

Item No.	Classification:	Date:	Meeting Name:
7.2	Open	11 December 2012	Planning Sub-Committee B
Report title:	Development Management planning application: Application 12/AP/1547 for: Full Planning Permission Address: CHARLES DICKENS PRIMARY SCHOOL, LANT STREET, LONDON, SE1 1QP Proposal: Extension of playground for school to the north of Lant Street and refurbishment of existing playground: comprising hard and soft landscaping with new tree and shrub planting, and timber installations; with new servicing area accessible by vehicles at the eastern end of the site; re-siting of fences within the site; with new gates erected within the site to allow emergency vehicle access.		
Ward(s) or groups affected:	Cathedrals		
From:	Head of Development Management		
Application Start Date 22 May 2012		Application Expiry Date 17 July 2012	

RECOMMENDATION

- 1 Grant planning permission subject to conditions.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Site location and description

- 2 The site is located to the north of the Charles Dickens Primary School and comprises of a strip of brownfield land and a tarmac area. The site incorporates a section of Lant Street which was closed as part of the extension of the playground accommodation for the school and this has been secured by the implementation of security fencing to the boundaries. A 'stopping up order' for Lant Street has previously been approved as part of the works to extend the playground for the school, which was approved in 2004 and has been implemented (as set out in planning history section of this report). There are existing vehicle access gates on both sides of the site.
- 3 Surrounding the site are predominantly residential dwellings in the form of both houses and flats, in the wider area there are also commercial uses. The area is not situated within a conservation area nor are there any adjacent listed buildings. The application site falls within the Central Activities Zone, Air Quality Management Area, Archaeological Priority Zone, Bankside and Borough Town Centre and Opportunity Area.

Details of proposal

- 4 The application is for the provision of additional outside play facilities for the school

which comprise of the brownfield site and tarmac area being divided into three areas.

- 5 The first area provides a garden space with play decks, that can be used for seating, performances and informal play area. Moveable powder coated steel planters will also be used to provide a green playable courtyard space. Each deck measures 1.2 metres by 2.4 metres with a variable height from .2 metres to .6 metres. The Planters will measure 1.2 metres by .6 metres with a height of .6 metres with a watering system and provision of drought tolerant planting. A play area covered in 'Kushionfall' is provided, a recycled shredded wood product, with the outer area having an open grade tarmac surface
- 6 The second area extends the existing tarmac area to create a small sports area for football and netball. The school, according to their planning agent, has a severe lack of large open flat space for sports activities, a situation which they state this scheme would help to remedy. The area will be marked out for the sports and will have a moveable netball post and football goal. The third area is to be used to improve service access for deliveries so that they can park off-street. There is an existing vehicle gate to this area.
- 7 In respect to the enclosure of the areas, the garden space will be separated from the sports area by a 0.9 metre high timber fence, partly created from relocating the existing fence around the year 1 outdoor space. New 3.7 metre wide gates instead of the existing solid barrier are proposed to allow access to the playground for the rest of the school during play time and also to provide fire engine access to the School House. Other equipment comprises of playhouses which can be accessed by year one children with the higher deck and access of 1.2 metres high, only being accessed by older children during playtime. Seating and low rise decking is provided across the site, along with planting areas.
- 8 The existing cherry trees will be provided with tree seats around them in timber to match the style of the existing boundary treatment around the year one outdoor space.
- 9 The existing eco garden will have its fence removed to connect it with the rest of the playground. Low rise planters of oak sleepers will be provided around the edge of the garden, consisting of fruit trees underplanted with strawberries. A long bed with a pictorial meadow mix sown in it, is also provided. The existing 2.1 high weld mesh fence around the eco garden is to be relocated to form the boundary of the service area. This is screened by shrub planting which will provide part of the rain water attenuation/infiltration system .
- 10 This proposal does not involve the closure of Lant Street nor call into question the ability to re-visit this matter, as closure was previously approved in 2004 (04-CO-0151) and has already been implemented.
- 11 Discussions have taken place with the applicants about the potential to provide a footpath within the proposal. It was identified that possibly a footpath could be provided on the north boundary of the site. The applicants produced a statement to emphasise that they had considered carefully the provision of a footpath but could not consider it as a feasible option for the following reasons:-
 - The footpath would have a serious and adverse impact on teaching, learning, safeguarding and sports provision at the school, if a potentially dangerous and insecure alleyway were to be created along the northern edge of the Lant Street site.
 - An urgent need for increased play and learning space for the children has been stated by Ofsted several times.
 - Nearly all the children live in flats, have no garden or access to a productive garden, orchard or greenhouse.

