

## Determination of Statutory Notices to Enlarge Three Primary Schools in Bath, Radstock and Whitchurch

### Summary of Representation Responses Report

#### Bathwick St. Mary C of E Primary School, Bath

**Total responses received:** 69

**From:**

- Parents: 46
- Parents and Local Residents: 3
- Local Residents: 2
- School Governor: 1
- Staff: 4
- Future Parent: 1
- Other Interested Parties: 3
- Unknown Relationship to the School: 9

  

- Objections: 45
- Support: 3
- Comments: 21

#### **Parents:**

The governors, church community and parents have always insisted on one school on one site maintaining the ethos of this very popular and successful school.

An additional area of adjacent land added to the site - 'adjacent' is ambiguous – the Council intends to have two separate schools one infant and one junior. Because of the geography the schools would have to be run separately.

While it is convenient and cheaper to keep the school as an infant school and only build half a school for the juniors on the new site, it is for many reasons impractical and financially short-sited.

The reality would mean higher running costs for staff, a head teacher or senior member of staff for both schools, two lots of administration/office staff, two site caretakers, two kitchens and staff, bigger heating and utility bills, more accounting and paperwork.

It will be a logistical nightmare for a parent with both infant and junior children. We would have to take almost an extra hour to do drop off and pick up. It would take 20 minutes to walk between schools. The school days would have to be staggered to overcome this or staff employed to look after them while siblings are collected, another potential cost.

The Government is trying to get mothers back into work but this drop off/pick up scenario would only hinder this even more for many women.

The traffic would increase because it would be easier to drive between sites. This is exactly what the Council has been discouraging because with more vehicles the risk of accidents increases.

The school community will be fractured - no ability for children to mix with other age groups, removing role modelling for higher years so vital for their social development. Some siblings with larger age gaps will never be at school together - a loss of a vital experience.

Schools rely heavily on parents volunteering in school and fund raising. With two sites this is more complicated and I fear that because of the drop off/pick up inconvenience more parents will be put off volunteering.

Why is the Council not supporting the school's needs when they are clearly also in the interests of the Council. While rushing to pass a housing development application, the Council don't seem to be looking at the financial implications of running two sites. This is the tab they will have to pick up year on year and with money for school budgets shrinking this should be at the forefront of their decision making.

It is completely possible to build one primary school on the new site. It boils down to the Local Authority simply using their authority. The old site can be sold and developed for homes which would bring in a considerable contribution towards the cost of the build. It may take more time but we have an opportunity to provide a decent school for the future of the city and its growing population and these opportunities are rare. The school is already on its second site and about to have a third, let's not be trying to rebuild a fourth in another 30 years.

We should be fighting to make developers spend more on the education of our children and their future.

The school has prided itself on being a small family type school with excellent results.

There obviously needs to be more places with so many homes being built, but maybe this should have been planned out before the 'go ahead' for so many houses. I now hear there are more flats to be built.

The proposed space for a new school is very small, how much outside play space will it have? I am not happy for my child changing to a junior school that has limited outside space? Or will it be infants? With very little information it is difficult to visualise. When is the first batch of housing meant to be completed? And when will a school be completed? Will it mean my child moves in Year 4/5/6?

I really don't think this has been thought through. It is an afterthought of - due to so many houses being built, a large proportion family homes, where will the kids go.

Could Bathampton Primary be expanded? They have far more land. I genuinely fear for my child's education with so much upheaval and uncertainty.

The expansion by 210 pupils is based on a site provided for 56 pupils.

This has happened because the Local Authority has got the question spectacularly wrong. When the MoD site was developed the Local Authority was provided with just enough land for the pupils generated by the MoD development, not a huge increase of 210 pupils as now proposed.

Why the additional increase of 210? Where did this figure come from?

An expansion incorporating a total of 420 pupils should require 16,000 sq metres. Instead only 7,000 sq metres has been available.

The Local Authority has not explored other options of dispersing pupils across other schools but focussed on the shortcut of radical change to what was an outstanding school. The impracticalities of the site and density of pupil numbers is particularly ill thought out. The plans are not settled or at least not publicly, despite press coverage to the contrary. Parents have not been given proper notice to consult. A meeting was held at the school on the 7 March with consultation closing on the 15 March. How is this democratic and transparent?

At a vote at the 7 March meeting one person of all the parents present supported the proposal, which was noted by the Governors in answer to the question as per paragraph three of the Local Authority's notice.

No single benefit of the proposed development could be put to the meeting on behalf of the Local Authority.

I understand the Local Authority has been invited to participate but declined to do so.

More time is needed. Will the Local Authority provide proper notice? That is at least a month to consult on fuller information with a greater number of parents given the opportunity to respond.

The Governors have written on the 3 March asking the Local Authority for further detail on specific points as yet unanswered.

The Local Authority should fully and properly explore and publish other options and offer a full and transparent consultation period.

Taking an outstanding and much loved school and ruining it with an ill thought out plan which serves nobody. This poor proposal should be fully expanded.

I broadly support the expansion of the school however I do not feel the current proposals that I saw at a meeting at the school are adequate to expand the school to two form entry. The site is too small for a 420 place school. Should build upwards on the existing school site as well as using the land the developer has given to address this.

I am assuming that it is not possible at this stage to do a "land swap" with the developer and get a larger piece of land where a new, taller school with a lift for disabled pupils could be built and houses built on the current site after the school has been completed to avoid disruption?

I live very close to the school and my eldest child very nearly didn't get a place, many people in the same street have been disappointed over the years not to get a place. The next closest undersubscribed school is usually St. Saviours (two miles away). These parents now add to Bath's congestion problems driving across town as there isn't capacity at Bathwick.

This is a once in a generation change, the council tax raised from the new housing will be significant and I suspect the forecast of 55 children will turn out to be too low based on the schools reputation. The Council should invest more to come up with a visionary plan to develop this challenging small site and work with the developer to come up with a better solution so that this won't need looking at again in another 30 years. There is a need for more places in this part of Bath.

I see the need for an extension of Bathwick, particularly with the new homes going in but I have several concerns regarding the proposed new site:

It is too small. It will intake 56 children only, while nearer to 200 places are needed.

There is insufficient outdoor space. Bathwick is already severely underserved for outdoor play space, and the new site and doubling of children comes with no additional space.

It is further along an already narrow, one-way lane, which will be heavily clogged with school traffic and presents a serious danger in the event of a fire emergency or need to evacuate quickly.

We will be forced to have a bigger school on the two pieces of land. We live in a city centre, land is in short supply and pupil numbers are rising.

The best solution is to rebuild a two form entry school on the existing site leaving the new piece of land as a much needed space for games and outdoor activities and a second school access point. It will be more costly which is why they don't want to do it.

This will also keep the school ethos as we know it and the teaching as effective as is has always been.

It will utilise the land much more efficiently because at the moment what is being proposed is inadequate and inferior.

The children can be housed in temporary accommodation on the new land while the old is being redeveloped.

The proposal across two sites is not in the best interests of any children now or in the future. The best solution would be a new school on the existing site to accommodate all the children on one site. This would allow the school to continue the outstanding ethos and sense of community between year groups and sense of unity it has built up and is renowned for. Splitting the school across two sites would greatly impair the school's ability

to maintain the fantastic teaching standards and sense of unity and caring across year groups at the very foundation of the school.

Having two school sites would result in two inadequate schools as neither would have a green space to allow the increased numbers to run around and have on site outdoor sports activities

The Council should be using this opportunity to create a flagship school of excellence to advertise the good the Council can do. They will need to make the most of the green space that is available to it. Outdoor green space and sporting activities is one element of an excellent school that is vitally important and is missing at Bathwick. The school's outdoor area is on different levels and does not have a flat green area allowing for outdoor sports or forest schools and outdoor learning. The opportunity to have a green space in an outstanding inner city school is something the Council would be very short sighted to miss. Existing pupils could be in temporary accommodation on the new green site, whilst the building works are done. This would allow the school to make use of the green site straight away. You could produce something fantastic and maintain the amazing reputation this school already has into the future.

The Council should use this opportunity to produce something outstanding and exemplary and as an example of listening to those it will affect. What is currently proposed across two sites is inadequate and for the sake of all the children now and in future, reconsider the proposal to be on one site and allow Bathwick to build upon its outstanding reputation by making the most of the green space potentially available to it.

After having a meeting with school governors many parents are very concerned. The proposed site for expansion is too small. I have been to Holburne Park to look at their plans. No mention of allocated space for a school, just saying the current site will be expanded. They referred to the Lansdown site which will have a school. What was even more worrying was a green area along the canal towards the swing bridge, being developed in the future, this they were convinced on. The development will be completed by 2019, with 240 homes, 150 being possible where children could live and taking that most homes with kids have two at least, potentially there could be at least 200 kids all to be placed by 2019!! This all seems very unclear.

Please could you respond with possibilities. Can there be a meeting with Holburne Park, the Council and school, please as soon as possible.

