

## WEST BLETCHLEY REVIEW GROUP : OPTIONS FROM 27.04.06 MEETING

Option	Description
1	Close all WB schools and make Lord Grey as "all through"
2	Amalgamate Rivers and Rickley and the Wellsmead schools
3	Amalgamate Rivers with Wellsmead Infant, and Rickley with Wellsmead Junior
4	Amalgamate Rickley with Wellsmead Junior, on Wellmead Junior site and keep the 2 feeder Infant schools
5	Maintain all the WB schools and look at alternative uses and reduce the PANs. Example : nursery facilities where not already provided
6	Close Rickley, Rivers, Wellsmead Infant and Junior and build a brand new primary school
7	Close Rickley and (a) redistribute pupils to other schools (b) re-use Rickley site for community use and dispose of playing field (c) reinvest funds from playing fields to WB
8	Close either Chestnuts or Holne Chase, and create one slightly larger school
9	Create 2 new Primaries and close the 4 current Primaries
10	Redefine the current Defined Areas to bring in more children to the WB area
11	Bus in children from the flanks
12	Close Abbeys or Rickley and use the site to provide a specialist children's centre for the area
13	Convert all remaining surplus at the schools to new facilities for the schools
14	Merge Abbeys and Cold Harbour
15	Close Abbeys
16	Move Abbeys into junior building
17	Close the Wellsmead schools and redistribute pupils to other schools
18	Move Cold Harbour somewhere where a new school is required
19	Change another school's status to Voluntary Controlled (as well as retaining Cold Harbour)
20	Close one school, and use St Thomas Aquinas site instead, and in turn provide St Thomas Aquinas with another site

Option	Advantages	Disadvantages	Comments	Shortlist ?
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Continuity and progression benefits from all-through model</li> <li>➤ Reduces surplus places</li> <li>➤ Creates larger, more viable school</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ School would be too big: 1928 +1500</li> <li>➤ Site is not big enough</li> <li>➤ Too many pupils would be disrupted</li> <li>➤ Capacity to manage such broad change?</li> <li>➤ Disruption to children, staff and parents</li> </ul>	<p>Sites would be likely to be sold for housing which would be likely to result in more pupils for the area whose education would not be able to be addressed via this option.</p> <p>Disadvantages outweigh advantages</p>	NO
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Creates 2 primaries to address transitional challenge of infant/junior model</li> <li>➤ Creates a level playing field for the area in terms of uniform primary schools</li> <li>➤ Creates larger, more viable schools</li> <li>➤ Reduces surplus places</li> <li>➤ Improvements to standards at KS2 may be more easily addressed in 2 larger, more stable primaries</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Site constraints: full feasibility study of all sites required</li> <li>➤ Less choice and diversity in area</li> <li>➤ Disruption to children, staff and parents</li> </ul>	<p>Capital investment would be required at the sites determined to provide the two primaries, although 2 capital receipts may be possible</p> <p>R/R 2FTE 420 W/W 1FTE 210</p> <p>2009 projections: Rivers 179 Rickley 437. Total 437 (17 over). WI 118 WJ 183. Total 301 (91 over)</p> <p>Therefore will require other changes to defined areas or a PAN of 45</p>	YES

3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Preserves choice and diversity</li> <li>➤ Creates larger, more viable schools</li> <li>➤ Reduces surplus places</li> <li>➤ Improvements to standards at KS2 may be more easily addressed in one, larger junior school with stable pupil numbers</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Site constraints: full feasibility study of all sites required</li> <li>➤ Further for some children to walk</li> <li>➤ Parents with siblings across the 2 phases may have difficulty</li> <li>➤ Disruption to children, staff, parents</li> </ul>	<p>Capital investment would be required at the two sites chosen, although 2 capital receipts may be possible</p> <p>2009 projections: Rivers 179, WI 118, total 297 – 3FTE (27 over). Rickey 258, WJ 183, total 441 – 3FTE (81 over with other changes to defined areas), or 4FTE with small surplus.</p>	YES
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Creates one larger, more viable junior school</li> <li>➤ Standards at KS2 may be more easily addressed in one, larger junior school with stable pupil numbers</li> <li>➤ Preserves choice and diversity</li> <li>➤ Reduces surplus places</li> <li>➤ Partnership of 3 will be likely to bring benefits</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Retains a small infant school in a large building</li> <li>➤ Disruption to children, staff and parents</li> <li>➤ Further for some children to walk</li> <li>➤ Parents with siblings across the 2 phases may have difficulty</li> <li>➤ Some parents may choose to send their infant children to Wellsmead Infant rather than Rivers due to the proximity of the junior school, thus compounding</li> </ul>	<p>Capital investment would be required at new junior, with possible capital receipt from Rickley site, dependant upon determination of use.</p> <p>2009 projections WJ 183, Rickley 258, total 441. 3FTE (81 over with changes to defined areas) or 4FTE with small surplus</p>	YES