- Current space is a safe and relaxing refuge for their children, parents encouraged to spend time with their children in the garden after school.
- In order to fit in all the elements approved in the 2006 change of use the school needs a secure boundary to be able to use all the outside space.
- Proposal would increase amount of space per child from 3 to 6 sqm which is an improvement on existing but is still less than the 12 sq m which is the normally guideline requirement for inner city schools.
- This amount would fall further if a footpath were provided.
- A footpath would need to be 2.5 metres wide for pushchairs to pass, and as such take up more than 16% of the available site.
- When the development is complete the site will be open plan to allow varied opportunities including team sports, multi use games area which requires the whole of the north area.
- Benefits of the open space include developing the children's gross motor skills, balance equipment, adequate space to run safely and use scooters and bikes etc.
- Concerns that teachers time will be taken up by supervising an external boundary with a public alleyway rather than focus on teaching.
- Need for children to be independent and responsibility to play unsupervised.
- Current inability to offer the best provision in all areas given the limited availability to conduct PE lessons. Mint Street Park provision poor.
- Emphasise improving sporting opportunities and creating an Olympic legacy
- Trying to complete the site for 2 years feels that it benefits everybody to see a purposeful and fully used site as soon as possible.
- That there would be a limited benefit to the local community of a pedestrian alleyway, with only minimally reduced walking times and no loss of amenity, but with very real adverse impact to security for both the school and the wider community.

Planning history of the Site and the adjoining school

- 12 02-CO-2124 – Planning permission granted for the installation of photovoltaic (solar) panels and ancillary equipment on school roof.
- 13 04-CO-0015 – Planning permission refused for closure of part of Lant Street and use of the former highway land and adjoining land on north side of Lant Street as a playground, multi use game area and garden for the school together with the erection of boundary fencing.
Reason for Refusal:
The proposed playground extension would be reason of its need to permanently close Lant Street preventing through traffic from accessing Southward Bridge Road or Borough High Street via Lant Street fail to give priority to improve safety conditions for essential traffic contrary to Southwark's Unitary Development Plan [July 1995].
- 14 04-CO-0151 – Planning permission granted for change of use of part of Lant Street to provide a nursery playground, a multi use games area and garden for primary school. (Traffic Assessment submitted with application detailing that there would be no material impact upon the traffic movements on the local highway and of those pedestrian trips that would be diverted, the walking distances would increase only slightly. The council as Highway Authority, and Transport for London, had no objections to the proposal.)
- 15 07-AP-2740 – Planning permission granted for removal of existing external entrance stair and refurbishment of the existing building and new build extension to create a new accessible welcome and reception area, a new teaching space with roof deck and

an external teaching terrace. Changes to pedestrian and vehicular access.

- 16 08-CO-0021 – Planning permission granted for construction of a new single storey “eco canopy” shelter, perimeter fencing and creation of garden on western part of site.
- 17 09-AP-0172 – Approval of Details – Detailed drawings of landscaping scheme as required by condition 2 of planning permission dated 21-05-2008 LBS Reg. 08-CO-0021 for construction of a new single storey “eco canopy” shelter, perimeter fencing and creation of garden on western part of site. (Subsequently withdrawn)
- 18 09-AP-0171 – Approval of Details – Detail of the Eco Canopy shelter and associated garden as required by condition 3 of planning permission dated 21-05-2008 LBS Reg. 08-CO-0021 for construction of a new single storey “eco canopy” shelter, perimeter fencing and creation of garden on western part of site. (Subsequently withdrawn)

Planning history of adjoining sites

- 19 23 Lant Street
02-AP-1231 - Planning permission dated 29.10. 2002 for the erection of a six storey residential development to form 6, 2 bedroom units.
- 20 Land bounded by Lant Street, Sanctuary Street, Weller Street and Peabody Estate
00-AP-1820 - Planning permission dated 8.1.2003 fro the erection of 3, five storey blocks comprising of 55, one bedroom, 36, two bedroom and 3, three bedroom units.