I am impressed by the excellence of the educational experience and cautiously welcome the expansion to benefit a wider and larger community, only if funding is in place for the development of a single school on a second adjoining site according to the original vision of expansion, resulting in a new single site school with proportionally increased grounds for recreation and P.E. across the existing site. I passionately oppose the creation of a split site school inadequately served by its buildings and grounds.

Having viewed the feasibility plans, the amount of additional for the expansion has been based on 56 additional children. However, the proposal is to increase by 210. The site is not big enough to accommodate such an increase, would be detrimental to all of the children as there would be far less space per child than at present. Outdoor space is already limited (the children get a coach to another school's playing fields in order for them to hold sports day). Having 210 more children in a space based on 56 children will clearly make this worse.

The ethos of the school is of paramount importance and a significant factor for parents when choosing schools for their children. Currently, all of the children are in one building, meaning that teachers, staff and children from all years know and support each other.

Under the new proposal, the school would be separated over two sites, with less opportunity for infant and junior children and teachers to interact, which would have a negative effect on the school ethos.

It doesn't appear that all other circumstances have been investigated properly, meaning the current proposals have not been fully considered. Other options need to be

investigated further, such as building a new school (which has been the case for other developments in Bath), sharing the expansion among other schools nearby or having one school building that will accommodate all 420 children, with the additional space being used as playground/car parking areas. Whilst the latter option may be more costly in the short term, there may be long term gains (including financial gains by not needing two lots of office, kitchen staff, etc.).

What would be the impact on the local area - access to the new site seems to be limited and would inevitably lead to increased congestion - and there is no detail in the consultation documentation of how this will be dealt with. I would like reassurance that there would be enough space for all children to have a safe emergency evacuation meeting point. It appears that this has not been sufficiently addressed.

I object and request that the current proposal does not go ahead.

We have concerns and objections on the expansion plans. We hope to have many more years to come in this school and the expansion would affect us and our children.

The provision of the additional land could have been a great opportunity to restore environmental assets to the school, the proposed feasibility studies have failed to look creatively at the potential use of this land. The proposed enlargement will not contribute to the children's well-being or outdoor learning. It includes no additional green space, or sports facilities. It would undermine the recreational and leisure activities currently enjoyed and would have an effect on the health, recreational and leisure needs of children.

The Local Authority has not yet worked with the local affected communities - the parents at the school - in order to ensure the social, physical and green infrastructure is improved.

I have grave concerns in relation to the information we have received with regards to the school enlargement.

I am sure you will receive many letters from parents who are concerned and will be quoting regulations, numbers, feasibility studies, health and safety issues, guidelines and traffic issues. I am confident that you will be well aware of these issues and the concerns of parents, teachers, pupils, staff and current and future stakeholders.

It is a fantastic school with a promising future. Many people are frightened of change and risk averse and these recent proposals have not been met with enthusiasm or optimism. I believe that change is a positive thing and can bring great benefit, advancement and further progress. What I do not agree with is how the process has been handled thus far. It seems the Council has given permission for new homes on the premise that land is allocated to allow for pupils to be added to the school. This is now not the case. The land is not big enough and the school is already over-subscribed. It is very popular and the cost of housing in the immediate area is exorbitant. If the Council agreed to the new housing then they should have made arrangements for the new children.

I have checked the prices of the new homes. It is terribly sad that the current trend will be continuing where only wealthy people will have access to an outstanding school.

There is a huge lack of outdoor space and facilities. The school is not a purpose built building – huge improvements can be made if done for the right reasons and to improve the current situation. The current expansion plans will not improve the school and the ethos of the school will be affected. Increasing the number of pupils will exacerbate the already congested roads and school.

Our wonderful school has excellent teaching and support staff, we are fortunate to have such a wonderful team. It is becoming more and more difficult to live and work in Bath. It is sad that we have to recruit staff from outside of our area and city to work at our great school as it is so expensive to live here. B&NES report to be committed to making Bath a better place to work, live and visit - sadly, this is not the case. In reality it is more like:

If you work in Bath, you have to live elsewhere as you don't earn enough to live here. If you live in Bath, you have to work elsewhere to afford to live here. If you are visiting Bath, you only see the "dream" of Bath.

If B&NES was really interested in improving our school for our school, pupils and neighbours it would put forward a plan and proposal that will benefit and not handicap us. There is no more room for additional pupils if we do not have more land.

I consider that we will embrace change but it must benefit our children and future children. B&NES should have this at the heart of its decisions and planning.

I respectfully request that you take all the concerns that have been raised into consideration and address these in a timely manner. We do not like "tail wagging dog" and do not want to be rushed into making decisions without consultation or time to consider the effects on the children and their future.

The proposals are not in the best interests of the current or future children.

The additional land is too small to accommodate an additional 220 children.

The land from the development will provide for an additional 56 places. Adding 220 pupils on to land provided for 56 will compound the existing space issues. The combined sites are of insufficient size to accommodate the total of 440 pupils.

The proposals will adversely impact on the amenity value of the site.

The current site is 5,521 sq metres which provides very limited outside space for the current 224 pupils. The outside space for play, physical education and learning about nature and the environment is fully tarmacked. There is a raised area of undeveloped ground which is a 'contemplation' and 'conservation' area. Much of the year it is deemed too muddy and/or slippery and pupils do not enjoy access to it. The additional site is 2,165 sq metres (including a 'no build area' for drainage of the housing development). Adding this to the current site will total 7,686 sq metres but with 440 children playing in the current outdoor space. This will lead to the space being even more overcrowded, and potentially unsafe from a health and safety perspective. The site recommended for 440 pupils is +16,000 sq metres. This was also stated in the feasibility study: The school is not currently compliant with its outside space and with twice the number of children, play areas are going to be inadequate.

The land given by the developers when combined with the current site does not reach half of the recommended size.

St Saviour's Infant is also a school in a residential area but has plenty of space for play and learning. Each classroom has an outdoor play/learning area as well as the common larger play area, a kitchen garden and forest school area. And this is only for 180 pupils. The outdoor areas offer great opportunities for children to learn about nature and the environment.

Bathwick is fantastic but in comparison to many schools in Bath the outside space for play, physical education and learning is minimal.

Fundamental to the school's ethos, culture and academic success is that it is a compact one school, where infants and juniors meet on a daily basis. Key Stage 1 and 2 pupils learn alongside each other and integrate through playtimes, with additional responsibilities taken on by older children - Year 5 Buddies and Year 6 Blue Hats to support and care for all children.

The proposed development can be seen to be contrary to the Local Authority's Core Strategy. The expansion would not: "enable more opportunities for people to lead healthier lifestyles and have a greater sense of well-being through ... encouraging social interaction and designing high quality, safe ... spaces", "ensure the timely provision of social and physical infrastructure, including health, welfare, spiritual, recreation", "support strong, vibrant and healthy communities".

The Core Strategy emphasises Council working in partnership with adjoining authorities, local communities, relevant agencies and providers to ensure that social, physical and green infrastructure is retained and improved for Communities.

I do not support the current proposals for the expansion - it should be in a single new building, preferably built on the new plot of land, leaving the existing site for outdoor space (perhaps with some sold for development).

This would also allow the existing school building to be used while the new school is built. A split site school (including joined by a long corridor) would be unsatisfactory, hindering the school being a joined-up community.

The current land and space is minimal. This is already an issue - the ability to play is severely affected by being in a crowded playground. The lack of space also affects the amount of sports during PE lessons and after-school clubs.

The land that would be given to the school is very small (provision for 56 pupils). Adding 220 pupils and buildings would compound existing space issues and severely affect the quality of education that the school can provide. The proposed enlargement does not promote the health and well-being of children, nor does it provide more opportunities for them to lead healthier lifestyles. This is not in keeping with the 'Sustainable Community Strategy' which forms part of the Local Authority's Core Strategy.

I strongly object to the school becoming multi-site. This would be contrary to the strong ethos which currently provides a caring, inclusive community environment for children across the year groups. All of my children greatly benefit from the community schemes in place, such as the Blue Hats, the class school councillors, inter-class reading schemes and joint worship times. Having a multi-site school would seriously compromise these successful schemes which staff have worked so hard to implement and build on for many years.

The proposed size of land is not large enough to accommodate an extra 220 pupils in a safe and healthy manner.

I have volunteered in school so have seen how hard it is for children to play in an overcrowded playground in a safe and enjoyable manner.

I often saw younger children bumping into each other and falling on to the hard tarmac.

Complaints from older children that there is not enough space to play, therefore they end up being mean to each other. Ball games and running in the playground are limited.

The importance of play is well known. A development proposal that only takes into consideration classroom space and not outdoor recreation space is unacceptable.

In addition to the lack of play space, I object to the lack of information regarding access and parking.

The current access is chaos in the morning and unsafe. The proposed development does not explain how it is going to accommodate the increased traffic and parking. It will be argued that it is a community school and children should walk but this is unrealistic based on daily before and after school demands.

The proposed enlargement of the school does not promote health and wellbeing for current and future children of the school and is unacceptable.

A proposal needs to be put forward that takes into consideration the needs of the children and the community.

