

I am concerned about the latest planning application submitted in respect of Chancellor's School. It appears to be the continuation of an unrelenting scheme to over-develop the school.

Of particular concern to me are comments within the Design and Access Statement submitted by Lyster Grillet & Harding Limited, specifically those detailed below:

**Page 2. Paragraph 6** Reference is made to a previous planning application (6/2019/0085/MAJ), which was approved and in this latest plan the fact that *"Due to limited funding and priority teaching requirements, these original approved plans did not originally include the necessary core provisions such as additional dining space requirements nor Sixth Form provision etc."*

I have two major concerns about this sentence, not least one which relates to something of a misrepresentation. Chancellor's School is part of the Danes Educational Trust. As at 31<sup>st</sup> August 2020 Danes Educational Trust had Cash and cash equivalent of £4.356 million. This is a remarkable amount of cash for an educational establishment to hold and not what I would consider to be limited funding. In the year ended 31<sup>st</sup> August 2020 the Trust had net cash inflow of £1.436 million. In other words, the Trust generated cash of almost £1.5 million in one year. Quite why *"Due to limited funding..."* is being used as an excuse to stagger the work over several years is beyond me.

It strikes me that this is just a cash generating business rather than a trust that cares about education, sustainability, the Green Belt, the environment and local residents. You may not be aware that Danes Educational Trust had total funds of £52.7 million as at 31<sup>st</sup> August 2020, an increase of over £7 million on the previous year.

Secondly the original plans were prepared by Lyster Grillet & Harding Limited, the same company that has prepared the recent plans. These original plans - and I use their words - *"...did not originally include the necessary core provisions such as additional dining space requirements nor Sixth Form provision etc."* Are there further core areas that were not included within the original plans that will be the subject of future planning applications? It would strike me as poor planning by the school not to have made the necessary provisions for dining areas and for Sixth Forms when it is the increase in pupils in the coming years is well known. I also note the use of *"...etc."* at the end of that paragraph. That suggests to me that there are further works planned which have not yet been submitted for approval.

**Page 2. Paragraph 10** Reference is made to *"...a new dedicated site office building for the school's estates management team."* The Summary on page 8 states *"The introduction of a site office dining at Chancellor's School will improve the functionality of the existing main car park access road and in particular the management of deliveries and collections to and from the school."* I am confused. Is the building to be used for dining, to improve the functionality of the main car park access or to assist with deliveries and collections? It is not clear.

**Page 4/5. Location and site** The application indicates *"The new office replaces a run down, inefficient storage hut currently positioned in this area. This external store area is no longer required."* I note from the photographs on page 4 that the proposed site of the new building is currently the site for what appears to be rubbish. One of these items seems to be a washing machine but I cannot be sure. This external storage area is clearly in use. Where will the rubbish be stored in future? The planning application makes no mention of this.

**Page 7. Green Belt Paragraph** The planning application indicates that *"The proposed location is not visible by neighbours and is discreetly located at the end of the school car park access road and has little, if any, impact on the neighbours."* I disagree. I believe the proposed location is visible from houses at ■ and ■ Pine Grove. There appears to be little restriction on what the school can obtain. Is there a limit or will the footprint of the buildings eventually extend to the full curtilage?

For the above reasons I object to this planning application. I would also like to state my concerns about the manner in which Chancellor's School is handling its expansion. It would appear to me that the school frequently submits planning applications for relatively small changes like this one because they think they have a better chance of councillors blindly approving - and neighbours not objecting - to smaller projects. When one considers the number of applications we have seen in recent years and those that I suspect are planned but not yet submitted, the expansion of the school is inappropriate for a residential area like Pine Grove. I find it particularly galling that a school which has funding of the levels that can be seen in the Danes Educational Trust's accounts has still not sorted out the parking and traffic problems and continues to have such a deleterious impact on a residential area.