KEY ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION

Summary of main issues

- 21 The main issues to be considered in respect of this application are:
 - a] the principle of the development in terms of land use and conformity with strategic policies.
 - b] the design of the proposal;
 - c] the impact upon the amenity of adjoining occupiers;

Planning policy

- 22 Local Development Framework 2011

Central Activities Zone
Air Quality Management Area
Archaeological Priority Zone
Bankside and Borough Town Centre and Opportunity Area

Core Strategy 2011

- 23 Strategic Policy 1 - Sustainable development
Strategic Policy 2 - Strategic transport
Strategic Policy 12 - Design and conservation
Strategic Policy 13 - High environmental standards

Southwark Plan 2007 (July) - saved policies

- 24 Policy 3.2 Protection of amenity
Policy 3.12 Quality in design
Policy 3.13 Urban design

London Plan 2011

- 25 Policy 3.6 Children and young people's play and informal recreation facilities
Policy 7.5 Public Realm

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

- 26 The NPPF is a material planning consideration. The sections relevant to the consideration of this application are
7. Requiring good design.
 8. Promoting healthy communities

Principle of development

- 27 In principle there is no objection to the development which seeks to improve the play facilities provided at the school, by fitting out the playground area in line with the previous approval for the change of use. The scheme would accord with development plan and National Planning Policy Framework policies and guidance in relation to healthy communities and in relation to enhancement to educational facilities and children's play. This proposal does not include the road closure; this has already been approved and implemented.

Environmental impact assessment

- 28 Not required due to the small scale of the development.

Impact of proposed development on amenity of adjoining occupiers and surrounding area

- 29 It is not considered that the use of the playground during normal school hours will affect the amenity of adjoining occupiers. The proposal does not include lighting and therefore could not reasonably be used outside daylight hours. A condition has been requested by the Environmental Protection Team to the effect that the play area is only used during school hours and/or during daylight hours. The older children will also only have access to it during playtimes. The tallest deck area is 1.2 metres and it is not considered that this will result in overlooking to adjoining occupiers or loss of sunlight or daylight.

Impact of adjoining and nearby uses on occupiers and users of proposed development

- 30 While the area is predominantly residential, the users of the proposed scheme will not be affected by adjoining users or occupiers.

Traffic issues

- 31 Existing gates are to remain but a new internal double gate is proposed for access to the play area by the older children and to provide an access point for a fire engine. An

area with an existing vehicle gate is to be formalised as a parking area for service vehicles and it is considered that as it is at the end of the 'no through road' it will not give rise to any harm in relation to traffic impacts. The scheme is also considered to be beneficial in relation to provision for servicing vehicles to be parked off the public highway.

Design issues

- 32 It is considered that the appearance of the proposed landscaping being constructed mainly of timber but with some metal planters, would enhance the appearance of the area, as would the provision of planting.

Impact on trees

- 33 The existing cherry trees are to be retained and seating supplied around them which would not result in harm to the trees. New small ornamental trees and fruit trees are proposed.

Planning obligations (S.106 undertaking or agreement) and CILL Liability

- 34 None required due to the scale of the development.

Sustainable development implications

- 35 The proposal has taken into account this issue by the use of sustainable materials and by providing a rain water attenuation/infiltration system.

Other matters

Archaeology

- 36 The application will have no impact upon significant archaeological remains.

Concerns raised about lack of consultation

- 37 Residents in Bittern House, Bittern Street have objected to lack of consultation. In the case of minor applications, such as the application proposal, adjoining properties are consulted. As this proposal may give rise to additional noise from the playground properties adjoining and across the road from the application site were notified. Bittern Court is over 100 metres away from the application site. Site notices were displayed at both ends of the site. There has been a representation received that letters were not sent to all the addresses on the consultation list, 284 letters in total. The council's records indicate that the letters were despatched, and there have been no objections received from those residents on the consultation list that they had not received a letter.