We strongly believe the major reason for the current school's success is that it is one school, where infants and juniors meet daily and infants enjoy support from juniors and daily collective worships create a unique sense of connection, mutual support and responsibility. Separating infants and juniors will destroy the school's heart and spirit, it will not be the same and will impact the school's main culture and ethos and its academic success and will violate the fundamental principles of the Christian Foundation of the school.

We don't object to the idea of expansion in general, but it should be without a violation of the principle of one school, which implies a bigger space for collective worship, kitchen, dining hall, sufficient space for outdoor activities etc. Given the current limitations of the proposed additional grounds and connections with the present school site, the realisation of one school could be very challenging in terms of planning and financial costs.

The most important long-term asset of the school and community is the intangible of having infants and juniors in the same area. Breaking this structure will certainly

undermine the probability of reaching “Outstanding” in the future, criteria well quoted by the local authority in all documentation.

Expanding the school to 420 will have serious implications to local and national children health targets such as obesity levels.

In its Sustainable Community Strategy, in relation to the SCS Driver ‘Inequalities’, the Local Authority’s objective is to “Plan for development that promotes health and well-being: [including]:

- enabling more opportunities for people to lead healthier lifestyles and have a greater sense of well-being through ... encouraging social interaction and designing high quality, safe ... spaces.

- ensuring the timely provision of social and physical infrastructure, including health, welfare, spiritual, recreational.”

Core Policy 6.02a states: “Sustainability Principles. Central to national planning policy is the presumption in favour of sustainable development. The Council is committed to help achieve sustainable development and will give favourable consideration to proposals which will contribute towards ... the prudent use of natural resources and which mitigate and adapt to climate change; and which support strong, vibrant and healthy communities. This approach is embodied in Policy SD1 and is reflected in all policies in the Core Strategy and planning decisions made by the Council.”

It goes on in CP6: “The Council will promote the management, conservation, enhancement or restoration of environmental assets.”

The proposed enlargement fails to support strong, vibrant and healthy communities. The provision of the Holburne Park site could have been an opportunity to restore environmental assets to the school, instead the feasibility studies have failed to look creatively at the potential use of this land. The proposed enlargement will fail to contribute to the children’s well-being, or to their outdoor learning as it includes no additional green space or sports facilities.

Core Policy 6.95 states: ‘The approach also follows on from the five key goals of the emerging Joint Local Transport Plan (JLTP3), which are: Reduce carbon emissions; Support economic growth; Promote accessibility; Contribute to better safety, security and health; Improve quality of life and a healthy natural environment.’

The proposed enlargement would in no way contribute to improved quality of life of a single or future child at the school and would fail to achieve a healthy natural environment for the children.

Core Policy 6.106 states: ‘The Council will also work with partners and in partnership with local communities to ensure that adequate and accessible provision is made for the health, welfare, faith, recreational, leisure and cultural needs of existing and future communities and neighbourhoods in B&NES.’

The proposed enlargement would undermine the current recreational and leisure activities currently enjoyed by the children and would have a seriously detrimental effect on the health, recreational and leisure needs of both current and future children living in Bathwick.

Core Policy 13 states: ‘The Council will work in partnership with adjoining authorities, local communities and relevant agencies and providers to ensure that social, physical and green infrastructure is retained and improved for Communities.”

It is hoped that the Local Authority will take note of these objections in order to ensure that the social, physical and green infrastructure is improved for the current and future children of Bathwick.

The proposed enlargement contravenes the LA’s Core Strategy in relation to the Local Authority’s objective to “Plan for development that promotes health and well-being”.

There are health and safety issues related to increased congestion and hazardous emissions from increased stationary traffic on the A36.



New places will also attract interest from afar and car transport will be the most popular means of transport.

There has not been a formalized procedure where parents and the community feel they have been properly consulted.

Lack of consultation with members of the public, parents and children.

The Local Authority has published a proposal to enlarge the school, but the details of the feasibility studies undertaken and provided to the Governors in January/February have been disseminated to the public alongside this proposal. Nor are there any details about the size of the additional land. The proposal and any consultation undertaken on the basis of it, is therefore woefully incomplete and inadequate.

This lack of information provided to members of the public or parents undermines the 'consultation' undertaken by the Local Authority.

We object to the expansion of the school into a two site school, as set out in the current feasibility plans, and feel very strongly that this will severely damage the school and the quality of the children's' education.

We'd like to see Bathwick remain as is - as a single site school, with no further development and if this is not possible, for the Council to allocate a proper budget and build a two form entry school on the existing site, leaving the new piece of land as a much needed space for games and outdoor activities.

There are serious health and safety concerns about increasing the numbers accessing the school from the A36 – it is a through route for HGVs with particularly heavy traffic at school drop off and pick up times. The pavement on the South side of the A36 is inadequately narrow and any increase in children crossing the road raises serious safety concerns. Also much noise both in the play area and the school and this is not advised for children.

The enlargement will have an adverse impact on the safety and well-being of children - children as young as four may have to make their way along a 'walkway' from the upper to the lower site to access a potentially overcrowded playground on the current site.

The additional pupils will render the site unsafe in the event of a fire on either site.

Additional children would significantly curtail the space onto which they could be moved in the event of a fire and be unable to move away from the buildings sufficiently to be provided with a 'place of safety' as required by s. 4(1)(a) of the Regulatory Reform (Fire Safety) Order 2005, SI 2005/1541). This would be of particular concern for the children in the buildings on the Holburne Park site. This would undoubtedly contravene any kind of health and safety assessment in relation to this matter.

From a health and safety perspective this might even exclude pupils with a physical disability from access to the Holburne Park site, as they would be unable to easily access it and for playtimes or in the event of fire, to access the current lower site.

The school might have to accommodate pupils with physical disabilities separately from their peers. This would amount to indirect discrimination as they would be unable adequately to integrate with their peers.

Having had access to the plans it is evident that this would mean expanding the school until it has doubled its intake, yet there is no provision for extra outside space. This has serious health and safety implications and is not in the best interests of the child. To essentially halve the outside space would deprive pupils of space that is essential for their development and overall wellbeing.

This is clearly a plan with an economic motive. It is frustrating that these issues were not considered before the Council agreed to allow the building of several luxury town houses. Particularly as the original plans of homes for affordable living have been abandoned.

I urge that these plans be reconsidered with appropriate provision made for extra outside space. The pupils' interests have currently not been carefully enough considered.

I have several reasons for doubting that the expansion will in any way benefit children who are already there. I can see benefits only for children who do not yet even live in this area but whose parents are destined to buy houses in the new development.

My main objection is the reduction to outside space which is already insufficient. All existing parents know this and lament it regularly. Most pay for extra curricular sports activities to compensate for this massive shortfall in an otherwise excellent school. Increasing numbers whilst not increasing the outside space would make it untenable and undesirable for us as a family and many others. Many outdoor activities become more and more popular and sport is promoted, yet the problem of childhood obesity grows. Whilst we are told that kids must get out more, somehow it seems acceptable to the Local Authority to even consider further reducing space at Bathwick that is already inadequate. The school is in danger of going seriously out of fashion and if it also loses its appeal for being small and caring, I would fear for the future of it.

Although I am not against expansion of the school in principle, the proposals presented would see numbers increased far in excess of the number that standards dictate can be accommodated by the extra land. The proposal is plainly inadequate and will have a detrimental effect on the children - affording even less outside space per head than they have now, and worsen the already strained access.

I object to the proposals presented and urge the Council to either seek alternative solutions to benefit teachers, pupils and parents of the school, or abandon the scheme. We do not agree with a split site, with a 1.5 form entry or with a reduction in outside space (which is already a cause to move our children to a different school, if we had the choice); none of these things are in the best interests of our children and we have not been shown sufficient due diligence to think otherwise. We have fundamental questions about several issues and therefore we are presently not in a position to support expansion. However, like the Governing Body, we are not actively opposed but seek further clarity so that an informed view can be taken to properly analyse the benefits to the children against the wider responsibility to meet the increasing need for school places. It is only in the event that the Local Authority can satisfy us, the parents, that the unique character of our school will not be compromised and the welfare and educational needs of the children can continue to be met at the outstanding level the staff work so hard to provide for them presently, that we will support any plan for expansion.

A detrimental effect on the culture and ethos of the school by splitting across two sites. I am extremely concerned by the possible impact of the current plans on the school. I cannot support the current plans and would ask for other options to be considered either on the Bathwick site or at other schools in the area such as Bathampton.

I strongly object to the current proposal because the additional area of land adjacent to the school site that has been allocated for the purpose of expansion is too small. The existing site is already cramped and the additional area allocated for expansion only approximately one third of the area of the existing site. I think that the proposed expansion would have an extremely adverse effect on the education of pupils as well as on the morale of staff and all those connected with the school.

If the scale of the expansion was reduced to, for example, a Planned Admission Number of 45, this would inevitably result in split year classes which would adversely affect the education of pupils and the ethos of the school.

