

Appendix 4: Summary of local meeting on 6th April 2022

Panel

- Chair: Emma Talbot – Director of Planning
- LB Planning: Georgia McBirney
- Agent/Applicant: Jamie Wright, Paul McCallum, Sean McGrath and Lee Maskell

Summary of local meeting

38 people signed the sign-in sheet.

Emma Talbot opened the meeting at 7pm and introduced the panel and explained the reason for the meeting.

Paul McCallum gave introductions on behalf of the Diocese, apologise for the situation to date and outlined that a new architect team had been bought on board.

Jamie Wright gave a presentation in respect of the proposed works.

A local resident raised concern in respect of the proposed colours of the materials, concern about the lack of articulation of the windows, concerns about the calculations in the submitted sustainability report and no justification has been made as to why the windows cannot be installed at the approved depths.

Jamie discussed the proposed reveals of the windows and the creation of returns on the windows.

A local residents raised concern about the weight of the materials on the as-built structure.

A local resident states that there are errors in the calculations in the submitted sustainability report.

A representative from the Sydenham Society asked whether the windows remaining in place means that the students do not need to be decanted and went on say the windows remaining in place is a practical solution.

A local resident said that suggestion for the windows is a good compromise.

A local resident and parent of a child at the school stated that the removal of the windows would be a difficult situation and the status of the build of the school is already having an impact on mental health of students.

Cllr Paul Bell who stated he was at the meeting in personal capacity asked what happens with the guarantee of the window spray if the company goes bust.

The project team said they would look into the guarantees and that the spraying of the windows would be added to the schools maintenance plan.

A local resident stated that they recognise the concerns of parents in terms of a decant, but in light of the lack of articulation of the windows and issues with the guarantee of the spray, it may be safer to organise a decant of the school.

A local resident asked about the difference between timescale for removing windows compared to spraying windows and why terracotta has been proposed.

Jamie Wright explained why terracotta is proposed and Lee Maskell set out timelines in respect of windows.

Cllr Chris Best set out that the timing and phasing of works is very important and needs to be considered.

A local resident stated that they did not understand why some residents are insistent on windows being removed.

A local resident stated that what has happened to date is not acceptable and the design is not acceptable. Emma Talbot set out that an Enforcement Notice has been issued and remains extant.

A teacher at the school stated that a decant would lead to the closure of the school.

A local resident stated that works a large project, there is no guarantee that the proposed windows works would be successful if applied in situ and has the risk of failure been factored into the project timescales.

Lee Maskell responded in response of project timelines.

A local residents stated that the works are a genuine attempt to put things right and want to remind attendees that this is about a school and if the windows are removed there will not be a school and the building should just be finished.

A local resident stated that the parents concern about the school is understandable but this does not excuse what the Diocese has built.

A local resident and parent of child at the schools said that we need to move past what has happened in the past.

A local resident invited the Diocese to apologise.

A representative of the Sydenham Society set out that past behaviour of the Diocese has not been acceptable but the focus should be on resolving the situation and thinking about the current proposals and that the Sydenham Society are generally supportive of the proposals.

Emma Talbot outlined that the Council understands that anger on both sides and the focus of the meeting should be on the current proposals.

A local resident said we need to move forward and that design is a matter of opinion and that residents need to look at the bigger picture.

Cllr Chris Best asked for the discussion to move onto materials and that an alternative colour for the plinth should be explored and options for signage should be explored. Cllr Chris Best also asked about Home Park works.

Georgia McBirney outlined that the works to Home Park were approved by Planning Committee and the Diocese have done their part of the works and the remaining works need to be undertaken by Council Contractors.

Jamie Wright discussed options for materials and signage.

A local resident raised concern that the British Standard details for the materials has not been submitted. Jamie Wright said that this can be provided.

A representative of the Sydenham Society stated that they has asked two architects to look at the proposals and they liked the scheme and the use of natural materials. It was said that it was good that there was an example in the Borough where the proposed terracotta has been used.

Cllr Jack Lavery asked as question in respect of the soft landscaping details. Georgia McBirney advised that the final details in respect of soft landscaping can be secured by condition. Jamie Wright stated that larger trees can be explored. Matthew Ringham (Head Teacher) stated that street trees cannot be installed on the footpath due to highway sightlines.

Emma Talbot outlined the process for the determination of the application.

Emma Talbot closed the meeting at 20:40.