Road Closure

- 38 The road closure in Lant Street has previously been approved and implemented and does not form part of this application.

Conclusion on planning issues

- 39 The proposal will provide much needed outdoor play area for the children and in planning terms will not impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties, will provide a new 'greener environment' and improve the appearance of the area. The proposal will also have the benefit of allowing the school to be serviced from an off road space

rather than the public highway. Therefore planning permission is recommended, subject to conditions.

Community impact statement

- 40 In line with the Council's Community Impact Statement the impact of this application has been assessed as part of the application process with regard to local people in respect of their age, disability, faith/religion, gender, race and ethnicity and sexual orientation. Consultation with the community has been undertaken as part of the application process.
- 41 The proposal provides additional play space for the Charles Dickens School which is currently below the normal guideline of 12 square metres per child, but the proposal will only increase this by 3 to 6 sqm and therefore even with the use of the whole area available the outdoor space is still below the normal guidelines for outdoor space. The provision of the suggested footpath for residents would not only reduce the 6 metres area available per child but would also impact on the existing productive orchard, garden and greenhouse. Furthermore it would reduce the site area by 16% and the school and local residents have sited the problems with providing a narrow isolated pathway that snakes around the back of buildings as not being attractive to use by pedestrians with little surveillance the path would be little used.
- 42 However, residents in Lant House, Redman House, Trundle House and Bittern Street consider that there should be a footpath around the school playground so residents can once again walk from one end of Lant Street to the other. However, a Traffic Assessment submitted with the 2004 application for the closure of Lant Street and the provision of additional play space for the school stated that there would have no material impact upon the traffic movements on the local highway and of those pedestrian trips that would be diverted, the walking distances would increase only slightly. The council as Highway Authority, and Transport for London, had no objections to the proposed closure of Lant Street. Members' of the Borough and Bankside Community Council Planning meeting at that time considered that while the proposal would disadvantage some elements of the community that on balance the school needed the additional land to provide better outdoor playspace for the children. While officers have investigated with the school the possibility of the provision of a footpath around the north side of the school to improve access for the mobility impaired, it is considered that the footpath may be little used, particularly in the evening, without any natural surveillance while depriving children of an increased playspace in an area of mainly flatted properties with little private playspace. Therefore, on balance the proposal is considered to be acceptable as submitted.
- 43
- 44 Conditions are recommended to safeguard local residents from additional noise and disturbance that may be caused by the provision of the additional equipment in the playground by restricting the hours of use in the evening and at weekends.

Consultations

- 45 Details of consultation and any re-consultation undertaken in respect of this application are set out in Appendix 1.

Consultation replies

- 46 Details of consultation responses received are set out in Appendix 2.

Summary of consultation responses

- 47 Objections have been raised by residents of Bittern House, Bittern Street and one resident of Redman House Lant Street on the following grounds
- 48 Proposal will result in the access along Lant Street not being re-instated, resulting in the elderly, people with mobility issues, children and their parents having to use busy main roads which in wintry conditions can be dangerous. An elderly resident not being easily able to visit friends in Lant Street after it was abruptly closed without consultation. Lack of consultation on this application and letters not being sent.

Human rights implications

- 49 This planning application engages certain human rights under the Human Rights Act 2008 (the HRA). The HRA prohibits unlawful interference by public bodies with conventions rights. The term 'engage' simply means that human rights may be affected or relevant.
- 50 This application has the legitimate aim of providing an outdoor play area for a school. The rights potentially engaged by this application, including the right to a fair trial and the right to respect for private and family life are not considered to be unlawfully interfered with by this proposal.

