

Representation	Response
<p>Dear Sir/Madam,</p> <p>Re; Proposal to implement a new designated SEND unit at Suttons Primary School - Publication of Statutory Notice</p> <p>With reference to our email of yesterday, we'd like to add some comments regarding cost.</p> <p>The cost of the building is given as an estimated £1.6m. However, as we are all aware, the cost of building materials has increased considerably over the past year, resulting in a build that is now likely to cost substantially more.</p> <p>Given the current situation, shouldn't a more economic approach be taken. At seven plus metres high and with a sawtooth roof design the building will require a much greater quantity of building materials than would generally be required for a single storey building and will be much more costly to construct and maintain. Whilst this type of roof does have the benefit of increasing light and ventilation, it is most useful when the roof space itself is being utilised and seems rather extravagant for a relatively small building with more than adequate space, and daylight and ventilation from doors and windows, for its occupants at ground level.</p> <p>Reducing the overall the height would not only save building costs and materials but would also considerably reduce the</p>	<p>In terms of the cost estimate of the proposal, we have carried out a due diligence exercise ad we have carried out a professional costing exercise according to the guidelines of the RICS and the RIBA. The project cost estimate includes a contingency sum to allow for any unforeseen expense. Of course, like with any construction project, the final cost may vary depending on a variety of issues.</p> <p>The design of the development proposal has undergone a thorough revision both internally (LBH Capital Delivery and its consultants) and externally (the planning process, with all the statutory consultees associated with this).</p> <p>The building has been designed with the specific wellbeing of SEMH children in mind and adapted to the specific site constraints. The details of the reasons for ample rooflights are detailed within the Design and Access statement.</p> <p>The architectural development proposal was granted planning permission (Ref P1150.22) subject to No16 conditions on the 06.04.2023. The planning process included a validation review, a review by planners, multiple reviews by the statutory consultees and a public consultation process, which in this case was extended upon request.</p> <p>According to conditions 2 and 3 appended to the Decision Notice, the building has to be constructed as detailed in the</p>

Representation	Response
<p>volume and hence the size and cost of the heat pump as well as reducing ongoing running and costs. It seems very careless to be wasting precious resources heating such a cavernous roof void. This heat, or indeed cooling, is not 'free', the heat pump will still require a constant electrical supply and the larger the pump the more it will consume.</p> <p>We sincerely hope our comments will be given due consideration. Obviously our wish is for the building to be substantially reduced in height or relocated within the school grounds. However, despite our personal interest, we do believe the points raised are very relevant, particularly given today's economic and climatic situation.</p>	<p>plans. As such it cannot be substantially altered or removed to another part of the site under the terms of the existing planning permission. Moreover a careful site analysis has been carried out before the development was proposed to the LPA and no other area of the Suttons site would have been available for development.</p> <p>The Statutory Notice and the public consultation associated to it pertains to the proposal to establish the educational provision and not to the building form of the building in which the proposal is meant to be accommodated in. As such the comment received is unrelated to the issue which is being consulted on.</p>
<p>Dear Sirs,</p> <p>We live in a house in Kent Drive that will back onto the proposed development. As stated during the planning consultation we have felt that the building has been designed with no regard to us the residents and neighbours of the school.</p> <p>We have always said that we have no objection to the proposal in principle but feel that the siting of the building is completely wrong. Surely if the idea is for it to be a bridge between main stream schooling and a separate special school then this fails in this objective. Far from trying to make the children feel included, I suspect they are likely to be teased and bullied</p>	<p>The architectural development proposal was granted planning permission (Ref P1150.22) subject to No16 conditions on the 06.04.2023. The planning process included a validation review, a review by planners, multiple reviews by the statutory consultees and a public consultation process, which in this case was extended upon request.</p> <p>According to conditions 2 and 3 appended to the Decision Notice, the building has to be constructed as detailed in the plans. As such it cannot be substantially altered or removed to another part of the site under the terms of the existing planning permission. Moreover a careful site analysis has been carried out before the development was proposed to the LPA and no</p>

Representation	Response
<p>because they are being sent to the separate 'building for naughty children'. I feel the building would be more likely to achieve its objective if it was attached or at the very least closer to the main building with a covered walkway.</p>	<p>other area of the Suttons site would have been available for development.</p> <p>A comment has been made about the position of the proposed provision within the site and in particular the fact that the proposed ARP will be sited on the Northern site of the shared access driveway. This has been identified early on during the development of the project as the only potential location for the ARP and it is clear that no other position within the site would have accommodated the building. Additionally it is important to note that LBH ARPs are always designed with the ethos of inclusion in mind and these serve the purpose of the continual education of children within the mainstream school, albeit supported with some additional resource space.</p> <p>With regards to the issue that the SEND unit should be located closer to the main Suttons school building to promote inclusion: SEND units are special provisions within a mainstream school where the children are taught mainly within separate classes. There will be opportunities for pupils on roll in the SEND unit to join mainstream peers for some aspects of school life where appropriate, such as assembly or PE, but this will be dependent on the needs of the pupils. The location of the SEND unit on the school site will enable the SEND unit to operate effectively.</p> <p>The Statutory Notice and the public consultation associated to it pertains to the proposal to establish the educational provision and not to the building form of the building in which the</p>

