Summary of responses to consultation on further expansion of primary school places in the Ealing and Hanwell area

June/July 2009

Background
A number of consultations were undertaken during 2008, seeking views on how best to increase the number of places available at primary schools in the coming years, to meet rapidly rising demand.

In December 2008, Cabinet agreed the need for an additional 375 Reception places (12.5 forms of entry) for pupils in primary schools by September 2011. A form of entry equates to 30 pupil places. Of the total required, 8.5FE was agreed to be provided in community and foundation schools, with up to 3 FE in the Catholic sector and 1 FE in the Church of England sector.

Expansion proposals were progressed and in April 2009 plans were agreed to create 210 additional Reception places (7 FE) by expanding eight schools across the borough. These primary schools are shown in Table 1 below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Current size</th>
<th>Expanded size</th>
<th>Additional FE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ealing and Hanwell area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fielding</td>
<td>3FE</td>
<td>4FE</td>
<td>1FE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Ealing</td>
<td>2FE</td>
<td>3FE</td>
<td>1FE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Ealing</td>
<td>2FE</td>
<td>3FE</td>
<td>1FE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St John’s</td>
<td>1.5FE</td>
<td>2FE</td>
<td>0.5FE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenford, Northolt &amp; Perivale area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oldfield</td>
<td>1.5FE</td>
<td>2FE</td>
<td>0.5FE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selborne</td>
<td>2FE</td>
<td>3FE</td>
<td>1FE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanhope</td>
<td>2FE</td>
<td>3FE</td>
<td>1FE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood End Infant</td>
<td>3FE</td>
<td>4FE</td>
<td>1FE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7FE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At the April 2009 Cabinet meeting, the expansion of Brentside primary school by 1.5FE (from the current 1.5FE to 3 FE), was not agreed. Members of Cabinet requested that a range of options be investigated to increase the number of school places available in the same geographical area as Brentside primary i.e. the Ealing and Hanwell area. A further consultation exercise was undertaken in June and July 2009, and this document summarizes its results.

The consultation document outlined the need to look at options in the Ealing and Hanwell area to further increase places available in local schools. The document showed that a further 60 (2FE) places are required by September.
2010 and another 30 (1FE) by September 2011. Since the publication of the consultation document, a report updating pupil projections was considered by Cabinet at it's meeting in July 2009. This report indicated that in the Ealing and Hanwell area, demand for school places is projected to rise even higher than was previously being planned for. A minimum of 6.5FE is required by September 2010 and at least a further 2FE by September 2012. It is not known at this stage whether the further increased birth rate last year has now reached a peak (these will be of Reception age children in 2012), or whether the trend will continue to increase. To date we have secured a permanent increase of 3.5FE in the Ealing and Hanwell area, which still leaves a shortfall of 5FE by September 2012.

The Ealing and Hanwell area consultation on expansion of primary places
An extensive public consultation was run from early June to the 17th July 2009, which sought views on how to meet the further demand for places in the Ealing and Hanwell area. A copy of the consultation document and the associated questionnaire is available at www.ealing.gov.uk/pastconsultations. The questionnaire asked respondents their views on the factors that should be taken into account when deciding which schools should be expanded and also which of the primary schools in the area should be increased in size.

Each primary school in the Ealing and Hanwell area were sent enough copies of the questionnaire to ensure all their parents could have copy. Significant numbers of copies of the consultation booklet were also provided. A full list of who else was consulted and the number of copies sent to them is attached in Appendix 1, and included: other schools, Children’s Centres, early years providers, libraries, residents associations, neighboring Local Authorities, GP surgeries, Diocesan representatives, MP’s etc.

The consultation document included the offer, in the seven additional local community languages, of telephone support for those who required translation support in completing the questionnaire.

To encourage as wide participation as possible the consultation document and questionnaire was made available in the current consultations section of the Council’s website for the period the consultation was running. It was also widely publicized that telephone support was also available from a member of staff for any who had any queries.

Schools included in the consultation
The consultation related to a specific geographical area in the centre of the London Borough of Ealing. The area covers the Central Ealing and Hanwell areas. The consultation document outlined those schools within the Ealing and Hanwell area that had already been agreed to permanently expand and who are not considered should be expanded further on a permanent basis. These schools are shown in Table 2 below.

Table 2
Table 2 - Schools in the Ealing & Hanwell area that have already been expanded and are not considered should be expanded further on a permanent basis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fielding</td>
<td>School already expanding to a 4 FE school, which will be the biggest primary school in the borough.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Ealing</td>
<td>School already expanding, further expansion not considered possible on the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Ealing</td>
<td>School already expanding, further expansion not considered possible on this site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St John’s</td>
<td>School already expanding to 2 FE. Technical advice is that further expansion would require a complete rebuild of the school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montpelier</td>
<td>School expanded already, no further permanent expansion considered possible due to the size and layout of the site.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition, there are also five denominational/faith schools within the Ealing and Hanwell area. Two are Church of England schools: St Saviour’s Infant and Christ Church Junior and three are Catholic schools: Mount Carmel, St Joseph’s and St Gregory’s.

The London Diocesan Board for Schools has gained agreement from the governing bodies of Christ Church Junior and St Saviour’s Infant schools to start consultation with parents on possible expansion of both the schools. A decision is also required as to whether any expansion should be as two separate 2FE primary schools or by expanding the schools to become a 4FE infant and a 4FE junior schools. The earliest date by which the additional places could be provided is 2012.

The Diocese of Westminster has been in discussion with the governors of St Gregory’s school, who are keen to expand their school by 1FE to 3FE. Apart from St Gregory’s, which has indicated that it may take an early expansion class in September 2010, the indicative programmes for the other proposed denominational/faith schools show the accommodation being made available from 2012, a year later than originally envisaged to meet demand.