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

Background Papers	Held At	Contact
Site history file: TP/1460-B Application file: 12/AP/1547 Southward Local Development Framework and Development Plan Documents	Chief Executive's Department 160 Tooley Street London SE1 2QH	Planning enquiries telephone: 020 7525 5403 Planning enquiries email: planning.enquiries@southwark.gov.uk Case officer telephone: 020 7525 5453 Council website: www.southwark.gov.uk

APPENDICES

No.	Title
Appendix 1	Consultation undertaken
Appendix 2	Consultation responses received
Appendix 3	Recommendation

AUDIT TRAIL

Lead Officer	Gary Rice, Head of Development Management	
Report Author	Michèle Sterry, Team Leader (Planning)	
Version	Final	
Dated	22 November 2012	
Key Decision	No	
CONSULTATION WITH OTHER OFFICERS / DIRECTORATES / CABINET MEMBER		
Officer Title	Comments Sought	Comments included
Strategic Director, Finance and Corporate Services	No	No
Strategic Director, Environment and Leisure	No	No
Strategic Director, Housing and Community Services	No	No
Director of Regeneration	No	No
Date final report sent to Constitutional Team	29 November 2012	

Consultation undertaken

Site notice date: 6 June 2012

Press notice date: N/A

Case officer site visit date: 6 June 2012

Neighbour consultation letters sent: 1 June 2012

Internal services consulted:

Transport Team
Archaeology
Arboriculturalist
Environmental Protection Team
Childrens Services

Statutory and non-statutory organisations consulted:

Metropolitan Police

Neighbours and local groups consulted:

FLATS 1-10 56A LANT STREET LONDON SE1 1RD
FLATS 1-33 56 LANT STREET LONDON SE1 1RE
UNIT 2A SIGNAL HOUSE 137A GREAT SUFFOLK STREET LONDON SE1 1PZ
UNIT 1A SIGNAL HOUSE 137A GREAT SUFFOLK STREET LONDON SE1 1PZ
FIRST FLOOR 133-135 GREAT SUFFOLK STREET LONDON SE1 1PP
UNIT 5A SIGNAL HOUSE 137A GREAT SUFFOLK STREET LONDON SE1 1PZ
UNIT 1B SIGNAL HOUSE 137A GREAT SUFFOLK STREET LONDON SE1 1PZ
UNIT 4B SIGNAL HOUSE 137A GREAT SUFFOLK STREET LONDON SE1 1PZ
THIRD FLOOR 133-135 GREAT SUFFOLK STREET LONDON SE1 1PP
UNIT 3A SIGNAL HOUSE 137A GREAT SUFFOLK STREET LONDON SE1 1PZ
UNIT 4A SIGNAL HOUSE 137A GREAT SUFFOLK STREET LONDON SE1 1PZ

UNITS 1-6 52 LANT STREET LONDON SE1 1QP
FLATS 1-19 54 LANT STREET LONDON SE1 1RF
133-135 GREAT SUFFOLK STREET LONDON SE1 1PP
FLATS 1-49 LANT HOUSE LANT ESTATE LANT STREET LONDON SE1 1PJ
FLAT 1-9 TRUNDLE HOUSE LANT ESTATE TRUNDLE STREET LONDON SE1 1QS
UNIT 1 SUFFOLK HOUSE 127-129 GREAT SUFFOLK STREET LONDON SE1 1PP
UNIT 3 SUFFOLK HOUSE 127-129 GREAT SUFFOLK STREET LONDON SE1 1PP
UNIT 2 SUFFOLK HOUSE 127-129 GREAT SUFFOLK STREET LONDON SE1 1PP
UNIT 5 127-129 GREAT SUFFOLK STREET LONDON SE1 1PP
UNIT 6 127-129 GREAT SUFFOLK STREET LONDON SE1 1PP
UNIT 9 127-129 GREAT SUFFOLK STREET LONDON SE1 1PP
FLAT 39A LANT HOUSE LANT ESTATE LANT STREET LONDON SE1 1PJ
UNIT 4 SUFFOLK HOUSE 127-129 GREAT SUFFOLK STREET LONDON SE1 1PP
UNIT 8 SUFFOLK HOUSE 127-129 GREAT SUFFOLK STREET LONDON SE1 1PP
UNIT 7 SUFFOLK HOUSE 127-129 GREAT SUFFOLK STREET LONDON SE1 1PP