Representation	Response
	<p>proposal is meant to be accommodated in. As such the comment received is unrelated to the issue which is being consulted on.</p>
<p>Dear Sir/Madam,</p> <p>Re; Proposal to implement a new designated SEND unit at Suttons Primary School - Publication of Statutory Notice</p> <p>We are writing in connection with the above statutory notice, details of which were forwarded to us by Councillor Morgon. As with the consultation period it appears that, if not for his email, we would yet again have been ‘kept in the dark’ about this final opportunity to express our views, despite having a property that borders the development.</p> <p>To state in the approval document that no objection was raised to site/size of the building is totally wrong. Ourselves and at least one other resident strongly objected to having the excessive bulk of the building so close to the border with our property.</p> <p>Whilst we are very well aware of the growing number of youngsters who require support with SEMH needs, and have no objection to a SEND unit being built within the school grounds, as stated previously on Havering Planning, it is the siting and design of the building which is causing so much angst.</p>	<p>The architectural development proposal was granted planning permission (Ref P1150.22) subject to No16 conditions on the 06.04.2023. The planning process included a validation review, a review by planners, multiple reviews by the statutory consultees and a public consultation process, which in this case was extended upon request.</p> <p>During the planning process the concerns that were raised to council officers have been taken into consideration,</p> <p>According to conditions 2 and 3 appended to the Decision Notice, the building has to be constructed as detailed in the plans. As such it cannot be substantially altered or removed to another part of the site under the terms of the existing planning permission. Moreover a careful site analysis has been carried out before the development was proposed to the LPA and no other area of the Suttons site would have been available for development.</p> <p>With regards to the issue that the SEND unit should be located closer to the main Suttons school building to promote inclusion: SEND units are special provisions within a mainstream school where the children are taught mainly within separate classes. There will be opportunities for pupils on roll in the SEND unit to join mainstream peers for some aspects of school life where</p>

Representation	Response
<p>We appreciate that some of our concerns as regards trees and the location/noise of the heat pump etc., are to be add through the conditions attached to approval, but the fact remains that we will still have an incongruous, overbearing and dominant factory style building located a few meters from our garden. This is not only un-neighbourly, but is also visually intrusive and harms our living conditions through overshadowing and by creating a feeling of being constantly overlooked.</p> <p>There is also the question of outdoor/security lighting and, more importantly, the height of the lighting which so far has not been addressed. Suttons tend to leave their lights on all night, regardless of the energy crisis, but being further away, although sometimes annoying, this doesn't cause a problem. However, if this new build were to follow suit it would be an entirely different matter.</p> <p>A further concern is parking and the overspill to the street. Approximately 20-25 car users currently park in the area designated for the build. This is in addition to the 21 marked parking spaces and is considerably more than when the consultation took place.</p> <p>Despite being sympathetic to its use we believe that most people, if consulted, would object to having a building of this bulk erected at the end of their garden. Having invested time and money in our property and, soon to be retiring, we were expecting to be spending a lot more time at home and in the garden so, for us, this is a major issue.</p>	<p>appropriate, such as assembly or PE, but this will be dependent on the needs of the pupils. The location of the SEND unit on the school site will enable the SEND unit to operate effectively.</p> <p>The Statutory Notice and the public consultation associated to it pertains to the proposal to establish the educational provision and not to the building form of the building in which the proposal is meant to be accommodated in. As such the comment received is unrelated to the issue which is being consulted on.</p>

Representation	Response
<p>Moving on to use, it is our understanding that this facility is intended to provide specialist support within the mainstream school setting and that children will, when possible, be encouraged to attend lessons/activities and integrate with mainstream pupils and school life. If this is indeed the aim, the siting of the support unit seems somewhat bizarre, being set away from the main school and on the opposite side of a busy service road which is used by staff, children and parents of Suttons and also by Sanders Draper School, staff, students and services. Is this really the best position for a specialist unit for vulnerable primary age youngsters? Yes, it's within the school grounds but It doesn't feel very much like inclusion, being separated as it is, and even less encourages integration. Surely it would make better sense for the unit to be nearer the main school, with perhaps some form of covered walkway between the two buildings so that children using the unit feel they have their own safe space but also have some sense of belonging, and mainstream children accept the children as their peers, as opposed to the current plan where it appears an outlier.</p>	