Proposal to create additional primary provision in the Roundhay area at Elmete Lane from September 2012 to be run by Roundhay School Technology and Language College

Public consultation response form

Please read the consultation booklet on the proposal and tell us what your views are. The questions on this form are provided to help you do so, but you do not have to respond to all of them. If you prefer not to use this form, you can also put your views in a letter. Letters and forms should be sent to the address at the bottom of this form, or by email to: educ.school.organisation@educationleeds.co.uk. Extra copies of this booklet and response form are available at: www.educationleeds.co.uk/schoolorganisation.

All responses will be reported to a meeting of Leeds City Council's Executive Board in March 2011.

Responses must be received by 4pm on Friday 18 February 2011.

1a) I agree with the use of the site off Elmete Lane for increasing primary provision. Strongly agree	Questions relating to the proposals
Strongly agree Agree Regree Disagree Strongly disagree Disagree Strongly disagree Disagree Disagree Strongly disagree Disagree Strongly disagree Disagree Strongly disagree Disagree Disagree Strongly disagree Disagree Disagree Strongly disagree Don't know Please tell us more about your views and your reasons for them. There are a number of humany schools within the local area who have surplas places. Why does a 60 place school need to be opened, when already it is not filled in schools. Many families already from the Filmet area cross the ling load to attend local furnary schools. There is no need for	1. How much do you agree with the following statements? Please tick as appropriate.
Agree agree or disagree Disagree Strongly disagree Don't know largeree agree or disagree Disagree Strongly agree agree nor disagree Disagree Strongly agree Don't know Disagree Disagree Disagree Don't know Please tell us more about your views and your reasons for them. There are a number of frimary schools within the local area who house surplas places. Why does a 60 place school meed to be opered, when already it is not filled in schools. Many families already from the Elmet area cross the ling koad to attend local frimary schools. There is no need for	1a) I agree with the use of the site off Elmete Lane for increasing primary provision.
Strongly agree Agree Disagree Disagree Don't know Please tell us more about your views and your reasons for them. There are a number of humany schools within the boal area who have surplas places. Why does a 60 place school need to be opened, when already it is not filled in schools. Many families already from the Elmet area cross the ling Road to attend local furnary schools. There is no need for	Strongly Agree agree nor Disagree Strongly Don't
Please tell us more about your views and your reasons for them. There are a number of humary schools within the local area who have surplas places. Why does a 60 place school meed to be opened, when already it is not filled in schools. Many families already from the Elmet area cross the king Road to attend local furnary schools. There is no need for	1a) I agree with Roundhay School changing its age range to include some primary provision.
There are a number of himory schools within the local area who hade surplas places. Why does a 60 place school meed to be opened, when already it is not filled in schools. Many families already from the Elmet area cross the king Road to attend local Primary schools. There is no need for	Strongly Agree agree nor Disagree Strongly Don't
within the local area who hade surplas places. Why does a 60 place school meed to be opened, when already it is not filled in schools. Many families already from the Elmet area cross the king koad to attend local Primary schools. There is no need for	Please tell us more about your views and your reasons for them
Many families already from the Elmet area cross the king Road to attend local Primary schools. There is no need for	There are a number of Primary schools
Many families already from the Elmet area cross the king Road to attend local Primary schools. There is no need for	within the local area who house surplas.
Many families already from the Elmet area cross the king Road to attend local Primary schools. There is no need for	places. Why does a 60 place school need
Many families already from the Elmet area cross the ling Road to attend local Primary schools. There is no need for	
area cross the king Road to attend local Primary schools. There is no need for	ir schools.
Primary schools. There is no need for	Many families already from the Elmet
	area cross the king Road to attend local
another school to make more surplicantinued overleaf	Primary schools. There is no need for
	another school to make more surplicantinued overleaf

Please tell us more about your views on this proposal (continued) within the Seawoft Primary a secondary school, I am normed specialised primary these children would Opening the school, may results in local learing their children not coming at impact on This will have a huge school, which will impact on the budget lose of jobs the present economic limate it seems dreadful to spend all on a new school where the money best put into present surresshil schools.

2. Have you found this booklet useful?		
How could we improve the booklet?		
In some ways.		
3. Have you found the consultation process useful? How could we improve the consultation process? Our school was not approach. The consultation was not public enough Also, there was only early on, so if you		
one public meeting	the	
didn't attend, your san	West West Treated.	
It was an extrenely	short consultation time	
Your personal details (if you want your response	onse to be formally acknowledged)	
Email address:	-	
Which school are you associated with? GRANGE FARM PRIMARY		
Parent/carer of present pupil(s)	Member of staff	
Parent/carer of primary school child	Local resident	
Other adult relative	Elected member	
Pupil	Community representative	
Governor	Other	
Data Protection Act 1998 Under the terms of the Data Protection Act 1998 we must inform you of the following. Education Leeds and Leeds City Council are seeking your views to help inform the decision on this proposal. Your personal information will be used only for this purpose, and may be shared with other agencies who are involved in the consultation, however only to address any issues you raise. If you do not wish to provide personal details your views will still be considered, but we will not be able to acknowledge your response personally.		
Please send your reply to: The Chief Executive, Education 10th Floor West, Merrion House	Leeds, FAO School Organisation Team e, 110 Merrion Centre, Leeds LS2 8DT	

