several adverse impacts on residential amenity ..... the new proposed northern playground with its associated noise levels.</i>	<p>The school has been located on the site for some 140 years with children playing outside. Most houses in the area post-date it by up to half a century. Children already play in the area at the front of the school at break and lunchtime. The School does not believe the overall noise levels will change significantly as a result of 15 additional children.</p> <p>It should be noted as well that the newly defined play space is taking the place of an existing car park area, which will contribute to lowering car use.</p> <p>This playground area is also enclosed by buildings and the existing tall boundary masonry wall, with a new fencing on the north side, which will assist in containing sound.</p>
40. <i>The DESIGN &amp; ACCESS STATEMENT states under Amenity: There will be no increase in noise levels to neighbouring properties as a result of the proposals. This is clearly not the case. The new proposed north playground, specifically for the youngest children, is to be directly opposite our main bed and living rooms at 17 Belsize Lane.</i>	Please refer to response to point 39.
41. <i>The school backs onto our communal gardens and there is already considerable noise from the children before school / during break times.</i>	<p>It is considered that the overall noise levels will not change significantly as a result of 15 additional children or the proposed development.</p> <p>The proposed new extension on the south side of the existing classrooms will effectively move the play area further away from the north boundary with Belsize Court compared to existing.</p>
42. <i>the additional two classrooms proposed will greatly increase the traffic flow during school drop off and collection times, as well as noise from the pupils, since the back of their building extends on to the back of Belsize Court.</i>	Please refer to points 18, 29 and 41.
43. <i>it has also suggested that a playground is intended next to established next to the new classrooms. The noise would impact even more on adjacent flats.</i>	Please refer to response to points 39 and 41.
44. <i>Living immediately beside it, I believe the level of noise and the increase in traffic will be significantly detrimental to my ability to enjoy my life in my apartment. We already have problems with parents parking illegally on our private property to drop off and pick up their children.</i>	<p>Please refer to points 22 et seq.</p> <p>Please do provide photographic evidence of parents / caregivers parking vehicles within your property. Vehicles must be shown on your driveway / private property (and not on the public highway in front of it) with the license plate included in the image. The School will endeavor to follow up on any such issues directly with parents / caregivers.</p>



<p>45. <i>The proposed additional students will create more noise.....when they travel to and from school and also at playtimes.</i></p>	<p>Please refer to point 22 et seq.</p> <p>It is not considered that the overall noise levels will change significantly as a result of 15 additional children, especially as the external play area is 'contained' by buildings and walls.</p>
<p>46. <i>The proposed new playground is to the north of the school building which directly adjoins our communal garden in Belsize Court. We already get noise from the school during break times but it is currently muted by the effect of the school building. Now it will be directly in front of the increased classroom spaces abutting our boundary.</i></p>	<p>Please refer to points 39, 41 and 42.</p> <p>The school buildings which abut the communal gardens of Belsize Court will not move as part of the proposal, alterations are proposed to extend the row of buildings along this boundary.</p> <p>The proposed play area will be on the south of the building extension, and thus will not directly abut the communal garden. In fact this extension will serve to move the edge of the play area further south away from Belsize Court.</p>
<p>47. <i>Noise disturbance. The plan appears to be to effectively more than double the number of reception age children attending the school. This is likely to significantly increase the amount of screaming and shrieking (probably coming particularly from the youngest children) which can already be very disturbing at times.</i></p>	<p>Please refer to response to points 39, 41 and 42.</p> <p>the School does not find that the youngest children scream and shriek regularly and try to ensure that their playtimes are engaging and well supervised.</p>
<p>48. <i>the new playground (which again will be for the youngest children) will be nearer to Belsize Court than the current playground,</i></p>	<p>Please refer to response to points 39, 41 and 42.</p> <p>The proposed new play area is already in use and is not closer to Belsize Court compared to other existing play areas.</p>
<p>49. <i>....I also feel that an additional 70 children will create an unwelcome noise level for residents directly next to the school...</i></p>	<p>Please refer to points 39, 41 and 42.</p> <p>With reference to the pupil numbers quoted, the figure of 70 is incorrect - please refer to response to point 2</p>
<p>50. <i>It appears that the new playground (which again will be for the youngest children) will be nearer to Belsize Court than the current playground, and much closer to the wall that divides the school from the much-cherished garden at Belsize Court.</i></p>	<p>Please refer to response to point 46</p>
<p>51. <i>It would be great to see Healthy School Street initiative applied in this area to ease the traffic and decrease the pollution and noise.</i></p>	<p>The School is very supportive of the Healthy School Street initiative and has already confirmed this with the local travel officer.</p> <p>Please refer to additional text statement at back of this schedule.</p>
<p>52. <i>Noise disturbance. Adding another Reception class will more than double the number of reception age children attending the school. This is likely to significantly increase the amount of screaming and shrieking</i></p>	<p>Please refer to response to points 39, 41 and 42.</p> <p>With reference to the pupil numbers quoted - please refer to response to point 2</p>
<p><b>LIGHT POLLUTION AT NIGHT</b></p>	
<p>53. <i>We are also affected with light pollution at night.</i></p>	<p>The new extension are on the south side of the existing teaching classrooms; they have northlight rooflights, however these are no higher than the existing classroom lanterns.</p>