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Reduces access challenges around Lord Grey (dependant upon reuse of Rickley site)</li> </ul>	<p>falling numbers at Rivers</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ May be too big at minimum 3FTE</li> </ul>		
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Minimal change and disruption</li> <li>➤ Reduces surplus places</li> <li>➤ Ability to meet wider ECM agenda via nursery and extended facilities, and thus potential to raise standards</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Retains organisational challenges of declining numbers, most of which are likely to impact upon standards (declining teaching staff, larger classes, teaching heads, multiple co-ordinator roles, recruitment and retention issues, planning challenges)</li> <li>➤ Some services are unlikely to be income generating, therefore not addressing issues around continuing viability</li> <li>➤ Possibility of saturation/competition of such services amongst all schools</li> <li>➤ Authority is still responsible</li> </ul>	<p>Capital investment required to provide alternative facilities at schools with surplus provision</p> <p>This option may be further supported by information coming from extended schools workshops</p>	YES

		for management of full size sites based on DfES funding formulae affected by pupil numbers		
6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Creates 1 primary to address transitional challenge of infant/junior model</li> <li>➤ Creates a level playing field for the area in terms of uniform primary schools</li> <li>➤ Creates larger, more viable school</li> <li>➤ Reduces surplus places</li> <li>➤ Improvements to standards at KS2 may be more easily addressed in 1 large, more stable primary</li> <li>➤ Provides brand new facilities to include extended provision, fit for 21<sup>st</sup> century learning and commensurate with other areas of the borough</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ May be too big at minimum 3FTE</li> <li>➤ Site constraints: full feasibility study of all sites required</li> <li>➤ Further for some children to walk</li> <li>➤ Disruption to children, staff and parents</li> <li>➤ Possibility of disadvantaging other primary schools in the area</li> <li>➤ Less choice and diversity</li> </ul>	<p>2009 projections</p> <p>Rickey 258 Rivers 179 WI 118 WJ 183 Total 738</p> <p>3FTE primary is 630</p> <p>Would require complementing with a review of other defined areas in West Bletchley to ensure that pupil distribution matched 3FTE and balance filled/continues to fill other schools where appropriate</p>	YES

7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Creation of more pupils for other schools leading to greater stability and viability</li> <li>➤ Reduces surplus places</li> <li>➤ Reduces access challenges around Lord Grey (dependant upon reuse of Rickley site)</li> <li>➤ Creates a development opportunity on the Rickley site</li> <li>➤ Provides a mechanism for investment in others schools in the area</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Further for some children to walk</li> <li>➤ Disruption to children, staff and parents</li> <li>➤ Retains a small infant school in a large building</li> </ul>	<p>Would require careful planning regarding the re-designation of the Rickey defined area to ensure that other schools have the capacity and are adequately invested in to provide a better outcome for all</p>	NO
8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Creates larger, more viable school</li> <li>➤ Reduces surplus places</li> <li>➤ Retains choice and diversity</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ One of the schools is already almost full</li> <li>➤ May be too big at minimum 3FTE</li> <li>➤ Further for some children to walk</li> <li>➤ Disruption to children, staff and parents</li> <li>➤ Continuation of challenges at other schools within the area</li> </ul>		NO

9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Creates larger, more viable schools</li> <li>➤ Reduces surplus places</li> <li>➤ Retains choice and diversity, assuming one C of E is retained</li> <li>➤ Provides brand new facilities to include extended provision, fit for 21<sup>st</sup> century learning and commensurate with other areas of the borough</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Two of the 4 primaries are almost full</li> <li>➤ Would require a change from community to controlled status or vice versa</li> <li>➤ May impact adversely on the remaining schools in the area</li> <li>➤ Further for some children to walk</li> <li>➤ Disruption to children, staff and parents</li> <li>➤ Retains a small infant school in a large building</li> </ul>		NO
10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Creates larger, more viable schools</li> <li>➤ Reduces surplus places</li> <li>➤ Retains choice and diversity</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Would result in movement of the problem to another area in the borough</li> <li>➤ Would require longer journeys due to extension of defined areas</li> <li>➤ Would be long term solution to an immediate problem and reliant on swings in parental preference</li> </ul>		NO
11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Creates larger, more viable schools</li> <li>➤ Reduces surplus</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Environment cost</li> <li>➤ Revenue cost for transport</li> <li>➤ Increased journey times for</li> </ul>		NO