RH24

Roundhay St John C of E Primary School North Lane, Leeds LS8 2QJ

Chair of Governors: The Revd Dr Colin Cheeseman

16 February 2011

The Chief Executive
Education Leeds
FAO School Organisation Team
10th Floor West
Merrion House
110 Merrion Centre
Leeds
LS2 8DT

Dear School Organisation Team

I write on behalf of the governing body of Roundhay St John's C of E Primary School in response to the proposal to create additional primary provision in the Roundhay area at Elmete Lane from September 2012 to be run by Roundhay School Technology and Language College. Several members of this governing body attended the public meeting on 24th January at Roundhay School and the document was discussed at our Governors Meeting on 26th January. This letter represents a summary of our discussion and opinions. We have a number of objections to the consultation process and also to the proposal itself. We focus here on those which directly affect Roundhay St John's Primary School. In addition, we have suggestions as to how the governing body might be involved in developing alternative plans to provide the additional primary provision.

The Process

As Roundhay St John's School could be significantly affected by this proposal, we consider that we, the governing body, are stakeholders in this initiative, in a different "category" to other respondents and the general public. There does not seem to have been any recognition, or indeed understanding, of this by those leading the consultation. We feel that to simply be invited to a public meeting is quite inadequate consultation.

We object strongly to the inaccuracy of the consultation document. On page 7 of the document we read "The map on page 9 shows where pre school children live in relation to their nearest schools." This is not true because Roundhay St John's Primary School has been omitted from the map. Roundhay St John's is therefore not shown as having any geographical interest in the proposal but this is clearly not the case. We acknowledge that an apology for this was given at the public meeting on 24th January but this does not alter the fact that the public are being asked their views on a document that is incorrect and misleading. We are also concerned that in the consultation document Education Leeds states that the proposed new primary provision "would build on the strengths of the existing secondary school without undermining any of the other primary schools in the area." Again we believe this to be a misleading statement (our reasons for this are explained in the later part of this letter) which undermines the integrity and validity of the consultation process.

We have serious concern at the speed at which it is proposed this additional primary provision be created. We understand that the proposal in its present form was only made clear to Roundhay School in October 2010 and to other local schools not until close to the day of the public meeting. It is important that adequate time is given not just to explore this proposal but also to investigate the viability of other proposals. This proposal appears to be a quick and convenient way of bypassing the government regulations on competition which would normally be applied when a new school is set up. Again, all this does little to inspire public confidence in the proposal.

Education Leeds Proposal

Regarding the proposal itself, we accept, according to the figures provided in the consultation document, that there will be a shortfall of primary school places in the immediate future in the area local to Roundhay St John's and that Education Leeds has an obligation to address this problem.

However, we are concerned about the demographics underlying the proposal. Based on the number of births cited on the map on page 9 of the consultation document, the provision of a new two form entry school on the proposed site would result in a significant over provision of places for the area immediately surrounding the "new school", assuming that Roundhay St John's continues to provide thirty places a year. One extra class each year would more than meet the need for more places in the area immediately surrounding Roundhay St John's and the proposed new school. The document does not explain where exactly the children will come from who take up these sixty places per year. Clearly it cannot be the area immediately surrounding the proposed new site unless the birth rate was to rise significantly. Issues of transport arising from this, and the resulting pollution. health and congestion concerns will not be popular. The assumption that children from the Talbot area might take up the 60 places may at first appear valid, but not when one takes into account the proposed new site that may be part of Allerton Grange School. It is in that direction that people from that area would more naturally gravitate than towards the area of this proposed site. Roundhay is effectively divided in two by Roundhay Park; families around Talbot look to the north, towards Street Lane and do not naturally look south towards the Oakwood area around the proposed new site.

Along with others who spoke at the public meeting on 24th January, we do not believe that a secondary school is the best institution in the area to run a primary school and provide primary education. Secondary and primary education are quite different and require different skills and approaches.

We strongly disagree with the statement on page 4 of the consultation document suggesting that the proposed primary provision "would build on the strengths of the existing secondary school without undermining any of the other primary schools in the area." The proposed primary school will accept children from much the same area as Roundhay St John's does at present. As Roundhay St John's is not able to offer the incentive of being able to guarantee a place at Roundhay High School which the new primary school will offer, the fear is that Roundhay St John's will struggle to fill its places from the area immediately surrounding the school. We seek to be a school that is part of the local community and do this with considerable success. We shall no longer be able to fulfil this role if children attending the school do not live in the local community. We note that the projections for primary school places needed for 2012 and 2014 are for the whole "Roundhay/Wigton" area spanning several miles and not just the area immediately adjacent to the proposed new primary school. We therefore question whether there is a need for 60 additional primary places in the area immediately surrounding the proposed

new site and Roundhay St John's. There is also a distinct possibility that Roundhay St John's may struggle to fill its 30 places at all if most local children attend the new school. The resulting damage to the morale of staff and the whole school community would be considerable as jobs and even the viability of the school would be threatened.

