

Source of response	Preferred Option	Main comments	Working Party Commentary
Cold Harbour CE Primary School	Not given	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Concerns about any changes to defined areas that may have an impact on the local community 2. Concerns about any adverse impact on pre-school provision and relationship with school. 	<p>A full consultation would take place before any changes were made to defined areas</p> <p>Pre-school provision will continue to be given priority. No adverse effects are anticipated as a result of any of the options</p>
Wellsmead Infant School	All rejected, including status quo. For suggested option see point 14	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. How do options link to raising standards? 4. Time frame for making decisions is too short 5. Fear of larger class sizes 6. Children may have to travel longer distances to school 	<p>Schools currently experiencing large numbers of surplus places are concerned about future financial viability and their ability to continue to sustain/improve standards as a direct result. Options are designed to maximise resources in order to provide the best possible backcloth to continue to raise standards</p> <p>A protracted timescale would work against the interests of all schools. The timescales in the protocol reflect a balance between the ability to carefully consider all issues and yet avoid unnecessary delay and anxiety</p> <p>One of key points of the review is to offer reasonable size classes, a greater consistency in the numbers arriving each year, and the ability to accurately project numbers in order to enable effective budget planning</p> <p>This is a key consideration. Safe travel to schools within a</p>

		<p>7. Parental choice would be decreased/Ethos of infant school would be lost (personal touch)/fear that young children will not thrive in a large primary environment</p> <p>8. No mention of extended school provision. No inclusion of 'Every Child Matters' agenda</p> <p>9. Bletchley has an established community, many extended families and schools have a historic population</p> <p>10. New building improvements recently undertaken seen as a waste of public funds</p> <p>11. There are pockets of new housing due for West Bletchley. Will there be enough places in</p>	<p>reasonable walking distance must form part of the site feasibility study involved in any option appraisal</p> <p>Not all options reduce parental choice. Options 2, 3 and 4 continue to provide a choice of infant, junior or primary education in the area. The Authority has a duty to balance the ability to provide parental choice against the provision of successful, financially viable schools for all children</p> <p>All options bar option 4 include new early years facilities at Chestnuts and the provision of a children's centre at Abbeys. Both new services embrace the extended schools and Every Child Matters agenda</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>No changes are anticipated until at least September 2008. The children and staff currently in the schools concerned deserve and require the best environment possible at this time</p> <p>All projected new housing has been factored into pupil projections. Severe surplus is still projected to continue since the new pupils expected as a result can only</p>
--	--	--	--

		<p>the future?</p> <p>12. Spare capacity at Wellsmead Infant has been effectively used to improve facilities. There is only one spare classroom that is to be used for a meeting space.</p> <p>13. Wellsmead Infant has been fully adapted for the inclusion of disabled children and staff have received appropriate training</p> <p>14. The Governors are disappointed that the current options do not mention an extension to the current school provision to enable wider community use of the school such as community library, parental facilities, local community services development, localised social services and housing advice etc</p>	<p>counteract the falling birth rate in the area</p> <p>Noted. This is an area wide review which is looking to provide the best infrastructure and outcomes for all children at all schools in the area</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>If all surplus space was converted to alternative facilities this would certainly address the surplus space issue, but would not address other objectives of the review and the issues driving the review, such as providing financial viability for all schools in the area. What the working party has sought to do is to embed within 4 of the 5 options enhancements to the area's ability to meet the extended schools agenda and the Every Child Matters (ECM) agenda. Chestnuts has been chosen to accommodate an early years facility, since it one of the few schools who do not already offer early years provision and has the space to accommodate it. Abbeys has been suggested for the children's centre as within its defined area there is a centre of need, there is already day nursery provision at the school which meets part of the core offer required for a children's centre, and the school has sufficient surplus to</p>
--	--	--	---