As the admissions authority for their schools, the governing bodies and the Dioceses are responsible for undertaking any consultation around proposed expansions and the subsequent publication of Statutory Proposals. It is recognised that denominational/faith schools draw from a far wider geographical area than other schools.

The remaining eight community primary schools in the Ealing and Hanwell area were therefore included within the consultation and are:

- Brentside
- Drayton Green
Consultation responses
Those consulted were provided with a short questionnaire to complete if they wished to, with a Freepost address to return it to. An online version of the questionnaire was also made available for completion in the Current Consultations section of the Council’s website.

The Local Authority received a total of 562 completed questionnaires and 94 other responses during the consultation period. In addition, another 19 questionnaires received could not be included in the results as they were either found to be duplicates, did not include the name and/or address of the respondent or were the result of two responses being submitted from the same address (these latter two requirements had been indicated as necessary on the questionnaire).

The 94 other responses that were submitted in a different format to the questionnaire are outlined in a separate section of this summary and are not included in this section showing questionnaire results.

Respondents to the consultation
Of the 562 responses, 97% of respondents identified themselves as belonging to at least one of the stakeholder categories listed on the questionnaire. 14% indicated that they fell into more than one category, most as both parents and local residents.

75% of responses were from parents, 8% from residents, 6% from teachers, 3% from school senior management and almost 2% from school support staff. In addition to these 3% were from individual school governors. This is illustrated in Chart 1 below.
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The range of ethnic backgrounds of respondents was far more representative in this consultation than in previous ones relating to expansions of school places. The main ethnic groupings are shown in Chart 2 below, comparing the ethnicity of respondents to that of the population in the whole borough and also in the Ealing and Hanwell consultation area.

**Chart 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Group</th>
<th>Respondents to consultation</th>
<th>Population in Ealing and Hanwell area</th>
<th>Population in whole borough</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese &amp; other</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents were asked to provide details of their home address, including their postcode. The majority have addresses in the W7 area of the borough, which is within the Ealing and Hanwell area. The geographical spread of respondents home addresses is illustrated by the map of the borough at Appendix 2. The map shows all primary schools in the borough and uses a diamond to indicate where the home address of each respondent is within the borough (and some of the 22 who have out-borough addresses too).

The home address data has also been used to determine the school catchment area of each household that submitted a questionnaire. Eighty-one percent of responses were from households within one of the eight primary school’s catchment areas concerned and 4% were from out of borough addresses. The remaining 15% were from respondents who lived in catchments of primary schools in the borough but outside of the Ealing and Hanwell area.

Respondents to the consultation questionnaire were asked if they were parents and if so what age group their children fell into. 182 of the 562 respondents indicated that they are parents of pre-school age children, 500 have primary age children, 87 secondary age and 32 have children over school age.
More than three quarters of the primary age children of respondents attend schools in the Ealing and Hanwell area (383 of the 500 who indicated). **Chart 3** below shows which school or category of school, the primary age children of respondents attend. The number varies from zero to almost 100 at Brentside primary school.

**Chart 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary schools attended by children of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brentside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drayton Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hathaway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hobbayne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oaklands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Mark's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previously expanded schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Ealing primary schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faith schools</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Schools attended by children of respondents - primary age only

**Questionnaire responses**

Respondents were asked two questions, one about the factors that should be taken into account in deciding which schools should be expanded and the other on which four of the eight schools in the Ealing and Hanwell area should be expanded.

The first part of the questionnaire asked respondents to choose up to four factors from a possible eight that should be taken into account in deciding which schools to expand. The responses are set out in **Table 3** below in descending order.

**Table 3: Factors that should be considered in deciding which schools to expand**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Percent of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schools with larger sites</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools that most need new equipment/facilities</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The most popular schools | 47%
Schools where public transport links are better | 45%
Schools with the best academic standards | 35%
Schools it would be the most cost-effective to expand | 29%
Schools that have fewer pupils | 28%
Faith schools | 16%

In addition to the eight listed categories, respondents were also able to add other factors they felt should be used to decide which schools should be expanded. 84 respondents (15% of the total) stated another reason, or added a comment. Ten of these expressed a preference for a new primary school (and a further four for new secondary provision), with one requesting an Islamic school. 24 respondents thought that additional places should be added to those areas where the births were higher and four thought that catchment areas of some schools should be revised.

With reference to those respondents who stated that they felt a new school should be built, the consultation document had included information on this for stakeholders to take into consideration. This outlined the Council’s previous commissioning of consultants to investigate potential school sites in areas of high demand in the borough.

The consultants found that sites that were owned by the Council were generally green open spaces such as parks and allotments. Changing the use of allotments requires the approval of the Secretary of State and the Council would be required to show that the allotments were surplus to requirement. Most open spaces are designated as Community Open Space and are well used and it is unlikely that a change of use would be permitted.

The Council’s property consultants have been asked to re-review whether there are any sites that are not in the ownership of the Council, which may be a potentially suitable site for a new primary school. (Please see the report to 15th September Cabinet for more details at http://www.ealing.gov.uk/services/council/committees/agendas_minutes_reports/cabinet/19may2009-24may2010.html)

If a site were identified, the costs of acquiring the site would add significantly to the costs of expanding provision and the timescales in acquiring it would not allow any additional places to be available when needed from September 2010 and 2011.

**Table 3** clearly demonstrates a concern that many respondents have regarding the size of school sites, as this was the factor selected most often. Around half of respondents support expanding popular schools and those with access to good public transport. It should be noted that most primary age pupils walk to school and public transport is not a significant mode of getting to school.