The topography of the expanded school would almost inevitable lead to a split site dividing the school and fundamentally changing the school's character.

I am also strongly opposed to any construction works that would disrupt the continued operation of the school and education of children.

The extra land is not only on a steep slope but a third of it is a 'no build zone' for drainage. It is considerably higher than the existing site and only joined by a small slither of land. None of these factors make this land easy to build on or utilise effectively. The Council has already granted planning for the houses on Holburne Park which literally border the

site reserved for the school. They have made no provision for highway access so a large swathe of the area will have to be taken from the school site for vehicular access. This should have been taken into consideration by the Council when planning was first submitted by the developers.

The feasibility plans produced by the Council only serve the purpose of showing how to build a mediocre and inadequate school to save the Council's purse with no positive outcome for the school whatsoever and it is a totally uneconomical use of the space to build a two site school. Overall what is now an outstanding school would inevitably suffer as a consequence based on the present proposals.

However, the population is growing and that means extra places need to be found. The only way 420 pupils could possibly be housed on a site so small is through good design. It is a golden opportunity to look at the wider possibilities to create an inspiring place for our children to be educated. Space can be maximised by building higher on several levels, grass roofs can create extra playing space, prefabricated pods/classrooms could be designed to reduce build time on site, solar panels could be incorporated for sustainability the possibilities are endless and of course if it is a sustainable school then the Council's purse will benefit too.

Children can be put into temporary classrooms as long as it is well thought out and planned, they could even be included in the design and build process to make it an education for them. It could be a very positive experience for everyone.

If this is going to work at all it will require a good architect and a good budget. I think then and only then could the school even consider the expansion.

It is of primary concern that the unique character of Bathwick should not be compromised. The welfare and educational needs of the children must continue to be met at the outstanding level the staff work so hard to provide. If this is shown to be the case then we understand the Governing Body will support any plan for expansion.

There are clearly benefits to expanding however the circumstances (budget, size of land, sufficient allocation for play and outdoor areas) under which this can happen must be considered against the current ethos and high standards of this excellent school.

The principle reason for my objection is the proposal to enlarge the school by 210 places when only land sufficient for 55/56 children has been made available. When we selected the school for our child we loved every aspect of the school with the exception that there is too little outdoor space. Good outdoor playing areas including playing fields are very important in encouraging children to be active and enjoy sports which, undoubtedly, lead to better physical and mental health. The proposal to extend the school without providing sufficient land will clearly reduce the amount of outdoor space per pupil. Where we continuously hear about the risks of obesity and the need to exercise more, the idea of reducing significantly the outdoor space should not be countenanced.

There are numerous issues with trying to squeeze too many children into this small space. For example, access to the site is already difficult, at pick up and drop off time the road to the school is already busy. On cold and wet days it becomes dangerous. Doubling the number of pupils is not going to just double the problem, access routes are already fully utilised so it will surely lead to big issues, possibly leading to daily tailbacks on the A36 and affecting non-school related journeys.

I would request that B&NES consider expanding Bathwick by an amount commensurate with the additional land made available i.e. 55/56 places (potentially rounded up to two classes of 30 children each). If three or four other schools were also able to add one or two classes then together they will meet the requirement for 210 places.

My children will be largely unaffected by the plans as they would have moved to secondary schools - I am commenting as someone with no real vested interest.

The need for expansion is clear, however I cannot think how it could be doubled on the existing site. The school footprint is already very small. The hall is unable to accommodate all parents etc. who wish to see the children in school plays for example, there is very

limited outdoor space, the library is tiny. Drop off and pick up for those who do not live close enough to walk or need to drive from work is extremely difficult as there are only four spaces for parents for the entire school and in a tight cul de sac with a builders yard in it any increase in traffic would make a very difficult congested road impossible to use for parents and residents alike.

A geographically split site seems wrong for this school. The thought of primary age children walking between sites, with all the palaver of outer wear and staff needed to supervise 30 small children seems obviously something to avoid.

There would also be the difficulty for parents with children in different schools. How would pick-ups be managed? At drop off, there would be even more traffic congestion with parents shuttling between sites.

The only sensible solution would be to build a multi-level school on the new site. I'm not clear on the size of the second site, but if it doesn't have a decent amount of outdoor space, perhaps the current site could be used for much needed junior school sports grounds and/or parking space.

These plans directly affect us, as our child is due to start Reception in 2019.

We understand the reasons that the school needs to expand: the school is already over-subscribed and the new development is only going to add to this. School places are limited throughout the city, so it seems sensible to have a plan to expand the number of places locally at an excellent school.

However, the school currently has a very caring and inclusive ethos, which we feel is likely to be compromised by expansion with separate sites for infants and juniors. With both children attending the same school in the future, we would not want them to be divided into separate buildings on different sites. We feel that the flow and interaction between the children (and staff) is vitally important - as the sites would be on different levels, it seems impossible for this to work.

The plans show that the new development is significantly smaller than the current site, which already has limited outdoor space. Such a small space would adversely affect the children in their play and development. Not to mention other practical issues, such as parking and access to the site in general. This plan would be detrimental to the school.

The obvious plan seems for a new double sized school on the extra land, so the ethos of the school is maintained, the current site can still be used while the new site is developed and then be redesigned for important outdoor play space/parking etc.

We already face issues crossing the busy A36 opposite the back gate. There is no crossing facility, despite the huge volume of traffic and heavy high speed lorries. We have put forward our views to the Council about this before, but to no avail. The expansion of the school will only add to the volume of traffic - this must be addressed. There is an accident waiting to happen.

Whilst I recognise the need for more places in the area and that in principle it is desirable to expand Bathwick to the extent that there is space to do so, there is not space to double pupil numbers. The school now is not compliant with the BB103 guidelines because there is insufficient outside space. The proposed changes would exacerbate this enormously.

The wish to create extra places at an 'outstanding' school is understandable but to keep it 'outstanding' extra space and facilities must be provided in proportion to the extra numbers, and it must remain an attractive school for teachers to teach in and for children to attend. This entails it having a large enough school hall, kitchen facilities, teacher staff room and staff parking facilities as well as sufficient classroom and play space and being designed appropriately, to support the pupil numbers.

Peak traffic along Darlington Road is already severely congested and at times dangerous. Vehicular access to the Holburne Park development does not appear to have been designed to take into account school traffic to the new site.

The school setting is already small and doubling the intake requires a proportional increase in space. I would be worried about health and safety issues with so many children locked in a small space, in particular in the event of a fire.

I do not oppose doubling the intake if the space provision is adequate. Yet, this is not at all met in the current proposal, so I support keeping the school at its current size.

I do not support the expansion as outlined in the proposal document. I believe children learn best in a smaller setting and a double-form entry with 420 pupils is simply too large to cater to the needs of children as young as four.

It would be far better to take the model of the existing school and apply it to a new purpose built one using the resources for the proposed expansion. This would provide more places in a smaller intimate setting and ensure that existing pupils are not in any way harmed. For instance, building works are sure to be disruptive and expansion would not mean all facilities are improved - it is unlikely that a larger school hall, play ground or sports facilities would be included. Expansion must inevitably be a negative on the experiences of existing pupils. I fail to see how any new site adjacent to the existing site can be seamlessly integrated - at the very least there is a need for a significant number of steps which is far from ideal with young children.

It has been suggested that a bigger school might offer increased possibilities. Any such advantage can be obtained by closely co-ordinating the activities of the two schools so that is a very poor reason to proceed with the expansion. The proposed expansion is poorly thought out and the objective of providing more places as a high quality school can be more appropriately delivered in other ways.

There are many issues we feel the Local Authority have not addressed adequately. The school would require £8.5 million to make this a viable project - it would make far more sense for there to be one building on the current site and to use the extra land as fields and outside space. The plans are not viable.

It seems that infant and junior pupils would be on different sites and this would have an extremely adverse effect on the education of pupils as well as on the morale of staff and all those connected with the school. This would be against the ethos that underpins the school activity.

I also think that other aspects, such as access to the school, car park and fire safety, have not been given enough attention and should be better analysed.

Having had the feasibility studies shared with us at a school meeting I am very worried that the current plans are woefully inadequate. The main and immovable issue seems to be the size of the overall site and while this cannot be changed the plans are simply unworkable.

I have shared a google document which has been drawn up by a number of similarly concerned parents at the school and attach it as part of my response.

A 210 place new build or extension will impact on the external school facilities, probably resulting in a disjointed school with excessive circulation requirements for pupils and staff. Existing circulation spaces around the building are minimal and new accommodation may have an impact on this for pupils, staff and the emergency services.

The road access is from a difficult junction leading along a narrow lane to a small turning/drop off area.

Access to the school is poor for large construction works.

The school will probably not be able to operate safely during the period of the works.

The obvious tension between land for 55 places when an additional 210 are proposed on a site already insufficient in terms of external space for current numbers.

The decision making power of parents is really dependent on the weight and direction of responses to the online consultation. It is hoped that the parental responses will be central to the Local Authority's direction of travel after the close of the consultation. This was the purpose of the meeting on 7 March, the availability of the feasibility studies in school this week and this brief report.