131 GREAT SUFFOLK STREET LONDON SE1 1PP
FLAT 1-47 4 SANCTUARY STREET LONDON SE1 1EA
1-12 GAITSKELL WAY LONDON SE1 1EF
1 - 33 ISAAC WAY LONDON SE1 1EE
UNIT C 127-129 GREAT SUFFOLK STREET LONDON SE1 1PP
UNIT D SECOND FLOOR 127-129 GREAT SUFFOLK STREET LONDON SE1 1PP
UNIT A 127-129 GREAT SUFFOLK STREET LONDON SE1 1PP
UNIT B 127-129 GREAT SUFFOLK STREET LONDON SE1 1PP
FLATS 1-25 SIGNAL HOUSE 137 GREAT SUFFOLK STREET LONDON SE1 1PZ

FLATS 1-6 54 LANT STREET LONDON SE1 1RF
FLATS 1-6 2 WELLER STREET LONDON SE1 1QZ

Re-consultation:

N/A

Consultation responses received

Internal services

Archaeologist - The application will have no impact upon significant archaeological remains, therefore no archaeological response is necessary.

Arboriculturalist - Standard tree protection and landscaping conditions are required.

Environmental Protection Team -

The new MUGA would appear to be for 'primary' use only as it does not appear to have substantial ball retention fencing; therefore I have no issues.

The application has not been completed in respect of times of use; if this is to be limited to schools times + daylight summer use I have no issues in respect of people noise.

Condition required in respect to land contamination.

Transport Team - No objection.

Statutory and non-statutory organisations

None

Neighbours and local groups

Objections to the proposal

Lant and Bittern Tenants' and Residents' Association

This TRA represents over 200 households (in Lant House, Redmond House, Trundle House, and Bittern House) who have been impacted by the full closure of Lant Street,

The committee objects to this proposal on the grounds that once again no pathway allowing pedestrians to walk from one end of Lant Street to another is included. In general residents are not opposed to the closure of Lant Street to traffic and the opportunity this gives the School to provide larger and improved facilities for children, however residents also want to retain some form of pedestrian access along Lant Street. Residents now have to make a substantial detour to visit neighbours, amenities and businesses at the other end of the street - this inconvenience has been imposed upon the community without proper consultation.

In their own campaign the School is using highly emotive and misleading language - local residents are not asking for 'access though the school'. All we request is reinstatement of pedestrian access along Lant Street - something which the community has enjoyed for over 200 years. One option could be a pathway around the perimeter of the playground - there is a local example of this by Disney Place where a pedestrian route has been incorporated between a high brick wall and school playground.

On behalf of its members the Committee therefore requests that Southwark Planning reconsider the application in view to incorporating a pedestrian route for the benefit of local residents, amenities and businesses.

Occupier of **46, Lant House Lant Street** objects on the following grounds:-

I object to the lack of public access to this new green space which was originally supposed to be provided when the closure of Lant Street was first proposed.

Resident at **6 Bittern House, Bitterns Street** objects on the following grounds

It is with regret that I have concerns as to the application, and process with which the planning application has been executed.

Quite a number of households have received NO formal notification of this application, local residents of BITTERN HOUSE, LANT HOUSE and REDMAN HOUSE.

Whilst the distribution list on the website indicates notice had gone out, a quick survey of persons at these house addresses can confirm that they did not receive the notices of the planning permission. This is not an isolated incident (that notice was reported to have been given, yet a 'mix up' within the notification department(s) within Southwark have failed to actually post notices..... That aside

Attached are 3 objections to the planning permission application 12/AP/1547, from residents who cannot or do not have access to the internet at this time.

I also submit objections (making this a 4th) to the planning permission 12/AP/1547 - Charles Dickens School proposals

I share the same concerns that this recent application is harmful to the well being of the community, school patrons, persons with mobility / disabilities and the elderly.