<p>54. <i>The school currently leaves lights on inside, and many floodlights outside on all the existing buildings every night of the year, including several on the single storey classrooms in this application.</i></p>	<p>This is not correct. The school has external lighting around the site to ensure safety of staff when they move onsite. The night caretaker turns off all classroom lights daily. the School only has floodlights on the court and these are turned off by 6pm at the latest. Staff are not allowed onsite after 7pm except in emergencies so it is only the minimal lighting that will be there after these hours.</p>
<p>55. <i>Should these classrooms' depth be further extended, the light pollution at night we be almost directly opposite our main bedroom. This is far too much light even for security reasons, and highly wasteful of energy.</i></p>	<p>Please refer to points 53 and 54.</p>
<p>56. <i>The light pollution from the school, all through the night, is in direct contradiction to their professed aims of being ecologically sensitive.</i></p>	<p>Please refer to points 53 and 54.</p>
<p><b>ENVIRONMENTAL HARM</b></p>	
<p>57. <i>The proposed additional students will create more ..... pollution ..... when they travel to and from school and also at playtimes.</i></p>	<p>There will only be an additional 15 pupils on site. The children do not create pollution during their playtimes. We expect that the School's parents will support the travel initiatives through provision of a School Travel Plan and choose greener travel solutions.</p>
<p>58. <i>I suffer from asthma and in recent years my condition has worsened partly attributed to the air quality in London. School Runs have transformed our roads into essentially a highway during peak drop-off times. I am very concerned about our poor air quality when 60+ additional pupils will be absorbed into local rush hour;</i></p>	<p>Please refer to point 57.</p> <p>Additionally, the school is committed to achieve the proposed car capping, whereby there will be no more vehicles accessing the site as a result of the proposed development, when compared to now. A range of measures and initiatives though employment of the School Travel Plan will help the school to achieve this target.</p> <p>Please note also the additional text at the back on the Healthy School Streets Initiative.</p>
<p>59. <i>Air and Noise pollution: expanding the existing school classrooms and adding extra pupils to the already very high total number of pupils at St, Christopher's, will significantly increase the air pollution in an already polluted area</i></p>	<p>There will only be an additional 15 pupils which will not significantly increase the air pollution.</p>
<p><b>AMENITY/PRIVACY</b></p>	
<p>60. <i>the classrooms would infringe on the privacy of a garden used by the residents of Belsize Court, i.e. the residents of 43 flats.</i></p>	<p>The proposed classroom extensions will not change the relationship between buildings and the garden of Belsize Court which exists at present.</p> <p>The new extension is single storey, addresses the School's own amenity space with boundary walls 'containing' views, and does not overlook or compromise the privacy of adjacent neighbouring properties. There are no new windows looking towards Belsize Court.</p>
<p>61. <i>I am concerned about the new classrooms looking directly across our gardens to our bedroom and lounge windows. We will have no privacy.</i></p>	<p>Please refer to points 46 and 60.</p>

<p>62. <i>In addition parents and children picnic/play on the private lawns of Belsize Court (we are an open-plan estate) in the summer months causing much irritation to the residents of the block fronting Belsize Lane.</i></p>	<p>The School has a policy to keep parents aware of the need for neighbourliness when collecting or delivering pupils.</p> <p>The school has reminded parents on several occasions not to do this and has spoken to parents regarding the issue on an ongoing basis.</p>
<p>63. <i>the building would overlook the communal garden [Belsize Court]</i></p>	<p>This is not correct and is a misunderstanding of the proposed plans.</p> <p>Please refer to points 46 and 60.</p>
<p>64. <i>The extra pupil numbers will mean more playground noise and increase in numbers loitering/playing on the private estate grounds either side of school opening and closing times</i></p>	<p>The School frequently reminds parents not to do this and has spoken to parents regarding the issue on an ongoing basis.</p> <p>The small number of additional pupils will not increase playground noise.</p> <p>Please refer to points 39, 41 and 42.</p>
<p>65. <i>As I understand it they also wish to build a block which would overlook the private garden, thus compromising the privacy of the residents of Belsize Court.</i></p>	<p>Please refer to points 46, 60 and 61.</p>
<p>66. <i>Those of us who live in Belsize Court object to some of the parents and children after school using our front lawns for picnics as if it was a public park and this will increase.</i></p>	<p>The School has reminded parents on several occasions not to do this and has spoken to parents regarding the issue on an ongoing basis.</p>
<p>67. <i>The increased height of the buildings will overlook the Belsize Court communal garden, as well as some of the flats, which directly impacts the privacy of the people living here.</i></p>	<p>This is not the case. Please refer to points 46, 60 and 61.</p>
<p>68. <i>The additions contemplated would without doubt have a damaging impact on the enjoyment of rights by the occupants of flats in Belsize Court. They would infringe the privacy of the garden used by the residents</i></p>	<p>This is not the case. Please refer to points 46, 60 and 61.</p>
<p>69. <i>If it is the case that the new classrooms overlook Belsize Court garden this is totally undesirable, taking away from the privacy of residents here</i></p>	<p>This is not the case. Please refer to points 46, 60 and 61.</p>
<p><b>PLANNING/CONSULTATION</b></p>	
<p>70. <i>The directors of Belsize Court are surprised that this application was not brought to our attention or any of the residents of Belsize Court, despite that fact that Belsize Court will be mostly affected by this as we have the only direct boundary to the suggested building works</i></p>	<p>Normally neighbour and party wall issues are dealt with once planning permission has been granted, as they will be in this case. It is worth also mentioning the obvious point that in the Covid pandemic, public meetings have been impossible, and it would not have been appropriate to conduct a meeting of this sort on-line.</p>
<p><b>BUILDING DESIGN</b></p>	
<p>71. <i>when the first application was made to build two new classrooms, the understanding was that they that would both be lined below the wall separating the school from Belsize Court. Instead these were doubled to reach well above the line indicated.</i></p>	<p>This is not the case. Please refer to points 46, 60 and 61.</p>