The school currently operates as a single school on a single site. This enables children of all ages to interact and support each other. This system encourages older children to show responsibility towards younger pupils and gives the younger children a support system separate from the staff and adults. This is a key part of the school ethos and I would only be able to support an expansion on a single site. Current plans show that a split site would be the only option feasible with the current land offered.

We chose Bathwick specifically because it is a single form entry. My child is quiet and we felt they would flourish in a smaller school community. It is a benefit to have a mix of school sizes in the area so that there is an option of choosing a smaller school.

The ability for children to play, communicate, socialise and learn outside the classroom is essential to enable them to grow into sociable and well-rounded young adults. Outside space is already limited and to reduce that further will be detrimental to education.

The Council appears to have no plans as to how the issues of access to the site and road safety will be managed.

Apparent lack of consideration of alternatives - the school has effectively been offered an expansion plan which appears to have been put together with no forethought or long term strategic planning and neither the school nor the parents were offered the opportunity for meaningful consultation.

We had a meeting with the Head Teacher last week and could see the expansion plan.

The play area and conservation are very important because it's the only time they can be exposed to a little Vitamin D. In the new plan there would be half the space compared to now. Other schools like Bathampton or St Stephen's have a huge area for play and sports. We chose this school because it is little and outstanding. The school will become really noisy and we do not think can attain the same standard.

The UN Convention on the Rights of the Child stipulates children's rights to be healthy, treated *fairly* (including changing laws and practices that are unfair on children) and to be heard (including considering their views).

Article 3 provides that: "In all actions concerning children, whether undertaken by public or private social welfare institutions, courts of law, administrative authorities or legislative bodies, the best interests of the child shall be a primary consideration."

In 2004, the *Children Act 2004* was enacted. This provides, in what is for this case its most material of its provision, that: "Arrangements to safeguard and promote welfare" Each person and body to whom this section applies must make arrangements for ensuring that - their functions are discharged having regard to the need to safeguard and promote the welfare of children; ... ."

It is clear that the health and well-being of children at Bathwick is a key material consideration and that the Council has a legal duty to have regard to the need to safeguard and promote the welfare of children and to act in their best interests (UN Convention and Children Act 2004).

It has been calculated that the Holburne Park development will generate 56 pupils. The developers have provided a plot of land that has been calculated as meeting their contribution for these pupils. The Local Authority has since issued a notice to enlarge the school by 210 places. No land in addition to the above land is being proposed. The Local Authority has produced two feasibility studies for adding 210 children to the current site which propose building on the Holburne Park site which is higher than the current site. We do not feel that the Local Authority has adequately satisfied the Governing Body that the character and outstanding ethos of the school will not be compromised.

We are unconvinced that the welfare of children and the educational provision would continue to be met at the outstanding levels currently provided.

The current model integration of infant and junior pupils - both in formal and informal contexts - is fundamental to the school's ethos, outstanding academic standards and pastoral care. Splitting the site would impact upon how this could be managed and sustained. This outstanding feature of the school was central to our choice for our child.

Expanding the school to dual form entry given the current restricted site will result in an unacceptable impact on the health and wellbeing of the children.

The additional site area is inadequate for the building of a new school for 420 pupils. The remaining option is to split the school over two sites or re-develop the existing site. Both options will lead to significant disruption while work is carried out, which is unacceptable.

### **Parents and Local Residents:**

I strongly object to the proposals and the way the whole process has been communicated. Looking at the proposal online as well as the feasibility studies I am shocked at how the education of our children is addressed by our local council.

While understanding the need for places, this should not be detached from a clear vision that includes the school's physical learning spaces. The school community must be at the heart of any proposals that are put forward by the Council. At present the school with a clearly successful and strong pedagogical position has been ignored when developing the possible proposals. The school and its community must be part of any schemes to ensure that the proposals add richness to the learning experiences and provide a physical learning environment that stimulates relationships and a sense of society, belonging and happiness in line with the school vision. At present, what is being put forward to the school does completely the opposite, erasing any ethos, culture or identity that could lead to the heights of academic achievement.

I don't personally object to an extension, but I strongly object to what has been proposed and how, as it could destroy a school ethos that has benefited the academic achievement of pupils for many years.

We have examined the feasibility studies, attended a parents' meeting regarding the potential expansion in future and considered the proposals that were put forward and object on the following grounds:

The need to use a walkway to link the two sites could be discriminatory against children with physical disabilities.

As local residents we are very aware of the dangers of traffic from parent's cars at pick up and drop off times to our children - an expansion to 420 children would exacerbate this issue.

The consultation process has been inadequate. We do not feel we have been given sufficient time or information to assess the proposals properly.

We are not against expansion per se, however it appears that the additional land allocated is insufficient for a two form entry school.

The changes would result in increased car traffic along Darlington Road. There are already too many cars at drop off and pick up, resulting in congestion, pollution and possible danger to pedestrians.

Insufficient information has been provided regarding the size of the additional land, what new buildings would be built and how the school would be structured. This makes it impossible to make judgements.

Is the additional land allocation based on the size needed for the additional 56 places from the new development or for the proposed extra 210 places?

In principle, we would support a single site proposal with additional land being provided for play and sport and safe provision being made for increased car access. There seems to be a wonderful opportunity to provide an imaginative shared play/sporting space for the school and the new community that would enhance both. Currently, the plans for the new development and the existing school lack outdoor space.

### **Local Resident:**

I fully appreciate that development is needed. My email is seeking to help ensure your plans do not have an adverse impact on the health and safety and well-being of all that live in the vicinity of the school and also on children and parents.

I am very concerned that in the absence of any firm and sufficient traffic control proposals, expansion will exacerbate the already existing congestion along Darlington Road, increasing road safety hazards.

Cars park along Darlington Road and on the pavement before school pick up, which is illegal, but this is now the norm to allow vehicle movement along the narrow road.

Because cars park on the pavement it means that pedestrians have to walk through a narrower gap or use the main Darlington Road, which raises significant safety concerns.

Cars often park on the double yellow lines on Darlington Road - which is a parking offence, but as the road is congested this has again become a norm.

When the recycling lorry comes to service the road, if this coincides with the picking up and dropping off then chaos will prevail.

Emery's are considering developing their old yard which will also add to congestion and safety concerns.

We need to ensure our environment is safe and sustainable but the present plans provide no information on how traffic is going to be managed.

As a responsible Local Authority who faces a number of challenges I would urge B&NES to listen to our concerns and ensure any proposals are fit for purpose and do not adversely impact on the safety and well-being of residents.

I object purely on the grounds of increased traffic on Darlington Road restricting my access to my own home in the 20 minutes before school and 30 minutes around close time and the safety of children/people using this road to access the school.

Specifically, parents rushing to drop off park on the yellow zig zag lines blocking access.

Only one side of Darlington Road has a footpath which is not wide enough when parents with children going to school meet those leaving, meaning people have to walk on the road or at least step off the pavement.

Adding 210 places will at least double the number of children in cars and as many will come from further away it is reasonable to assume that disproportionately more will be dropped off by car.

If traffic reduction measures could be introduced such as making the street "residents and goods delivery only", these effects could be mitigated and the risk of injury to children reduced, in which case I would welcome the expansion.

Please take notice the traffic on this street is already dangerous to children, expansion without dealing with this risks injury.

### **School Governor:**

I am writing to voice my concerns. There is a need to expand the school as it is regularly over-subscribed and the local population is due to increase, in part due to the housing development at Holburne Park. However I have a number of concerns about the proposals that have been put forward.

The lack of a school hall large enough to for all children plus some parents and staff:

A strength of the school is its sense of community and the way that it celebrates children's achievements. These strengths are fostered by the school coming together regularly for collective worships and assemblies, some of which are open to parents.

Movement of children between the proposed two buildings:

The proposed 'walkway' between the two buildings should be weather-proofed. If children have to put on coats this will result in the reduction of teaching time and require addition cloakrooms/coat storage in what are already very confined buildings. It should also provide level access for children with mobility issues.

Lack of outdoor space:

The current school makes great use of its small and very steep outdoor space. Doubling the number of children and reducing the outdoor space would be detrimental.

Access to the school buildings:



The proposals show that Darlington Road would remain as the only vehicular access to the school. Doubling the number of children would increase the number of staff, visitors, parents and deliveries needing access to the school. Darlington Road is already unsuitable for the traffic the school currently generates. Creating more traffic would cause more congestion and safety issues.

Lack of car parking space for staff:

Staff will frequently be carrying heavy loads to and from school - if they are unable to park nearby it is likely to have a detrimental effect on staff morale and could cause difficulties in recruiting staff.

### **Staff:**

I object to the proposed plans to enlarge the school over two sites joined by a walkway. I am aware of the increasing need for places, especially with new housing developments but I am concerned about the impact on the ethos of the school, the supportive nature and 'togetherness' of the whole school which is so valued by staff, parents and children, the physical and practical questions raised by a new building and on the educational impact on children as a result of an expansion over two sites.