The second question asked respondents to select four of the eight schools listed, that they felt should be expanded. Three percent of respondents felt...
none of the schools should be expanded and a further 24% did not select any of the eight listed schools. The majority of these respondents felt that they either did not know enough about the schools to decide, or that the decision should be made in line with the criteria they’d indicated elsewhere in the questionnaire or that a new school should be built.

The choice of schools that respondents thought should be expanded is shown in descending order in the Table 4 below.

Table 4: Responses to which four schools should be expanded

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Percent of respondents*</th>
<th>Percent of respondents in catchment area**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hobbayne</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Mark’s</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oaklands</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brentside</td>
<td>39***%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hathaway</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayfield</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drayton Green</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grange</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Percentages based on the 562 responses
** Percentages based on responses from those living in each school’s catchment area
*** This includes 142 responses that ticked Brentside (16 of which indicated support for expansion to 2FE and 1 for 3FE) and a further 77 that did not tick the Brentside option but all of whom indicated support for expansion to 2FE.

Almost one third (32%) of respondents did choose four primary schools from the eight listed as suggested, and a further 40% chose between one and three of them. However, over a quarter (27%) of respondents did not choose any of the schools.

Table 5 illustrates the number of responses for expansion of each of the eight named schools broken down by using the respondent’s postcode to show the schools catchment area that they live in. Each respondent was asked to name four of the eight schools, so numbers are higher than the 562 questionnaires received.
Table 5: Respondents preferred schools for expansion, shown by the primary school catchment of the respondent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support for proposed expansion at each school</th>
<th>Brentside</th>
<th>Drayton Green</th>
<th>Grange</th>
<th>Hathaway</th>
<th>Hobbayne</th>
<th>Mayfield</th>
<th>Oaklands</th>
<th>St Marks</th>
<th>None of them</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responses from catchment areas in the Ealing &amp; Hanwell area</td>
<td>Brentside</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drayton Green</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fielding</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grange</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hathaway</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hobbayne</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Ealing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayfield</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montpelier</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Ealing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oaklands</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St John’s</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Mark’s</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responses from other catchment areas</td>
<td>Outside Ealing &amp; Hanwell area</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out-borough</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other responses
In addition to the consultation questionnaires, the LA received 96 other responses.

89 of these were letters forwarded on to the Council from Brentside primary school. All indicated that they were against expansion of Brentside primary school to 3FE. Of these, it appears that nearly 90% of these parents had also made their views known by the submission of a completed questionnaire, the results of which has been included in the summary of the questionnaire responses. Only 12 of the 89 letters appear to have been submitted from parents who had not also completed a questionnaire. All of these were against expansion of Brentside primary to 3FE. These 12 are in addition to the responses analysed in Table 5.

Seven other letters or statements were also received from parents and others, although three of the seven had also submitted questionnaire responses. Of the four that did not submit questionnaires, two raised concerns around the existing traffic congestion around Grange primary school and the increase of noise from the school if more children were on site (one of these was a verbal response taken over the telephone). One respondent wrote in support of
building a new primary school. Another wrote in opposition of Oaklands to 3FE but accepted that temporary expansions may be possible.

Of the three respondents who also submitted a questionnaire; one was opposed to expansion of Brentside primary to 3FE but not to 2FE, one was in support of expansion at Hobbayne school and one was opposed to expansion of Drayton Green school, stating that larger classes affect the concentration of students and is difficult for the teacher to control. Full responses are included in Appendix 3.

The views of governing bodies
The governing bodies of the schools concerned were asked to formally respond to the consultation exercise. Copies of their full replies are attached at Appendix 4 and Table 6 provides a summary of their responses.

Table 6 – The views of the governing bodies of the schools consulted on

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Key issues raised by the governors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Brentside       | Supportive of expansion to 2FE (with clear caveats) | Support is conditional on:  
• The new block of 3 classrooms being built and completed before any increase in the number of pupils.  
• The emergency access to and from Greenford Avenue through Brentside high school is reinstated. |
| Drayton Green   | Awaiting formal response from School. Discussions with the Headteacher indicated that the Governing is opposed expansion to 1.5 would consider taking another bulge year group subject to necessary alterations to foundation Stage accommodation. |                                                                                                      |
| Grange          | Opposed to expansion to 4FE     | • No room to accommodate another class in the school  
• School has recently been rebuilt (works are still in progress with the Children’s Centre) & would want period of assimilation without the disruption of building works  
• Problems with access to the school – works traffic as well as pedestrian |
| Hathaway        | Opposed to expansion to 3FE     | • The building is not adequate  
• School is not the most popular in the area & has recently come out of special measures  
• Need to concentrate on raising standards across the school |
## School Position Key issues raised by the governors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Key issues raised by the governors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Hobbayne | Neutral                                       | • Local infrastructure constraints, especially around transport  
|          |                                               | • How to accommodate the extra numbers & associated additional school infrastructure without compromising the school  
|          |                                               | • Additional infrastructure to improve the school’s existing provision in areas such as ICT & a new kitchen  |
| Mayfield | Opposed to expansion to 2FE                    | • Would be keen to expand to 2FE in terms of school management but the current building & site means there is not the space  
|          |                                               | • Lack of both internal & external playspace already  |
| Oaklands | Opposed to permanent expansion to 3FE (In favour of taking a bulge year if appropriate accommodation provided) | • Site, internal spaces & playground spaces are too small  
|          |                                               | • Wish to maintain the community fell of the school  
|          |                                               | • Works would need to be carried out to the site  
|          |                                               | • If a temporary expansion is agreed, but then the plan is to continue so we have to become a permanent 3FE, the confidence & trust the parents have in the school & LA will be lost, having a detrimental impact on relationships & possibly the number on roll. It could change the ethos of the school for the worse.  |
| St. Marks| Support expansion in principle to 2FE, have some clear caveats | School have caveats of:  
|          |                                               | • The school would need an additional ICT suite, a larger hall, more toilet facilities, a larger staff room, more available space for smaller group or individual work areas  
|          |                                               | • The current location is the optimum size for 1.5FE & would not be able to take on any additional pupils without modification to the site  
|          |                                               | • Entry to the school premises would need to be relocated  
|          |                                               | • Would not wish to be part of a PFI initiative  |