For a number of years now, the arguments on access around the perimeter of the Charles Dickens grounds have been ongoing with the local residents, community, Tenants and Resident's associations. From the dubious way which initial permission to 'absorb' the roadway adjacent to the school, despite objections, 'no further concerns' decision granted the school the grounds, whilst this has been granted, planning to work on a 'walkway or access route' whilst maximising the land space of the school and activity area, in a safe compromise for all concerned.

I have been in the meetings with the schools board of directors, local community and councillors to find a way forward.

This application seems to negate all of this work, and WILL cause a detrimental effect on the local area and community.

Witnessing children and mothers slipping on iced pathways and falling into the roadside along "Marshalsea road" and "Great Suffolk Street" is of grave concern to all. This is not to mention the current "detour" which diverts persons close to "Mint Street Park" which has had serious incidents recently of assault.

There are many elderly and less bodied people living around the area, and this closure means they struggle to access Borough High Street, with its many bus routes, tube stations and shops.

In winter, with icy weather local roads and pavements can become treacherous for children, elderly and people with mobility problems, so the closure of Lant Street means detouring around main roads (Marshalsea Road and Great Suffolk Street), which in wintry conditions can be dangerous.

The school initially engaged with the local community, with a view to creating pedestrian access around the perimeter, however this latest planning permission prevents the local

community from negotiating a way forward which benefits both the school and the community.

Occupier of **8 Bittern House Bittern Street** objects on the following grounds:-

Not informed in writing as is the usual procedure with planning permission in the local area.

There have been talks with the school that a pathway around the edge of the grounds would be beneficial to the community including persons with mobility problems, school children and elderly.

These proposed plans appear to stop this access (around the edge of the old Lant Street) from happening in the future, which would divert children, less able people around to the main and busy roads.

This can be very dangerous in slippery or icy weather, I feel more discussion is needed to go forward.

Occupier of **13 Bittern House Bittern Street** objects on the following grounds:-

Having read the proposal, it appears that the hard and soft landscaping will completely cut off future development in partnership between the local community and the school for allowing safe and easy access to the local area's.

My concern is not only for elderly members of the community who have lived on this estate for years, but those with mobility problems, and also younger children (and parents) who are currently forced to walk along busy main roads, which are treacherous in bad weather conditions, snow and ice. Elderly and Children should not have to walk or slip into main roads at these times.

The elderly need a safe and direct route between Bittern/Lant houses and Redman house which leads to local shopping.

I would like this matter to have further discussion.

I would also add that I've received no formal information on these proposals through the post. This is wrong.

Occupiers of **16 Bittern House Bittern Street** object on the following grounds

Not informed in writing, only from neighbours, there aren't notices on local lamp posts as is normal.

The permission grants soft and hard landscaping and new gates which would appear to block of any future plans of allowing pedestrian access for the local community, school children, pram access and elderly.

This raises a number of issues that effect safety, access, especially in bad weather conditions taking account of busy main roads.

I feel more discussion is needed for a better proposal, as these current ones will have a negative impact on the immediate, local area, community and residents.

Occupier of **22 Redman House Lant Street** objects on the following grounds:-

As an elderly resident of Lant Street, through access was abruptly stopped and cut off without warning and this has made it difficult for me to visit friends at the other end of my street. I now have to take a different route, which causes discomfort.

As a resident I was not consulted before Lant Street was closed off, nor was I consulted about plans of Charles Dickens School to make this closure permanent.

I feel further consultation and discussion needs to take place with local residents before a main road is closed as the closure has made it very difficult for local residents.

Occupier of **8 Sudrey Street** objects and requests that a public thoroughfare between both halves of Lant Street can be added to the design.

Occupier in Isaac **Way** objects as they consider they have been left off the consultation list and is affected by the closure and noise from the school. it would be better to re-open the public right of way that this road has been subject to, for many [hundreds of years].

Believes the children already have a large play area in the school, but that they only have to walk to Mint Street Park for a large grass area.