Ethos - as a church school we meet regularly as a whole school for collective worship - the current hall would not be sufficient for this to happen. If it were to be enlarged considerable learning time would be lost walking between the two sites so regularly.

I feel our Christian ethos, family feeling and feeling of unity and solidarity will disappear if we are split over two sites. This is one of the reasons I believe that Bathwick has maintained its outstanding reputation for so long. The current hall would not enable us to have lunches as a social and important part of the day. We could not have role models for Key Stage 1 with Key Stage 2 working as buddies and support in the playground. Staff would not be able to see each other as regularly and have shared dialogue regarding children's learning and progress. Being on two different sites (albeit joined by a walkway) will cause challenges in communication and interaction between both staff and children, and families across the school. Relationships across the school community would suffer. Educational - I am concerned about the amount of learning time which will be lost walking either infants or juniors over a long sloped walkway for collective worships, lunchtimes, access to the library, music room, additional learning resource rooms and the ICT suite.

If this walkway is not enclosed huge amounts of learning time will be lost repeatedly putting on and taking off coats, especially for the very young for whom this takes time.

The walkway concerns me in regards to its sloping nature and distance. With a child already in our school with reduced mobility I am concerned as to the inclusive nature of the school and access for children with additional needs. Will they have to leave earlier to navigate between the two sites? Again a loss of precious learning time. I am concerned that infants are going to lose their role models in the school, currently they are learning alongside Key Stage 2 children in shared areas, outdoor areas and moving around the building. If the school was to be split these vital role models and friendships between the oldest and youngest in our school community would be very hard to maintain and see flourishing naturally as they are now. Currently the Headteacher, deputy, SENDCO and head of key stages are all very visible within the school with regularly communication and conversations daily between staff. I worry how this incredibly high level of communication about children and their progress would happen. Shared knowledge about children and families would be increasingly challenging and I believe children's education would suffer. I am concerned about the financial impact of having to duplicate resources, systems and functions. Already working on a tight budget I am concerned we are going to be struggling to provide some basic education needs while we try to resource new classrooms and learning areas to a basic standard. Will additional funding be provided for this?

I am concerned about the heart of the school being lost - where would the main entrance be? Where will the offices be placed? All of these having an impact and losing the shared

problems, knowledge of staff, shared staff morale, shared friendships with staff and children over key stages, shared friendships with children over key stages. We are proud to educate the whole child - and I believe that an outstanding element of the education we are providing, the social and emotional development of children, will be impacted negatively.

Practical - we are currently stretched to the limit with staff car parking and visitors (including external agencies providing educational support for our children) regularly cannot park or staff have to move cars to block others in. Where will we accommodate all of the new staff cars? Traffic along Darlington Road is extremely busy at drop off and pick up times with parents often being late due to parking issues. How will this road cope with traffic for 420 children? How will families with children in both Key Stages manage the collection and drop off with such a long distance between the sites. Will the walkway be sufficient to enable movement of families to and from each part of the school? How would the current building be modified to include resources for 420 children? E.g. library of sufficient size, ICT suite, kitchen, hall. The current staffroom would not enable all staff to meet together. Would there be another staff room built and where? Or the current one extended?

Vehicle access and staff car parking at the site is not adequate for the numbers of staff, parents and delivery vehicles which a two-form entry school needs.

Walkway linking two sites will mean time will be lost by staff and pupils - teaching, playing and working. Moving small children in all weathers under a covered walkway is not ideal. Assembly hall and staff room sizes are questionable for whole-school and staff provision. Playground areas are less than ideal for 420 children and their playtime supervisors. I am in favour of local children attending local schools but feel these plans are not in the best interests of the pupils and creating a split-site is less than ideal. I feel too large an establishment is being squeezed into two small plots and that the children deserve more space and a better solution.

In the best interests of children and staff, I am not in a position to currently support expansion. I am not actively opposed to expansion, but I will only be able to support the 420 place school if the Local Authority can satisfy the Governing Body that the school's unique character will not be compromised and the welfare and educational needs of the children can continue to be met at the outstanding level the staff work so hard to provide. A non-exhaustive list of concerns that need addressing is as follows:

A traffic solution designed so the increase in traffic both on and off the school site is carefully managed to ensure the safety of children, parents and the wider community.

Enough land provided to ensure the outdoor playing space provided in relation to the proposed number of children is increased from the current space available, not decreased. Enough land provided so an appropriate amount of car parking is available.

Collective internal areas including an assembly hall and staff room could be of an appropriate size to facilitate the smooth running of the school.

I object to the proposal. The size of the additional land is too small to accommodate the extra children. The current site is already small, with limited outdoor space and the proposed enlargement seems to show even less outdoor space. This would be detrimental to the children as outdoor space is vital for healthy outdoor play. More outdoor space needs to be provided, preferably including a grassed area for sports as well as hard play. It would also be difficult for the children to gather safely outside in the event of a fire, given the limited space.

The proposal envisages the school enlarging into two separate sites linked by a covered corridor - a single site would be preferable. A highly valued aspect of the school is the interaction which takes place daily between Key Stage 1 and 2 children, which means all children feel they belong to one school. A split site would make it much harder for the school to maintain this, particularly if the children would not all be able to gather in the hall.

Access to the school is down a narrow road, so any increased car use would make it much harder for children to walk to school safely.

**Future Parent:**

I am interested in finding out more about the plans to double the size of the school, as my child is due to attend the school within the next two years. When are the plans going to be in place and which year intake of students will be affected?

**Other Interested Parties:**

I am writing to send my full support for the proposed expansion of Bathwick. The Council has correctly identified a need for additional primary school places in this part of Bath, which is undergoing significant population increase due to new housing development. Many new families are entering the existing housing stock, as the demographics of the area changes.

The school is an ideal candidate for expansion, due to its high quality of teaching and occupies a good location due to the opportunity to use s106 funding and land made available at the adjacent housing development. I hope that the Council and the school will proceed with the expansion on the proposed timescale.

I have been most impressed with the successful introduction to school life, with its excellent ethos and successful organisation. It is difficult to understand how the Local Authority has concluded that an overly small, split site would be of benefit to these pupils' future education and wellbeing, when it would inevitably become so obviously overcrowded and fragmented. Apart from the inherent safety issues, such an establishment would force considerable numbers of children (described in detail in the Parents' Association document) into grossly insufficient space and the existing pleasant outdoor recreational and learning areas would be filled with mobile classrooms with all the logistical problems this entails. This would be a great loss. Having taught in some schools where this frequently occurred, I believe it is to be avoided where possible, certainly when there is an opportunity with sensitive planning to start afresh.

With a new housing estate of the size anticipated, the number of children expected (which is often exceeded) should warrant a totally new school on a site still to be sought out, meeting all the criteria. In the meantime places for newcomers will have to be found elsewhere, leaving Bathwick to operate as successfully as at present.

I must register my objection to the proposal as outlined in the collated points circulated by some parents from the school.

As a past teacher at several primary schools in the past, the detrimental effects of split sites, use of mobile classrooms, crowded parental access and inadequate school grounds are well known to me. School ethos is very difficult to maintain on split sites, especially if hall provision is inadequate for the entire population. Even when it is available, time lost by transits of staff and pupils becomes significant over the year. My 400+ pupils had to endure two shifts for assemblies and other functions. The change was palpable when the new building allowed the entire school to function as Bathwick does today. To reverse this seems an error.

The split-site separated infants from juniors so integrated curriculum arrangements and even school identity, was difficult to organise. Movements along a public highway were of concern and parents had additional problems when delivering or collecting pupils at two locations. Arrival and departure arrangements for 400+ pupils with the busy A36 and cul-de-sac Darlington Road as access points will be exceedingly difficult. On the Warminster Road adult and pupil safety will be an even bigger concern. Unless space can be found for a school to house all pupils under one roof, in my opinion the status quo should remain.

### **Unknown Relationship to the School:**

Please log my support to expand - please consider ensuring that all pupils have better access to playing fields and outdoor learning space and that all communities in the Bathwick area, including new housing, have access to local school places.

Regarding the forthcoming development at Holburne Park incorporating the enlargement of Bathwick, may I suggest that the Councillors get out and spend at least an hour on the Warminster Road and see for themselves the volume of traffic now. What will it be like when 240 homes with no doubt two cars each are occupied, let alone the incredible number of cars delivering children - you, in your wisdom, will have created an incredible and ridiculous situation. Where will the enlargement be? Will there be a sports field? A playground? Have you actually thought this through or just looked at plans?

We note the proposed expansion of Bathwick St Mary School with interest. We applaud the decision to expand the school and offer increasing numbers of children the 'Outstanding' education that the school currently provides. We do, however, have serious reservations about the proposed new building:

The limited amount of land making the number of pupils per square metre even more concentrated than at present. There is very limited outside play space - the new combined site would mean even less.

Access to the school is going to be even more restricted with increased numbers of children and staff travelling to an already overly congested road.