### Next steps
These results and other information on the eight schools will be presented to Cabinet on the 15th September 2009 for a decision as to which of the schools should have expansion proposals progressed of them.
Appendix 1

List of people/ bodies consulted for Ealing and Hanwell consultation – June and July 2009

- Governing bodies of the schools named in the questionnaire (enough copies for each parent). Each school decided how they wished to involve their stakeholders in the consultation including teaching and non-teaching staff, pupils, and local residents.

- All other primary schools in the Ealing borough were sent a number of copies of the consultation and the questionnaire to circulate as appropriate to their stakeholders.

- Neighbouring authorities.

- Trade Union representatives.

- The Diocese of Westminster and the London Diocesan Board for Schools.

- Ealing borough MPs as well as MPs of neighboring boroughs.

- Children’s centres.

- Private nursery providers in the Ealing and Hanwell area.

- Residents associations were all sent information on the consultation as well as copies of the questionnaire.

- Letters were sent to all residents within the planning areas for all schools named in the questionnaire.

- Local parent and toddler groups.

- Community groups and cultural associations.

- The local police.

- Libraries.

- GP’s surgeries.

- The consultation and questionnaire was also made available on the Council’s website in the Current Consultations section and a link was put on the ‘Ealing Community Network’ website.
Appendix 3 – Other responses (in full)

Schools Planning and Resource Development
Schools Services
Ealing Council
Perceval House
14-16 Uxbridge Road
London W5 2HL

Your Ref: Oak09

Dear Gary Redhead

Cc: Cllr Ian Gibb
    Cllr Amit Kapoor

Primary School Expansion in Hanwell

I received your letter (dated 15 June 2009) inviting participation in the online consultation and document entitled ‘Planning for our Future’ (http://www.ealing.gov.uk/services/council/consultations/). I have completed the consultation as requested but have a number of outstanding questions that I could not include in my online response.

I understand there will be a shortage of 90 reception places in schools in Ealing and Hanwell over the next 2 years and that the Council is seeking to address this situation in the short term by expanding existing schools.

As a parent of a pre-school child I am concerned that the 17% increase was not forecast correctly and that a short term solution to the problem is being sought. The document clearly states ‘further increases may be required from September 2012’ and ‘there will be even greater demand in 2012’. What plans are in place to accommodate these and any future increases?

I do not believe it is acceptable that acquiring a site from private ownership is not considered to represent value for money for future generations of children in the long term (especially as the economic downturn is likely to result in sites remaining vacant for the foreseeable future).
It is stated that a new school in Ealing or Hanwell is not considered feasible by the Council. However there are two vacant sites within ten minutes walk of my home that could be considered as the site for a new school or an extension to Oaklands School. The sites are Bookers cash and carry site on Trumppers Way and the Cambridge Yard site, Cambridge Road. Have these sites been considered by the Council’s property consultants? Alternatively is it possible to negotiate a section 106 agreement as part of the Dickens Yard scheme in Ealing to accommodate educational needs?

I recently read in the Ealing Gazette (26/06/2003) that there are plans to give every household in the Borough a £50 rebate on their council tax to the cost of £6 million. Why can’t this money be made available to purchase land for a new school?

The document implies that a number of other London Boroughs are also experiencing an increase in the demand for primary school places. Have the neighbouring Boroughs been consulted and any work completed to investigate whether it would be feasible to jointly fund a new school between Boroughs?

I am also concerned about the impact on nursery places. Has any research been done on this area? Are there any plans to expand the current number of places available? What number of nursery places will be available in the next two years?

I look forward to receiving your response.

Yours sincerely,

Email response from a parent of a child at Oaklands primary school:

Thank you for coming to our school to discuss the expansion proposal. We as parents/carers were very interested to hear both your views and those of our head teacher Mr Hamidi.

I can speak now as one voice but am confident in the belief that I am joined by many others who also feel passionate about our school. That was apparent at our meetings.

We are, firstly, delighted to have a new head teacher who is committed to our primary school and we are in return committed to him as our leader and advisor. In him we trust the education of our children and the development of our school.

It is a very strong shared opinion with staff, parents and carers, also the local community, that our school is one with a very friendly, happy, small community and that this benefits all concerned. We all know each other and work together.

The site is old fashioned which adds charm and gives a solidity, a foundation which we trust as a good base from which to learn. Yes, we need a bit of modernisation but too much change creates instability. We have had a difficult patch before the new head, we now want to work with him to build a great school without unnecessary disturbances.
Mr Hamidi has put forward a good case to us with regard to this proposed expansion, and as a good leader he has made a valid suggestion. That we meet the council with an offer.

Perhaps it would be wise to offer the council help with a Temporary Bulge Year to accommodate the current problem.

He is being pro active and he wants it to be team effort, a partnership between parents/carers and the staff at Oaklands. Our question, what if we trust you Mr Hamidi? Will you get bulldozed and will we become disappointed, become disillusioned in your leadership?

Or will the council listen to you and therefore not jeopardise the relationship we are building, that very important dialogue between staff and parents/carers. After all, we all want the same thing, a great education for our children and those children coming up through our local community.

So, perhaps our site may just fit a temporary solution to help the council, but we are not big enough to support a long term expansion, that is not if we value the community of our school and the community of its local area.