<p>72. <i>I understand that the plans include an extra storey on the classrooms built against our wall a few years ago. This will obviously cut off our light and there will be extra noise and light pollution.</i></p>	<p>This is not the case. Please refer to points 46, 60 and 61.</p>
<p>73. <i>Looking at the plans it seems the proposed roof lights will be higher than the boundary wall between St Christophers and Belsize Court. If that is the case, the roof lights will be visible from the gardens of Belsize Court. I would suggest the roof lights should be lower than the boundary wall</i></p>	<p>The proposed northlights are no higher than the existing classroom lanterns, which are as existing higher than the wall.</p> <p>There are proposed to be photo-voltaic panels on top of the roof of the existing lanterns – also higher than the boundary wall – these are part of a sustainability proposal for a low energy building. These are therefore higher than the existing roof lanterns.</p>
<p>74. <i>The proposed buildings will in height extend way beyond the existing ones and be visible from our garden, right at the edge with St Christophers school. The visual effect on our garden, if this goes ahead, will drastically change as we would be looking onto a building at the edge of our garden, whereas we cannot see the existing lower buildings at present.</i></p>	<p>This is a misunderstanding.. Please refer to points 46, 60, 61 and 73.</p>

### Additional commentary on School Healthy Streets Initiative

Camden Council have developed the Healthy School Streets initiative. The aim of the initiative is to provide children with the opportunity to travel to and from school in a safer environment by restricting vehicles during school opening and closing times. The Council will carry out a public consultation for the implementation of all ETO's, this will consider the extent of the ETO, times in which motor vehicles will be restricted and another other specific details for the proposed Healthy School Street. Once approved, the ETO would then be implemented for a trial period of 12-18 months. Following this full public consultation will be held after the experimental scheme has run for 12 months. This consultation would then, together with relevant information from other sources (e.g. monitoring and residents' feedback), inform the Council's decision as to whether, at the end of the 18 month experimental period, the ETO is removed or of the changes should be made permanent.

The Healthy School Streets are operated through the provision of signage and ANPR cameras. Signage at the extents of the Healthy School Street zone identify the times when motor vehicles are not permitted, while ANPR cameras ensure that any / all motor vehicles, that are not registered as resident vehicles, are suitably penalised for entering the Healthy School Street zone during the restricted times.

Camden have a range of existing ETO's in operation, and have also resolved to grant permanent implementation for a range of Healthy School Streets, including: Burghley Road for Acland Burghley School, Savernake Road for Gospel Oak Primary School, Macklin Street for St Joseph's School and Lady Somerset Road for Eleanor Palmer School.

Camden Council have confirmed that they are seeking to progress with consultation for implementation of the Healthy School Street initiatives on the road(s) providing access to St Christopher's School later this year (during **September / October 2021**) in order to support the implementation of an ETO in **January 2022** for the initial temporary period of 18 months. Accordingly, if Camden's Healthy School Street proposals are accepted, school pick-up and drop-off for St Christopher's School may be removed from Belsize Lane all together, this may be for a period of 18 months or indefinitely, if data collection and feedback is supportive during the 12 month consultation stage.

In the event that the Healthy School Street initiative is successful for St Christopher's School, this would greatly improve existing road traffic conditions in front of the school at pick-up and drop-off times. The measures will encourage more parents and caregivers to walk, cycle or scoot to school as they will be required to walk the final part of the journey.