The plans would 'break up' the school - separating the infants and juniors, providing no single area for group assembly. This goes against the ethos of the school and the governing body have described this as essential in all discussions.

I'm sure there will be many other similar concerns and urge the Local Authority to consider all concerns seriously and come up with a suitable plan that will meet both the needs of the school staff and pupils and the needs of the local population.

Granted, there needs to be expansion of places in Bath and Bathwick is a candidate for change but I believe the way this plan has been evolved is deeply flawed.

Three years ago there were three options on the table. The third and least viable was the one the previous Headteacher said he would never support - expanding numbers at the expense of the quality of provision for existing and future pupils, a cramped after thought of leftovers.

The failure of the current plan is due to inadequate outdoor space for the already restricted site.

The statutory Early Years Foundation Stage Curriculum places strong emphasis on the importance and value of daily outdoor experiences for learning and development. Children as young as four will not be provided the basics of sound learning if this plan goes ahead. Educationalists are aware of the importance of healthy lifestyle choices at a critical developmental age and beyond. New Reception children will have benefitted up to that point from a focus on outdoor activity - but what then? Start school at four to find those days are over? And there is nothing but an over-crowded concrete playground?

Bath, Bathwick in particular, supports an affluent cohort many of whom move here to raise and educate their children due to the exemplary success of its state schools. Are the Local Authority seriously prepared to gamble with that reputation?

The inevitable expansion needs to go back to the drawing board and find a way to ensure that progress is not at the expense of local children - both those now and in the future. We should be investing in their health and well-being and the quality of their school experience. Not taking away their space and freedom because of an ill-conceived and misguided plan.

Please lift your heads from figures and plans, targets and metrics for a moment and think about the children. Focus on what they need (which is not as prosaically simple as "a school place") and make every effort to provide it. We are not the future of Bath, they are. I object to the Council's proposal to expand Bathwick. As an educator, I feel that these

proposed plans would be highly detrimental to the education of Bathwick pupils and harmful on a number of fronts.

I urge the Council to withdraw its plans for the proposed expansion.

I am particularly concerned by the quality and area of land for the expansion and the implications this has for the outdoor space. I'm very aware that unless outdoor space is prioritised at the feasibility stage of a project, good quality landscape is difficult to achieve at a later stage. The current sloping school site is a case in point. Although the site is rich in experience, the demands on the space mean there is constant conflict between ball games and other uses, and the Key Stage 1 pupils have a very limited level area for play. Contrary to their success in B&NES sporting competitions, Key stage 2 pupils are disadvantaged by lack of access to playing fields, and are limited to single tarmac netball court for all their team sports.

The proposed changes are the first opportunity in 30 years to rectify this situation.

I would consider expansion only if the amount of useable outdoor space is increased at least to that required by statutory requirements but would add a caveat that if a site is not level or has other physical restrictions, the 'land take' required may be greater than noted 'on plan'. This is an important consideration if optimum use is to be made of the site, and should not be overlooked early on.

Whether the school remains at its current capacity or increases in size, all future pupils should have better access to good quality outdoor space, including well-designed, properly implemented areas for team sports, outdoor play and learning.

We object as we believe there is not enough space available to provide a two form entry school with adequate space for both learning and play.

Bathwick is an excellent school where all ages of children interact with each other daily and greatly benefit from this. Splitting the school onto essentially separate sites will damage the ethos of the school.

### **St. Nicholas' C of E Primary School, Radstock**

**Total responses received:** 5

**From:** Parents: 3  
Local Residents: 2  
  
Objections: 4  
Support: 0  
Comments: 1

#### **Parents:**

I am very concerned about the scale of the enlargement and impact on the school's character and learning environment.

Happy with the school - they are caring, friendly and approachable. The receptionist knows me and my children, as do teachers - even staff who haven't taught them. A lot of that friendliness and sense of community will be lost.

I am shocked at the percentage increase proposed. If full, it will be almost double the number of pupils. The pressure on communal spaces will be awful. There are already two lunch sittings, pupils are working in corridors in small groups, finding a room to meet in can be tricky. This will have a detrimental effect on learning and change the school's character.

How has this decision been arrived at - my understanding is there are other schools locally where numbers are low.

I believe you will lose parents who fear their child will be lost in a large school.

My eldest is quiet and could easily have been overwhelmed in an atmosphere which will be noisier and harder to manage unless it becomes more regimented. Special needs children e.g. autism, could struggle. Currently it feels staff are able to cope with children needing additional support but I fear this will become overwhelming.

Radstock is a challenging area with many needs – there will be challenges for such a large school. I think the school is able to nurture the children - I fear this will be lost with so many children and parents with needs.

How accurate are these predictions and what alternatives have been looked at? It will be a real shame if the character of the school is lost and the nurturing, care and education of the children is overlooked.

The school facilities are currently insufficient let alone with extra pupils. Restrictions are placed on numbers of parents attending school performances etc. How will circa 700 parents be accommodated if the proposal goes ahead?

The enlargement is not phased and will have a negative shock impact on the school and wider community.

Loss of small community feel/ethos of the school. My child will not cope with such large numbers and we will be looking at other smaller village schools (as will many parents) if this goes ahead. This is already happening.

The proposal says there are no other schools capable of taking more pupils. Incorrect – St. Mary's in Writhington, Kilmerston and Trinity. Trinity has space to expand and the same building layout so why does St. Nicholas' have to take them all?

Loss of outside play space - this has already been reduced in size by the nursery relocation.

Loss of Library and open learning spaces which are in constant use - more congestion will mean more issues.

Building on a known flood plain.

Loss of green space going backwards on the Forest school concept being developed.

Socially deprived area.

Higher than average SEN. Children need a feeling of belonging, not just being one of a crowd.

Increased traffic flow on already congested road.

Parking in the town has been dramatically reduced by the new houses (loss of one entire car park behind Victoria Hall).

### **Local Residents:**

There is chaos at the start and end of the school day caused by parents flouting all parking restrictions. Vehicles are parked all along Meadow View restricting access for residents, on the corner of Meadow View and pavements obstructing the view of on-coming traffic when turning out, parked in field gateways, half-way up Kilmersdon Road restricting the road width. They park anywhere they can to minimise their walk to the school with no consideration for other road users, particularly in inclement weather.

Parking Wardens are never in attendance to control or penalise offenders. More places will only exacerbate this problem.

The noise from the children in the school playground shouting and screaming, accentuated by the noise from the wheels of ride-on toys is intolerable. This will only get worse if the school capacity is increased.

The existing building had to be built on a raised mound to lift it off the flood plain therefore any extension would have to be raised incurring unnecessary expense. Where would there be a playground and sport field? The current playground quickly floods under several inches of water after rainfall.

There is already a serious problem with parking. Any school day, vehicles are parked a considerable way up Haydon Hill and residents in Meadow View (many have no access to park their cars off road) cannot always park, let alone close to their home! The drastic

drop in car parking facilities in the town has exacerbated the problem - unless this is confronted with any planning development, I despair of what might ensue. When the current school building was in the 'planning stage' locals were informed through the post. This time I have only heard about this development through one of my local Councillors. Then several residents objected because the current 'hot tub' building was supposed to have a sedum roof (and several other eco-friendly innovations) but we did not think this fitted in with the Conservation Area status. I doubt the new plans will be any better. Hopefully, the other attraction (buy one, get one free – referring to Trinity School) will not be applicable this time around.

### **Whitchurch Primary School, Whitchurch**

**Total responses received:** 13 + 48\* = 61

**From:** Parents: 7  
Parents and Local Residents: 2 + 48\* = 50  
Other Interested Parties: 2  
Neighbouring Local Authorities: 2  
  
Objections: 8 + 48\* = 56  
Support: 0  
Comments: 5

\*51 individually signed copies of a standard letter objecting to the proposal were received, stating that the response was from a parent at the school as well as a resident of Whitchurch village. 10 were from the Village and 41 from further afield. Comments are listed under Parents and Local Residents section below. 3 of the copies were from parents who had also responded with objections by email.

#### **Parents:**

Parking and the road is already dangerous, causing the residents problems, without increasing this figure by 33%.

The school is already failing - it seems ridiculous to add more children to the problem.

The playground barely fits the current children.

Catering is already a massive problem with children rushing meals to make way for the next children.

The school would benefit from a nursery and SEN unit as pupils with additional needs aren't supported as well as they could be with a special unit.

How is the expansion of half a year group going to work? Is this going back to previous attempts of having mixed year groups? Will there be two classes per year? I would not be happy with my children being in a 45 pupil class. I don't feel that any of the classes should be changed and additional children added or mixed with different years.

Not fair on the pupils to have to learn under construction noises. It will be like a builder's yard, they will lose a lot of space whilst this is being built and it will disrupt their learning.

I chose this school as it was only one class per year and has a village feeling. Everyone knows each other and the kids know everyone.

I have other children joining, I wanted them to have the same experience which won't happen if it's changed too two classes/more pupils to a class. I am very upset about this. I can't go to an alternative school as I don't drive and wouldn't get my child to Whitchurch and my other children to another school on time. My first child is looking forward to them starting. It wouldn't be fair to move them as they have all their friends.