Thank you for your time.
I hope this is helpful.
Re: Current Consultation on additional funding available for Ealing Primary schools for expansion September 2010, in particular Hobbayne Primary School, Hanwell.

Dear Holly,

Following on from our telephone conversation yesterday, I would like the following comments and feedback to be taken into consideration as part of the current consultation on Ealing Primary Schools receiving additional funding for September, 2010:

- I already have a daughter attending Hobbayne Primary School in Hanwell (currently aged 7, Year 2) and I will be applying for a placement for my son this September 2009 for entry September 2010.

- I did apply to Hobbayne Primary Nursery School for my son to start in September 2009, unfortunately he did not get a place, due to over subscription. He is currently 18th on the waiting list.

- It has come to my attention that over the past couple of years, that Hobbayne has become an oversubscribed School, where this year there were 20-25 Appeal cases, where only 1 out of 25 won the appeal.

- The birth rate continues to increase and due to the economic downturn, with many job losses, parents cannot afford to send their children to Private Schools in Ealing.

- This is a great concern for me and my family, as I am working full-time Monday to Friday and my husband is unable to help as he does shift work. This means him starting work at 4.00 am and finishing at 11.00pm. Therefore, he cannot help me with the school runs, before and after school. Nor do I have family members nearby to help me out.

- The Government is encouraging parents into work to reduce benefit claims. Therefore, Government should do more by supporting working parents to gain access to their first choice school, where siblings also attend. Not only do the parents suffer but their children who are being separated by attending different schools, also suffer.
• If I do not get a placement in September, 2010 this would cause me great stress as I would have to do separate drop off to School and hold a full-time job. I cannot afford to do part-time work as I have child costs, a large mortgage to pay, plus utility bills.

• I applied for a full-time placement at Hobbayne’s After School Club for my daughter’s in March 2005. I am still waiting for a full-time vacancy to arise. I have been told by staff that numbers at the maximum and there is no room for expansion.

Recommendation:

If Hobbayne had the funds to expand, they would able to cater more children at their Breakfast and After School Club as they would have the resources in place, and parents would not be disappointed.

• Working full-time, facilities such as Breakfast and After School Clubs is imperative as I need to ensure that my children are in a safe, healthy and caring environment (in accordance with ‘Every Child Matters’). Please note that there are many Primary Schools in the Ealing Borough who do not cater for Breakfast and After School Clubs. This would be a very big problem for me.

• Although catchment area is high on the Local Authorities Criteria List, it seems unfair to have this criteria higher than siblings, as I am aware that a lot of people are moving into the catchment area i.e. Renting 1 Bedroom Flat to secure their child’s placement within the catchment area. Once the parent has been allocated a placement at Hobbayne, parents and child are moving out of the area, a few months later, as Hanwell is not a cheap area to live in.

• Also, a lot of people are giving other people’s addresses e.g. parents address (i.e. Patel Case at Harrow Council), to secure their child’s placement at Hobbayne, within catchment area. Although I am aware that the Local Authority does do residential checks based on utility bills in the parents name, this is unfair on parents who are truthful about their applications. I am aware that the Local Authority is not the Police and they cannot check every application. Recommendations:

  1. Criteria for Siblings need to higher of the criteria list.

  2. Parents should give proof of their residency for at least 5 years to the Local Authority, once their child has been allocated a placement at Hobbayne. This would cut down the fraud and unfairness to honest parents.

Therefore, on behalf of myself and many other stressed parents I would be grateful if you could include the above points and recommendations for Hobbayne Primary, to receive additional funding ready to cope with the high demand of children, at Reception Level in September, 2010.
I look forward to receiving a positive outcome of this consultation in September 2009 and the final outcome on January 2010.

If you require any further information, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours sincerely
Dear Mr Redhead

Re: Planning for our future: Have your Say on Primary School Places in Ealing

I write in reference to your letter of 15 June 2009 on the above subject, having read the consultation report. I would prefer to submit my comments by letter rather than complete the on-line questionnaire and hope you will take still take due notice of it and pass it to whomever is concerned with this matter.

As a resident of Church Gardens, W5 and living in the house immediately opposite the entrance to the school, we have already on many occasions dealt with the school, the parking services, the police and many of the hierarchy within the various departments of the Council with respect to the enormous and unreasonable burden placed by school traffic on the residents’ parking facilities in the street. It is a matter of record, no doubt, within your own department.

We were delighted to see, therefore, that the Consultation document comments that Grange School is “not in the best geographical location to meet the demand for places”. This most definitely continues to be the case and it would be totally horrendous for residents if the number of children (and thus parents’ cars attending daily) were to be increased at all. It is hoped, therefore, that the viewpoint expressed in the consultation document will be very much maintained and that we will not be forced into a position of having to make further representations on this matter.

I might additionally mention that the many other residents of the street who have spoken to me on this matter feel exactly the same as this household does but are not for the most part able for one reason or another (disability, etc) to formulate a written response, let alone respond by internet since they do not have access to it.

Yours sincerely
Dear Mr. Redhead,

As one of the parents who formally objected to the expansion of Brentside Primary School during the first consultation process, I am satisfied that my views were noted.

However, I was concerned to see that the views of parents who had participated in the school-wide ballot - but who had not written directly to the council - were perhaps not fully acknowledged.

For this reason, I would like - again - formally to record my objection to the expansion of Brentside Primary to 3-form entry as part of the current (2nd) consultation process.

I am not opposed to the expansion of Brentside Primary School to 3-form entry.