We believe that all existing schools in the south Roundhay area will be disadvantaged by the proposal to give assured places to the sixty children a year attending the proposed new school. Roundhay School is already heavily over-subscribed. The offer of an assured place there cold be a distinct attraction to parents of four year olds and therefore would reduce the number of parents applying for places at a number of other local primary schools. Equally the removal of sixty high school places from the allocation to children at local primary schools, including Roundhay St John's, could place them at some disadvantage. We believe this to be unfair competition. If the rise in birth rates is not sustained in the long term, and particularly if they decline, we are very concerned about the adverse effects on Roundhay St John's and other local primary schools.

Our Proposal

We are an energetic and interested governing body, committed to our task of maintaining and improving the high quality of education provided at Roundhay St John's and ensuring that it is distinctive but inclusive as a church school. We want to build on the success of this school, not see it decline. However, we are also aware of the wider context in which we operate. We acknowledge that there is a need for more primary school places to be provided from 2012, at least in the short term, within Leeds. We have major concerns about the proposal in its present form but are disappointed not to have been given the opportunity to enter into discussion with Education Leeds as to possible alternative proposals that might involve Roundhay St John's. As we are the main provider of primary education in the area in question we consider that we would be the best provider of the additional primary provision under discussion. We can see three possible ways that Roundhay St John's might be involved in this additional provision: The present Roundhay St John's site could be extended, Roundhay St John's could move to the proposed site or could operate as a split-site school on its present site and the proposed site. All three options would enable the school to be larger than it is now and therefore meet the need for additional places in the area. We would welcome the chance to discuss all these possible solutions with Education Leeds.

I am copying this letter to our local Councillors, Matthew Lobley and Valerie Kendall.

Yours Faithfully,

Proposal to create additional primary provision in the Roundhay area at Elmete Lane from September 2012 to be run by Roundhay School Technology and Language College

Public consultation response form

Please read the consultation booklet on the proposal and tell us what your views are. The questions on this form are provided to help you do so, but you do not have to respond to all of them. If you prefer not to use this form, you can also put your views in a letter. Letters and forms should be sent to the address at the bottom of this form, or by email to: educ.school.organisation@educationleeds.co.uk. Extra copies of this booklet and response form are available at: www.educationleeds.co.uk/schoolorganisation.

All responses will be reported to a meeting of Leeds City Council's Executive Board in March 2011.

Responses must be received by 4pm on Friday 18 February 2011.

Questions relating to the proposals 1. How much do you agree with the following statements? Please tick as appropriate. 1a) I agree with the use of the site off Elmete Lane for increasing primary provision. Neither Strongly Strongly agree nor disagree Don't Agree Disagree agree disagree know 1a) I agree with Roundhay School changing its age range to include some primary provision. Neither Strongly Strongly Don't agree nor disagree Agree Disagree agree disagree know Please tell us more about your views and your reasons for them. There are already surplus places in heeds schools around that area Building primary provision will lead to places. A decrease within other local schools possible 1099 of jobs. believe it would be more appropriate schools are able to accommodate Continued overleaf

Please tell us more about your views on this proposal (continued)

Many parents are quite happy at the moment to travel to the other side of the ring road and use the school in these areas. In our school we are now seeing a more diverse grap of children attending, midening our continent area which has had a very positive influence nithin school. By opening a new school in the proposed area will inecitably reduce this group of children choosing to attend our school and similar schools within dose proximity to finete

2. Have you found this booklet useful?		
How could we improve the booklet? Yes No		
*-		
92		
-		
3. Have you found the consultation process useful?		
How could we improve the consultation process?		
There was only one public meeting		
in January - if members of the public		
were unable to make this inceting,		
there was no futher opportunity to		
gain I dainy knowledge of the proposits.		
Your personal details (if you want your response to be formally acknowledged)		
Nam		
Addr		
Email a et.		
Which school are you associated with? GRANGE THEM PRIMITELY		
Parent/carer of present pupil(s) Member of staff		
Parent/carer of primary school child Local resident Local resident		
Other adult relative Elected member		
Pupil Community representative		
Governor Other		
Data Protection Act 1998 Under the terms of the Data Protection Act 1998 we must inform you of the following. Education Leeds and Leeds City Council are seeking your views to help inform the decision on this proposal. Your personal information will be used only for this purpose, and may be shared with other agencies who are involved in the consultation, however only to address any issues you raise. If you do not wish to provide personal details your views will still be considered, but we will not be able to acknowledge your response personally.		
Please send your reply to: The Chief Executive, Education Leeds, FAO School Organisation Team 10th Floor West, Marrian House, 110 Marrian Centre, Leads I S2 8DT		