I don't feel comfortable with my child who is due to start 2019 to be the guinea pig year.

There will be teething problems which will interrupt their learning - being the youngest it will be hard enough.

Because there is a new housing estate there should be a new school, not an old school disrupted to accommodate the housing.

I struggle to get to and from the school on the small paths as it is. Let alone when there is more children.

Where will the additional teaching funding come from?

The school is not yet Ofsted Good and does not have any outstanding areas. Putting additional pressure on resources and staff at this point does not seem a logical plan.

Class sizes of 30 are already large - taking them up to 45, even at Key Stage 2 is madness!

Children need to be able to focus on their lessons. Larger classes mean more distractions and teachers less able to spend time individually with children or oversee their tuition properly.

It puts additional strain on the teachers who, according Ofsted, are not always able to tailor homework/activities to individuals. Adding 50% to class sizes will not help.

Part of the charm of the school is its small size and single form entry. If the expansion is granted I will definitely consider other options for my children.

A more appropriate expansion would be to increase the number of classes not the size of them. Have those classes grow in size naturally over time. Doing this could assist the school in upping its Ofsted rating rather than putting additional pressure on it.

The expansion could involve class size expansion and mixed age classes rather than an additional class in each year group. I have huge concerns about this. The school has been classed as Requiring Improvement. If children are not working to full potential currently how will increasing class sizes benefit them? And mixed age classes have proven to not work in other local authority schools.

My priority is my children's education, to increase Key Stage 2 classes at a critical time for learning does not make sense. You should act in the children's best interests - all I can see is to fulfil the places quota so the housing application submitted for Whitchurch can go ahead. Parents urge you to look at the pupil's best interests and expand the school with this in mind.

In January 2017 the school was given its second Ofsted rating of Requires Improvement, the same as the previous inspection. The school is working extremely hard to raise standards but the quality of teaching, learning and outcomes are still rated below standard, so we believe expansion at this time will be detrimental to children's education, as this will no longer be their primary focus/aim.

The Governors have said that the proposed increase of 105 pupils could be added anywhere across the school age range. Guidelines permitting, Key Stage 2 class sizes will therefore increase from 30 to 45. Budgets are generally stretched - would additional funding be available for extra teachers, to cover the increased class sizes.

For a school the size of Whitchurch, this can only mean mixed year groups, mixed abilities, etc., which becomes a minefield to implement.

The school building is over 100 years old, with very small classrooms, corridors and limited space. The hall can currently host a full school assembly - would this be possible with the additional numbers. This loss of pupil interaction would be a huge loss to the existing pupils.

It states that an additional adjacent area of land would be added to the site. We presume this will be for the additional classrooms required.

The land either side of the school is already developed, so no space to increase the hard play space. When the field is 'out of bounds' due to weather, there is insufficient play area for pupils our children tell us. Very serious concerns, that if the building did go ahead, there is no access to the adjacent land than through the existing school from the A37.



Has any consideration been given to the construction process and how vehicles will access the site. It is very likely that it will be a traditional build as there is such limited access for modular cabins to be delivered, so the build would take longer than the six week summer holidays, introducing a significant safety risk to the pupils.

The school is situated on the A37 and is very heavily congested at most times - we believe that this will increase. Traffic regularly queues beyond the village in all directions. There is little scope for mitigating measures on the approaches to the school.

On numerous occasions the school has requested a 20mph speed limit - this has been refused on the basis that further congestion would result.

There are limited busses so additional car journeys are inevitable. The school is within walking distance from many parts of the village but in today's car-reliant lifestyle, the reality is parents will drive and park close to the school not walk.

Under the current school policy, pupils are not permitted to cycle to school unless in Year 6, deterring younger pupils from walking or cycling.

The walking routes are very narrow and potentially unsafe, further compounded by lack of quality street lighting and low numbers of safe crossing points.

The additional traffic will exacerbate congestion and parking issues in the village as well as increasing air and noise pollution

The additional land for the expansion must be the historical railway line. This land is greenfield with established trees providing an excellent habitat for wildlife. Removal of this would adversely affect wildlife many of which are protected species.

The increased pupils will result in a direct increase in noise pollution, a mere 3dB increase is the equivalent of doubling the level for the human ear.

A retirement home is located adjacent to the school – an increase in noise pollution for residents and inconvenience this may cause.

I believe that expanding the school will have a negative impact on my children's education.

My children would benefit from being in a smaller/village school with an intake of 30 - one class per year. They would have struggled in a larger school. An expanded school would remove parental choice as all other local schools have 60 or 90 pupils per year.

The school is Ofsted Requires Improvement - how can increasing class sizes help the school improve its performance?

A large proportion of children live in the Bristol area. Could the places required be provided by giving priority to children living in Whitchurch Village in B&NES?

The school is on a very busy road with limited parking - concerned about the increase in traffic and pollution and impact on road safety around the school.

Where will funding come from for ongoing extra resources? E.g. extra teaching staff, books, computers.

Class sizes are large enough already - to increase some to 45 per class is ridiculous.

Children's education will suffer due to disruption, reduced individual teaching time reducing or eliminating a child's individual needs, children's abilities are all different and these would not be catered for due to lack of time. Mixed classes seem ridiculous as each year has their own curriculum to follow.

A small village around a very busy main road, traffic during school drop off and collection is appalling - this is only going to get worse. Many people drive, there is very limited parking, cars park in residential areas as well as on pavements, on corners of junctions, etc. To add more cars is ridiculous.

It seems it has just been a case of build houses and expand the school! If more houses are being built then maybe a new school, doctor's surgery, etc. need to be built as well.

Are other schools in B&NES having their class numbers increased?

**Parents and Local Residents:**

Increasing Key Stage 2 classes to 45 in an already under performing school is preposterous. The recent Ofsted states the school 'requires improvement' and is especially falling short in its quality of teaching, learning and assessment and outcomes for students - most particularly in Key Stage 2.

The impact of large classes on children's attainment is well documented. One study states that it reduces the time students actively engage with each other, it increases disruptive behaviour, it reduces the time teachers can spend with each pupil, it reduces the material the teacher can cover, it can eliminate many methods of assessing students and it can reduce the learning by restricting the kind of teaching methods employed.

According to research, pupils in smaller classes consistently performed higher on standardised tests in both maths and reading.

An article published by a prominent figure at a University states, 'from experience alone, we can state with full confidence that large class sizes have, are and continue to wreck many positive advances in education and learning - the future of our children does not look good if we continue to ignore this fact'.

There is already severe traffic congestion along this stretch of the A37, to increase this would be ludicrous. There is heavy congestion daily, utter chaos around the school and surrounding roads due to blocked roads and poorly parked cars. This congestion, with inconsiderate and dangerous parking, has already led to several near misses with children put in danger by vehicles mounting or getting incredibly close to the pavement outside the school.

To increase this traffic by potentially another 100 cars, without putting a strategy in place to ease current congestion and provide safe parking, would be putting our children at risk of injury or death.

The likelihood of parents walking their children to school is small as most of the new pupils will come from households where parents work, dropping them to school in the car enroute. Also, many of the additional pupils are expected from the new housing in Staunton Lane, which does not have a good walking route to the school.

**Other Interested Parties:**

We are very concerned about the impact the enlargement will have on the traffic and car parking in Whitchurch. The A37 through Whitchurch is a very busy road and even more so at school times.

We are situated close to the school and are experiencing huge problems with parents using our car park. It is extremely difficult to get parents to park elsewhere and these spaces are needed by those members of the public using the facilities here. Frequently people get blocked in and there is also a safety aspect with both children and cars trying to get in and out.

If the situation gets worse, as it obviously will with more parents driving, we shall have to put a barrier across our driveway. This will be very costly for us and inconvenient for those using the facilities or with a right of access across our property.

We would urge you to find a designated parking area or failing this provide the funds for a barrier to protect our car park from unauthorised trespass of additional school users.

This would hopefully mitigate the severe inconvenience endured by ourselves, those using the facilities and those with a right of access.

We have concerns regarding the location of the school and safe routes to it.

The speed of 30mph outside the school has been a concern for many years but requests to reduce the speed for the safety of children walking to school have been turned down.

Many other local schools have a reduced speed of 20mph.

HGV vehicles are causing air pollution.

Parking issues around the school will increase with extra pupils and no parking facilities.

Cars park on double yellow lines obstructing those walking to school and local residents.

The pavements along Staunton Lane from the Horseworld site are very narrow in places, making them unsafe and impossible for buggies or wheelchair users. There are no safe crossings from the Horseworld/Sleep Lane sites to the opposite side of the road, which will be required. A copy of the Neighbourhood Plan (NP) Risk Assessment of the safe routes to school will be sent in with this response. The aspiration from the NP is for a new larger school to be built in a more sustainable location.

**Neighbouring Local Authorities:**

North Somerset Council and Bristol City Council - no reason to oppose the expansion of the school to meet basic need in its (*B&NES*) local area and no objections.