Yours sincerely,
I do not want Drayton Green to expand

I want Drayton Green to expand

Reasons for my answer:
when class have more students that could the quality of studying and learning it affects the concentration of the students. It would be very hard for teachers to control the class and will be more problems under class notes. Teachers will get difficulties to keep class quiet and under control.
Appendix 4 – responses from governing bodies (in full)

Grange primary school

PLANNING FOR THE FUTURE

The governing body of Grange Primary School object to any expansion of the school in the foreseeable future for the following reasons:

1. In September 2009 there will be three year 5 classes and in September 2010 three year 6 classes. All the classrooms in the school will then be fully occupied, as will be the nursery. There is no meeting room, or similar room, that could be converted into a classroom to accommodate a bulge class.

2. The school is a two storey building with a pitched roof. Any extension to this building would therefore be impractical. Since there is no playing field any extension would have to be built on the playground. This would drastically reduce the hard play area available and would be well below the minimum area per pupil recommended in the Building Bulletin 99 (2nd Edition) Briefing Framework for Primary School Projects.

3. Construction work began on the site five years ago with the rebuild of the school. Once the school was completed in 2007 building of the Children’s Centre commenced and is not scheduled to be finished until March 2010. The past five years has been, and continues to be, a period of considerable disruption in the school. It has increased the work load of all the staff but particularly of the Headteacher and the Deputy Headteacher. An Assistant Headteacher has recently been appointed and we are currently recruiting a Business Manager. When it is built, a manager for the Children’s Centre will be recruited. The governing body consider it essential that there is now a period of consolidation to assimilate these changes without the distraction of any further building works.

4. The pedestrian entrances to the school can only be accessed from Roberts Alley. The alley runs between the back of houses in Church Gardens and the boundary of the school. At the beginning and the end of the school day the alley gets very congested. If the number of pupils was increased beyond 640 this would create a considerable problem.

5. Vehicle access to the school site is very restricted. The main entrance to the school is at the end of a Grange Gardens, which is a very narrow, residential road. Staff, parents and visitors coming to the school often congest the road causing inconvenience to local residents. During construction of the new school a separate road had to be constructed across Mayfield Gardens to accommodate site traffic.

Eva Sorensen
Chair of Governors
Hathaway primary school

Hathaway does not want to expand to three forms of entry.
- Hathaway is not the most popular school in the area as it has just come out of special measures.
- It already has many vacancies across the school.
- It has just restructured the staff based on a two form entry school.
- It needs to concentrate on raising standards across the school.
- The building is not adequate.

Short term- Capital investment
- Hathaway needs immediate capital investment into the school to cater for pupils attending at present.
- The back of the building needs re-cladding to match the front and ensure the pupils are safe from loose materials.
- The canteen is not fit for purpose.
- The playground is not big enough for pupils.
- The two buildings need to be linked with an extra room for art/ science activities.
- The Reception area of the school needs expansion.

Long Term-Rebuild of Hathaway
- Hathaway was a temporary structure to last only 15 years (that was 36 years ago).
- It is top of LA list to rebuild as there is plenty of land to build on.
- It could be developed as part of the regeneration of Copley Close.
- It will give pupils in one of the most deprived area an appropriate learning environment.
- It will help to raise the profile of the school and in turn improve the reputation and increase numbers on roll.
Hobbayne primary school

Following our meeting on 8 July (and a Full Governing body meeting on the same date) I promised I would write on behalf of Hobbayne’s Governing Body to outline our position before closure of the consultation period on 17 July with regard to our position over the potential for Hobbayne to be considered for expansion.

Consideration of the Governing Body’s response is based on a number of factors:

- local demographic trends, which place pressure on school provision in the area (it would be helpful if the school could have access the latest Council projections, to enable us to study these in more detail)
- the school’s current position as a place of high educational achievement and positive pupil experiences (as recognised by OFSTED), which we wish to preserve at all costs
- the school’s desire to expand and improve its provision in a number of areas, including ICT
- the school’s wish to serve its local community in the best possible manner, now and in the future
- local infrastructure constraints, especially those around transport.

Having discussed the position we feel that if, following the consultation period, the Council decided to recommend Hobbayne for expansion to a three-form entry school, we would want to engage positively with the local authority to understand how our concerns would be addressed. In our view future support from the school and the local community for such a proposal would depend on:

- Satisfactory resolution of the issue of how to accommodate the extra numbers and associated additional school infrastructure without compromising the school environment unduly and irrevocably. This is far from a given and would, we feel, be likely to require a highly creative architectural solution. As a starting point, the school would want to examine carefully the indicative plans currently being prepared. Beyond this, we would want any tender process to incorporate a number of different architects, to enable a wide selection of possible options and to achieve the best possible outcome for the school in terms of use of space.

- Additional infrastructure to improve the school’s existing provision in areas such as ICT and, importantly, a new kitchen. (As you will be aware, as one of only a handful of primary schools in Ealing without a kitchen, the school has already expressed interest in building one via a match-funded DCSF bid.)
• Satisfactory resolution issues of local access and congestion that might result from expansion – we feel this would be an important factor in allaying the potential concerns of local residents.

• Recognition of the strain that overseeing a project of this size and complexity would place on the school’s management, and inclusion in any project funding of the necessary resources to support the school in managing the project.

I hope this clarifies the school’s position. We await the outcome of the consultation with interest. In the meantime, if you would like further clarification of any of the above, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours sincerely

Matthew Batchelor
Chair, Governing Body
Mayfield primary school

As you are aware, the prospect of going to 2 forms of entry is very attractive from a classroom management view, curriculum management view and I know there are some parents who would prefer a school with two forms of entry.