			accommodate the additional facilities required. The working party therefore believes that the options on the table (other than option 4) offer solutions that meet the objectives of the review, whilst enhancing the area's ability to meet the extended schools and ECM agendas wherever possible.
Rivers Infant School	Of the 5 options on the table Option 3 – but without a federation arrangement Afterwards, Option 2, Option 1 and Option 5 in that order.	15 It is unhelpful for the Authority to display ambivalence with regard to the primary school versus separate infant and junior schools question. This should be properly debated 16 It is hard to express definite opinions about options where the locations of schools have not been published 17 Location of schools in relation to homes is vitally important. Rivers excels in this respect. 18 Retain separate infant and junior schools 19 Schools (especially for youngest children) should be smaller rather than larger 20 Nursery provision needs to be	Noted. The current policy in place with regards to existing schools is to continue with a mixed economy. This was debated at the time of School System Review. The working party therefore felt that options involving both scenarios were pertinent. Consultation about the options should provide a useful parental steer about future policy. Noted – this will be picked up in the feasibility stage and will be detailed in the next stage of consultation Noted. This is a key consideration. Safe travel to schools within a reasonable walking distance must form part of the site feasibility study involved in any option appraisal This provides possible support for options 2 and 3 rejects 1 and 5 This favours option 3 Nursery provision will be a key part of any developed

		<p>taken into account</p> <p>21 No building to be demolished and sold off</p> <p>22 Quality and reputation of existing schools should inform the final decision</p> <p>23 Option 3 is preferred but idea of federation rejected. It is imperative to have someone demonstrably in charge on both sites</p> <p>24 Option 2 has the advantage of infant and junior provision but fails on journeys to school aspect</p> <p>25 Option 1 deprives choice of infant and junior provision. Location on Rickley site would be unsuitable</p> <p>26 Option 5 is the worst option depriving estates/communities of any schools at all and creating a school of inappropriate</p>	<p>solution</p> <p>Should any site become free as a result of the implementation of any option, careful consideration and full consultation will ensue about the future use of the building and land in question</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted – although this is possible, even under federation arrangements</p> <p>This is a key consideration. Safe travel to schools within a reasonable walking distance must form part of the site feasibility study involved in any option appraisal</p> <p>Noted. The suitability of all potential sites will be picked up in the options appraisal stage</p> <p>Noted</p>
--	--	---	---

		<p>magnitude</p> <p>27 Overall, option 13 from the original long list is preferred (see Appendix C) – converting surplus accommodation to alternative uses.</p>	<p>Please refer to answer given to point 14.</p>
<p>Rickley Junior School</p>	<p>Option 1</p>	<p>28 Current falling roll evident in some schools is likely to result in some schools experiencing financial difficulty and increasing inability to provide the standards expected</p> <p>29 Support for option 1 but must consider carefully traffic and access issues</p> <p>30 Option 5 gives attraction of new purpose built school but would potentially be too large and transitional issues could affect standards in short to medium term</p> <p>31 Strong feeling that Council adopts a planned approach rather than waiting until action is urgent and necessary as a direct</p>	<p>Noted – and one of the main reasons for this review</p> <p>Noted – This is a key consideration. Safe travel to schools within a reasonable walking distance must form part of the site feasibility study involved in any option appraisal</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>

		<p>result of a school in crisis. After the decision not to close Abbeys several years ago it is hoped that the Council is serious about resolving this issue and will not cause further uncertainty by delaying any decision further</p> <p>32 Lack of understanding about why the 2 junior and 2 infant schools feature exclusively in all the options. There are other local primary schools with significant surplus places</p> <p>33 The current position of uncertainty could result in staffing and parental confidence issues that are out of the school's control but need to be managed</p> <p>34 The Council should consult and make their preferred option known as soon as possible. The Governors and staff urge the Council to work with the schools</p>	<p>The working party considered 20 different options which included all schools in some way. The options shortlisted by the group were the options that the group felt best met the objectives of the review. Other significant issues had a bearing, such as an area of need in Abbey's defined area that will benefit from a children's centre and the geographical location of schools, the lack of early years provision at Chestnuts and the fact that some schools are currently almost full</p> <p>Noted – the timescales within the protocol demonstrate a clear decision-making path which attempts to minimise the period of uncertainty. Parents will continue to be provided with accurate information as and when it is available and support will be provided for staff using experience from the School System Review if and when proposals are made</p> <p>Noted</p>
--	--	--	--