The occupiers flat directly overlooks the blocked off Lant Street and even with double glazing the screaming from the teachers [often worse than the kids] is a nightmare if I have worked overnight and need to sleep in the mornings or indeed any time Mondays to Fridays. School caretaker appears to be doing a lot of odd jobs at the moment waking us up by 7am last Saturday with banging. If the school get a further permission for work on the road the noise will be unacceptable, as it was when they dug up the tarmac and reinforced the closed gates in Lant Street, a while ago. The flat has no other windows or view, apart from to overlook this area, I have no escape nor peace in my own house.

Letters of support

35 e-mails of support have been received from **parents/grandparents whose children/grandchildren attend the school and local residents** on the following grounds:-

Children of the school will benefit from a bigger area for sports and outside activities, at the moment they walk to Mint Street Park which eats into their precious PE time, dog owners do not clear up after their pets in the park, higher risk being exposed to traffic. Being an open space it is not possible to do games there. Walking to Mint Street is hazardous with narrow pavements and cars and vans often take the corners too fast and very close to the pavement with no regard to pedestrians, particularly young ones, who are more likely to appear out of nowhere.

The extension to the playground cannot possibly be significant for anyone except the children of the school. It is ridiculous that they have to trek, along a road that is used as a rat run by local traffic, to a local park instead of using facilities within the school.

Concerns about the lack of provision of sports activities, one local parent had considered moving out of the area they love for this reason. Following on from the Olympics and Paralympic Games in London, the children have acquired a greater interest in sport. A parent believes that it will boost the children's moral in developing early interest in sports.

I'm a new mum and whilst my daughter is not old enough to go to school she is interested in any initiative which helps make schools more child friendly. Too many young families are moving away because of lack of facilities and perceived 'good' schools.

Charles Dickens is a great school doing a fantastic area, only area of concern is the lack of exercise classes which has been attributed to not having a dedicated PE ground. I cannot see what can take priority to this. I am a local resident and would never object to anything that is for the greater good. Building schools, emergency services is an entirely

different thing to building bars and restaurants, more luxury flats or offices.

The area has been in limbo and the children should be able to take advantage of this space without delay.

Borough Babies (an online forum of parents and carers in SE1) support the proposal for the following reasons

- Borough is an amazing community which would be even better if more family friendly. This means our Council investing in schools which can offer the best possible education and give young children opportunities they do not get at home ie access to safe outside educational space that most of them do not get either at home or even at many local parks, free from traffic dangers, in which they can learn and experience the world freely.
- All local parents would have grave concerns how children will be safeguarded if public access through Charles Dickens school is allowed. The closure of Lant Street means only a slightly longer journey from one end of the street to the other, via Marshalsea Road, and we consider the greater benefit to the community as a whole to be in the best possible learning environment for the children of our community.
- Further, we would say to the Councillors who have called this scheme into committee that we from discussion on the Forum that there are many local voters who are in favour of this scheme. Too often, it is only those who object whose voices are heard. To convince local families that you have their best interest at heart, please approve this scheme immediately and do not create further delay.

Cathedral School Parent Forum - supports the proposal as it will greatly enhance local children's opportunity and exposure to ecological, natural and environmental issues, provide much needed open space for physical activity and improve sporting provision for local children in our borough where it is greatly needed.

Occupier of 5 La Gare 53 Surrey Row supports the proposal on the following grounds:-

- A pedestrian footpath would not benefit anyone, it is true of course that it was once a fully functioning street, but it is now a much used space for a truly magnificent school.
- A pedestrian path would compromise the use and security of school children and their activities. This is nothing to do with their being a dividing fence but more to do with the presence of adults along the perimeter making the job of security all the harder for no apparent gain. If the fence is solid then it makes the path more isolated and dangerous to use.
- Due to a lack of surveillance, the path would be very unsuccessful and unpleasant. One kind of space which is negative in the heart of urban areas is pedestrian pathways that snake their way through the backs of buildings. They may be used if people feel confident to walk down them but the vast majority of the time they are underused because people feel insecure. That in turn adds to the lack of use in a downward spiral which encourages those who are seeking isolated spaces to do what ever it is they cannot do in more active public places. As I'm sure you are aware, the Police have warned against this very path in this location and seems to have been ignored. Added to that it will take up an immense amount of space that the school could use to great effect being hemmed in by recent medium rise apartments.