However, I have considered both the advantages and disadvantages and although the initial advantage is attractive, the disadvantages are greater and out weigh the advantages:

DISADVANTAGES:

- I have grave concerns about the lack of internal and external space - we are currently spatially challenged both internally and externally and do not have enough space to accommodate small groups, additional classes and one-to-one work. When visitors call with teams such as Ofsted, CLLD evaluation, I am required to vacate my office so that they can work there because there is no where else for them to go!
- The prospect of 60 more children on the KS2 playground, 45 on the KS1 playground and 15 on reception playground will put increased pressure on the already restricted areas we have. The playground areas are very small.
- The original school was an Infant school and our school hall was built to house 210 infant children. Since the expansion in 1995 this has risen to 350 children who use the hall for assemblies. With the prospect of going to 2 form entry this would mean 470 children were being squeezed in to the same space. Parents and carers regularly attend our assemblies and they sit at the back of the hall. With the potential increased places, it would be very difficult for us to accommodate parents and carers and therefore affect the very good relationship we have with them. It would decrease opportunities for them to be involved in the education of their child.
- The hall is currently timetabled for each class to use for PE. Children also eat their lunch in the hall. Additional classes will restrict the use of the hall for all classes.
- The ICT suite is used for teaching sets in the morning (year 5 and 6) and then it is timetabled for ICT use by other classes throughout the day. There would be major timetabling issues around this resource if additional classes were added.
- Our library is actually a remodeled cupboard. It is inadequate for current needs. It would not be suitable for use with additional classes.
- There are over 40 staff at Mayfield and our staffroom is very small. It does not accommodate all staff at any one time. Additional classes bring additional staff which will increase pressure on this already inadequate resource.
- We currently have one administrator who works in a very restricted office space. The increased staff and pupils created by moving to 2 forms of entry is likely to require additional admin support. The current reception room would not be able to accommodate another administrator due to a lack of space.
And my other concern is about the building itself – where would it go? If it extends to the side from the current building then this will encroach on playground space which is already tight.

It is essential that for this project to be considered that substantial land is gained from neighboring areas so that the staff, children and parents feel that they are benefiting from a larger school and not that we are all being squeezed in to grounds and teaching areas that are already inadequate to support our full needs.

As I began my email, the initial prospect of 2 form entry does sound appealing, however, the extensive list of disadvantages outweigh the disadvantages that were initially considered.

I hope that I have considered all the main issues both for and against the proposal to expand to two forms of entry and have made clear that the school would be favourable to such expansion, but on balance it is the lack of space that confines our response. If you require further help please contact me.

On another note, we are keen to build a small extension to the front of the school. This will give us much needed small teaching rooms, teaching areas and a larger staffroom. My deputy would also benefit from a room – at the moment she currently shares a very small and inadequate area with the SENCo.

The school is able to contribute a substantial amount to this project but requires an additional £200000 to fund it. The feasibility study suggests that we need a total of £350000. I would be very grateful if the LA would consider financially supporting this small project - it would make a huge difference to the quality of learning for all of our pupils and a massive difference to the working conditions for my staff.

I hope that I have covered all the main concerns and indeed, expressed the advantages for Mayfield for the proposal to expand to two forms of entry. If you require further help please contact me.

Belinda Ewart
Head teacher
Following our initial discussions regarding the expansion proposal, I and the governing body on behalf of all Oaklands stakeholders came to the following conclusions:

- We acknowledge the issue of rising birth rates and the need for additional places
- We would support a temporary “bulge” to three forms of entry to support the LA – parents understand that this would help and can see the benefits to Oaklands children especially linking into a purpose built Early Years provision
- The parents who expressed their opinions in an open evening made it very clear they were opposed to a permanent expansion to three forms of entry. The governing body and staff of Oaklands agree that our site would not be suitable for three forms of entry due to a lack of hall space, playground space and site space

The overall conclusion is that whereas the ideal is to not change we also see the opportunity a temporary expansion presents and we are confident we would have the backing of the school community for a temporary expansion.

However a permanent expansion would meet a great deal of resistance for the reasons mentioned above and also an attraction of our school is a close, community spirit which will be difficult with over 200 more children and families in the school.

What is a concern we want noted on behalf of the parents is that if a temporary expansion is agreed, but then the plan is to continue so we have to become a permanent, the confidence and trust the parents have in the school and LA will be lost having a detrimental impact on relationships and possibly the number on role. It could change the ethos of the school for the worse.

Furthermore if it was agreed that if nothing happened at Oaklands now, but then a permanent expansion was imposed when most of the funding was spent, this would be even worse.

Whether a temporary or permanent build, certain aspects of our site must be improved to enable additional intake of pupils:

- Purpose made classrooms for Early Years Foundation Stage including improved provision for free flow outdoor play as identified in our last OFSTED report
- A larger hall to enable whole school community assemblies and activities
- Improved provision within the site for library and ICT
• Security enhanced and access reviewed to enable increased numbers and visitors

• Assurance of what will happen should temporary or permanent increases appear not to be needed in the coming years

• Minimal disruption to the already small playground – site contractors etc must take up minimal space

• Support to make best use of the external and internal learning environments

We want honest, open dialogue with the LA as to the actual position and we can work with our school community to try and achieve a positive outcome for us all.

If you need any further details do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours sincerely,

Sash Hamidi          Sarah Hayward
Headteacher         Chair of Governors
St Mark's primary school

It was very good to meet with you and Holly last week to discuss the possible expansion of St Marks to a two form entry. As we understand it, this is not a PFI but a local authority initiative. It would mean the expansion of the school premise without affecting the field which is designated as Metropolitan Open Land.

We have been consulting with the governors, parents/carers, staff and pupils of the school to ensure that all concerned have had an opportunity to comment. Whilst we are in principal in favour of the expansion we have some concerns that will need to be addressed before we could agree to this proposal. We list the concerns that we have gathered below. They are not in any particular order of priority.