		and arrive at an outcome within the earliest possible timescale	
Wellsmead Junior School	<p>Option 1 with reservations about removal of choice for infant/junior model and location of new schools or Option 2 with reservations about location of sites, defined areas and transport</p> <p>Option 3 needs more detail.</p>	<p>35 Governors expressed surprise that there are only 5 options and that not all schools featured in the final list</p> <p>36 Before public consultation it is crucial that site and redefined areas are detailed. Parents and the local community will need this information in order to make informed judgements</p> <p>37 An indication of the criteria used in the selection process would have been helpful. All agreed that standards should not be used</p> <p>38 One or two governors expressed the opinion that the review is really about saving money and not about the general well-being of pupils</p>	<p>The working party considered 20 different options which included all schools in some way. The options shortlisted by the group were the options that the group felt best met the objectives of the review. Other significant issues had a bearing, such as an area of need in Abbey's defined area that will benefit from a children's centre and the geographical location of schools, the lack of early years provision at Chestnuts and the fact that some schools are currently almost full</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted. Standards were not used. All options were tested against the objectives of the review. Those shortlisted were those that best met the objectives</p> <p>One of the objectives of the review is use the same pot of money in a more efficient way. This is not the same as reducing the amount of money available</p>

		<p>39 All governors were concerned about transport and traffic implications.</p> <p>40 Strong view that vacant buildings and land should not be sold for housing but retained for community use.</p> <p>41 Option 3 needs more detail providing, especially about the possibility of a federation arrangement</p> <p>42 Option 4 is not an option. Something must be done.</p> <p>43 Option 5, whilst exciting, is the most expensive and disruptive option</p>	<p>Noted. This is a key consideration. Safe travel to schools within a reasonable walking distance must form part of the site feasibility study involved in any option appraisal</p> <p>Noted. Should any site become free as a result of the implementation of any option, careful consideration and full consultation will ensue about the future use of the building and land in question</p> <p>This will be provided at option appraisal stage before further consultation is carried out</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>
Abbeys Primary School	Option 1	<p>44 Option 1 is by far the best option. It provides an easier transfer for siblings and they already go to the school. It also means that the respective schools can carry on with their own ethos and they would not have to change their curriculum to accommodate another school.</p>	<p>Noted</p>

		<p>We feel the children's centre for us is very positive as well as the early years provision for Chestnuts</p> <p>45 Option 2 would provoke huge transport issues especially if the junior site moved to Rickey as this would mean more parents from the Wellsmead area would travel by car causing a school run nightmare in Rickley Lane. There is also the potential of friction in joining two separate schools together. There is also the problem in moving siblings around if they has to travel to different sites</p> <p>46 Option 3 will cause problems in curriculum consistency, especially in year 2. Both schools would have to make sure they were teaching the same things before the children joined the junior school. This would make the situation very hard to manage and would require too much co-operation between all the schools</p>	<p>Noted. Safe travel to schools within a reasonable walking distance must form part of the site feasibility study involved in any option appraisal</p> <p>Noted</p>
--	--	---	--

		<p>47 Option 4 was never really an option as we all know that something has to be done, but we realise that this option had to be included</p> <p>48 Option 5 is the least favoured option. Putting four schools together would be a huge problem for parents. Firstly where would it go? None of the sites are big enough by themselves without major redevelopment so if it was a completely new site then would the old building be sold off to pay for this? Presumably they would be sold off for housing meaning we would need more schools. Also with such a vast catchment area just travelling to school would be problematic for children which would exacerbate the problem being faced by West Bleckley Safer Schools Forum in trying to get more children to walk to school</p> <p>49 We were very concerned that nothing whatsoever has been</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted. Safe travel to schools within a reasonable walking distance must form part of the site feasibility study involved in any option appraisal</p> <p>The designated nursery class as currently provided at Rivers would be continued in all options.</p>
--	--	--	---

		<p>mentioned of the designated special state nursery at Rivers. What will happen to this? Surely this provision needs to be kept?</p> <p>50 We are concerned that no thought has been given to how the Bletchley Park development will affect Abbeys. We are the designated school for this area and some consideration must be shown that if we get the children's centre which takes our surplus space we will still have enough room to accommodate Bletchley Park children</p>	<p>All projected figures take account of extra children expected to attend schools due to new housing planned within the area. Clearly if the children's centre goes ahead at Abbeys the only accommodation that could be handed over to support the centre would be that which would be seen as surplus having taken projected numbers into account</p>
--	--	--	--