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>places</li> <li>➤ Retains choice and diversity</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>children</li> <li>➤ Impact on growth</li> </ul>		
12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Creates valuable new resource for local community</li> <li>➤ Reduces surplus places</li> <li>➤ Retains choice and diversity</li> <li>➤ Creation of more pupils for other schools leading to greater stability and viability</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Abbeys is one of the most improved schools in the country</li> <li>➤ Further for some children to walk</li> <li>➤ Disruption to children, staff and parents</li> <li>➤ Retains a small infant school in a large building</li> </ul>	Abbeys has the “super output area” within its designated area, and yet Rickley is more centrally placed to provide a range of facilities to support the West Bletchley community.	NO
13	This option is covered under Option 5			
14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Creates larger, more viable primary school</li> <li>➤ Reduces surplus places</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Abbeys is one of the most improved schools in the country this year</li> <li>➤ Too big?</li> <li>➤ Site constraints?</li> <li>➤ Cold Harbour is almost full</li> <li>➤ Challenge merging a community and voluntary controlled school – may not</li> </ul>		NO

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>retain choice and diversity</li> <li>➤ Further for some children to walk</li> <li>➤ Disruption to children, staff and parents</li> <li>➤ Retains a small infant school in a large building</li> <li>➤ Does not address recruitment problems at Rivers</li> </ul>		
15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Reduces surplus places</li> <li>➤ Retains choice and diversity</li> <li>➤ Creation of more pupils for other schools leading to greater stability and viability</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ One of the most improved schools in the country this year</li> <li>➤ Further for some children to walk</li> <li>➤ Disruption to children, staff and parents</li> <li>➤ Locality within Abbeys designated area has been defined as super- output area</li> </ul>		NO
16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Reduces surplus places</li> <li>➤ Creation of more pupils for other schools leading to greater stability and viability</li> <li>➤ Creates a development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Does not address viability and planning issues in other schools in the area</li> <li>➤ Retains a small infant school in a large building</li> <li>➤ Does not address recruitment problems at</li> </ul>		NO

	opportunity on the Junior school site (children's centre?)	Rivers		
17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Reduces surplus places</li> <li>➤ Creation of more pupils for other schools leading to greater stability and viability</li> <li>➤ Preserves some choice and diversity</li> <li>➤ Creates a development opportunity on the Wellsmead sites</li> <li>➤ Provides a mechanism for investment in others schools in the area</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Removes some choice and diversity</li> <li>➤ Further for some children to walk</li> <li>➤ Disruption to children, staff and parents</li> </ul>	<p>2009 Projections:</p> <p>Wells Inf = 118, Wells Jun = 183, total = 301 pupils to relocate</p> <p>Will involve full review of defined areas to ensure that walking distances are reasonable and capacities sufficient</p> <p>(Redefine towards Abbeys?</p> <p>Abbeys capacity minus projected NOR at 2009 = 142  Rivers 31 spare places  Rickleby 102 spare places  TOTAL = 275)</p>	NO
18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ May result in pupils filling other schools in the area and therefore leading to greater stability and viability</li> <li>➤ Creates a development opportunity on the Cold Harbour site that may</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Removes choice and diversity from the area</li> <li>➤ Cold Harbour is almost full</li> <li>➤ May involve transport costs for those attending for C of E reasons</li> <li>➤ May not necessarily result in pupils moving to other</li> </ul>		NO

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ produce more children</li> <li>➤ Provides a mechanism for investment on other schools in the area (check there is no deed of trust/retainer in place)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ schools in the area, thus not addressing viability issues</li> <li>➤ Further for some children to walk</li> <li>➤ Disruption to children, staff and parents</li> </ul>		
19	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ May result in more children choosing a school in the area?</li> <li>➤ May result in reduction in surplus capacity</li> <li>➤ May result in greater stability and viability for local schools</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Would result in movement of the problem to another area in the borough</li> <li>➤ Would be long term solution to an immediate problem and reliant on swings in parental preference</li> </ul>		NO
20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ May result in reduction of surplus capacity</li> <li>➤ May result in greater stability and viability for local schools</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ No demand for additional growth in the Catholic sector at present</li> <li>➤ Catholics school unlikely to wish to leave existing site</li> <li>➤ Reduction of choice and diversity in the area</li> <li>➤ Further for some children to walk</li> <li>➤ Disruption to children, staff and parents</li> </ul>	Which school?	NO