1. The current location is the optimum size for 1.5 form entry and would not be able to take on any additional pupils without modification to the site.
2. In order to accommodate 2 form entry the school will require 14 classrooms, we currently have 10.
3. We would also need to ensure that there is a space for the Nursery.
4. The increase in size will put pressure on other facilities which are already a premium.
5. The school would need an additional ICT suite, a larger hall, more toilet facilities, a larger staff room, more available space for smaller group or individual work areas for those with additional needs.
6. Increased staffing costs and potentially caretaking/cleaning costs.
7. The current kitchen facilities would be insufficient to cope with increased number of school meals.
8. Entry to the school premises would need to be relocated as the current entrance would not be able to cope with the additional foot fall. We have narrow pavements around the school with a busy main road. Safety would be an issue as there would be increased demand for parking.
9. The field plays a crucial part in the life of the school and would have to remain. It is currently widely used for play, sports days, fetes/other fund raising events, gardening and wildlife club, and after school activities such as football matches.
10. The play space guidelines would have to be observed and any expansion would have to ensure the correct ratio is persevered.
11. We would prefer to have the option of design build.
12. Need to improve/increase library facilities

There was a common theme in the concerns raised in the consultation and that was the loss of the ‘small school/community feel’ of the school. Whilst many felt the benefit of two form entry would make the classes easier to manage than our current vertical grouping, they also felt there would be a loss of the small school feel. There was also recognition of the benefits of the improved facilities within the school. In all this, a major feature was the safety of the roads and access to the school bearing in mind the increased car travel and foot fall on the already narrow paths and busy roads.
Having considered the feedback we have received, we would ask you to address the following concerns

1. Please confirm that this is a local authority initiative and not a PFI
2. That the playing field and nature area will not be affected/reduced in size
3. Safety issues will be addressed and suitable access to the school is provided
4. Play space ratios will be observed
5. In addition to the extra classrooms sufficient facilities of
   - a larger hall
   - additional ICT suite
   - library
   - toilets
   - staff room
   - spare space for small group work
   - kitchen area
   would be provided and would not be at a premium.
6. That the school would be able to opt for design build
7. Could the Local Authority consider the purchase of the former tutorial site adjacent to the school as part of the expansion programme and thus reduce the affect on the main site?

We would be pleased to hear your views on these issues before we confirm our position. We look forward to hearing from you.

Kind regards

Yours sincerely

Suchitra Hammond
Chair of Governors
With reference to the LA proposals to expand BPS to either 2 or 3FE Ealing
Consultation for expansion of schools places.

Dear Gary,

I am writing to inform you that the governing body met on Thursday 16th July and
voted on two issues concerning site and expansion of BPS. The vote was
unanimously for the issues presented below.

1. That a new three classroom building completed before any increase in
the number of pupils

2. That the emergency access from/to Greenford Avenue is reinstated.

With reference to the LA consultation, 94 questionnaires were returned to us by
parents, 28 by staff and 30 by local residents. Almost all responses returned to us
indicated support for BPS moving to 2FE.

The pupils voted 59 against any expansion to 58 for expansion to 2 FE also 2 pupils
voted for 3FE.

The feedback from parents in relation to your further consultation was that they
were troubled and angry that their views, represented in the submission of the 13th
February 2009 in which 220 parents voted against BPS expansion to 3FE were not
represented in your report to Cabinet and therefore the Cabinet were not made fully aware that BPS parents had made their views known about expansion to 3FE.

The feedback from the local residents was that they were very concerned about the traffic congestion implicated in a 3FE expansion.

Re the blocked off fire exit at the back of the school.

The governors have also asked me to raise the issue of the emergency access at the back of the school which was blocked over in 2004/5 by Kajama. The HT and governors are concerned that for two reasons:

1. Despite numerous attempts to contact Health and Safety and Steve Denham to re-examine the fire safety provision for BPS, nothing has happened.

2. It states clearly in the deeds of BPS that there must be access maintained between BPS and the Brentside High School for emergencies, building and disposal of rubbish. To date Ealing have chosen to ignore this legal denial of access and safety by Brentside High PFI.

3. The staff and governors are of the opinion that BPS does not meet DCFS fire regulations and believe the safety of pupils and staff is at risk without fire exit at the back of the school. Added to which building a further block will serve to cut the front and the back of the school off from each other and thus make the re-installation of the emergency exit even more imperative.

Governors' concerns about the consultation document and process.

In relation to the consultation document we do have some concerns which we would like to be noted by the LA and Cabinet. They are as follows:

We are concerned that given that BPS was the only school to have been nominated for two proposals there should have been a separate analysis and information given to the reader as well as a means of indicating which proposal, if any, they wished to support.

We are still unclear about what the purpose of the consultation was. It has been suggested by your department that it is to gauge public opinion however it is our understanding that a consultation should primarily seek the views of the
stakeholders of the school community. We are concerned that people who do not have a direct interest in BPS will be shaping the future without a mandate to do so.

We would ask that all decision made about BPS reflect the views of stakeholders and prospective stakeholders of this community and that the 'postcode' should determine the validity of the choice of school to be expanded.

We are also concerned that the consultation document could lead parents across the borough to presume that all they have a right to send their children to popular and outstanding schools despite Ealing's admissions policy relating to postcode and catchment areas.

We are concerned that federating schools such as Hathaway with North Ealing have not been considered. This would enable the borough to take positive action to remedy weaknesses in standards in some schools thus enabling more pupils to have access to an 'outstanding' and 'good' education.

We are very pleased that the electrical work to re-wire the middle section of the school is to be completed this summer and thank for this.

Yours Sincerely,

Anne Chapman
Chair of Governors.
Drayton Green primary school

Response awaited