

**Flintshire County Council**

# **Lifelong Learning**

## **Area Schools Review 2012 Final Report**

**30th April 2012**

**Responses received by 30/04/12**

- 1. Buckley, Mynydd Isa and Mold = English 178 / Welsh 0**
- 2. Queensferry, Shotton & C Quay = English 198 / Welsh 1**
- 3. Holywell High School = English 19 / Welsh 0**
- 4. Ysgol Perth y Terfyn and Ysgol y Fron = English 3 / Welsh 0**

**Flintshire County Council**

**Lifelong Learning  
Area Schools Review 2012**

**Buckley, Mynydd Isa  
and Mold**

**Responses received by 30/04/12 = English 178 / Welsh 0**

**Final Report**

## Area Schools Review 2012

### Buckley, Mynydd Isa and Mold

#### Elfed High School and Westwood Primary School Consultation Form Responses.

178 received by 30/04/12

**OPTION 1 - Retain 11-16 provision at Elfed High School. Rationalise to 600 places, to include Additional Learning Needs and other education, leisure and cultural uses.**

#### **Q1 How strongly do you agree or disagree with OPTION 1 (please tick ONE box only)**

Strongly Agree	=	44	24.9%
Tend to Agree	=	20	11.3%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	=	13	7.3%
Tend to Disagree	=	20	11.3%
Strongly Disagree	=	63	35.6%

#### **Q2 To help us understand why people agree or disagree with OPTION 1 please provide a short summary of your reasoning (250 words maximum)**

1. As long as it is only secondary school children on the Elfed site I would settle for that option. I do NOT wish there to be primary and secondary school children on the same site. It is not good for children as young as 3/4 to be around 16/18 year olds. Likewise I am sure it would be very distracting for the older kids to have young ones around. My youngest is 4 and would be very intimidated attending a school where secondary aged pupils are present. He is not a timid child either. School at that age is scary enough when you first start. Primary school aged children require a different learning environment to older children. I think there should be 16 - 18 year old provision available in Buckley other than travelling to Mold. The Elfed higher education serves both the Elfed and Argoed pupils. Both my children attend Southdown Primary School, and although it is a few years before my eldest will attend high school, I want to ensure that there will still be provision for them if they choose to go onto further education. I respect that it is Westwood that is affected but would not like to think of my children on one site. The Elfed is also within walking distance however Mold Alun is not.
2. After great consideration we chose Elfed as our only daughters education purely on the fact that she would be able to continue on site with 'A' levels after GCSE's and the pass rate being good.
3. Sixth form is a vital part of the school as there is no other sixth form in the Buckley area we would have to travel to Mold, this is also losing pupils not gaining them.
4. To propose the loss of a sixth form facility at Elfed is absurd. Use of the building by third parties has potential to create conflict between users and pupils. Access & parking is already a nightmare which would only be aggravated if this were to be considered. Furthermore I simply do not want my children being bussed about Flintshire; this is safe, sustainable or ethical. Funding should not be cited as an excuse for providing inadequate education provision. If Flintshire is short of funds then it should start by looking to cut the number of Councillors by two thirds before messing about with children's education.
5. with the proposal to increase the school leavers age to 17 from 2013 and 18 in 2015, it would be very short sighted to remove provision for school children age 16+
6. we need provision of 6th form in Buckley and the Elfed is one of the best 6th forms in the area
7. Buckley is the most populated town in Flintshire and is increasing all the time with the building of new homes. It is my opinion that it does not make sense to reduce the capacity of the Elfed when the population is rising. If Buckley has the highest

population in Flintshire, then it is my understanding that Flintshire County Council must therefore receive the most in council tax from the residents of Buckley, myself included, yet I feel that Buckley and its residents are always short-changed have lived in Buckley all my life as have my husband and his family, our children both attend the Elfed and our daughter is a pupil in year 13, she had excellent GCSE results and is doing extremely well with her "four" A level subjects. Our daughter is a quiet person who has greatly benefited from being able to carry on with her education at the Elfed and without it she may never would of done if she had to travel elsewhere .If the Elfed lost its Sixth Form it would be a tragedy, not just to the school, but most of all to all the prospective Sixth Form students and future ones. Taking away the choice from the children and parents of Buckley that they could not study at sixth form at the same school in the town where they live, would be absolutely appalling. Elfed's exam results have continually gone up year after year, surely this should have a bearing on its future.

8. This option would remove sixth form provision from the school which would mean that there would be no sixth form provision in the Buckley area. This cannot be right and will have a negative effect on the community as well as severely restricting the continuity of education provision. The success of sixth forms rests in the quality of the relationships between students, parents & staff, built up over the years. It plays a large part in the life of the school, giving students the opportunity to work with younger pupils in areas such as supported reading, PE and other skilled areas. The links with local businesses would also be lost and this is vital in the context of future employment for the students concerned, particularly as more are now looking to employment rather than seeking university placements. The Elfed sixth form would also be a small sixth form, giving it the advantage of catering for those pupils who may feel 'lost' within larger sixth forms and thus unable to perform to the best of their ability. It is also contradictory to remove the provision and increase travelling costs at a time when fuel costs and other costs related to travelling are at significantly high levels.
9. Historically The Elfed has always had a 6th Form; latest results are outstanding and set to improve. Why try to mend something that is not broken. Transporting pupils around the county is both environmentally and socially irresponsible. Children are people not commodities.
10. I strongly think that Elfed high should remain at the site where situated now and have regular access to the leisure centre.
11. I feel it would be detrimental to the school to lose their sixth form.
12. I feel it would be detrimental to the school to close the sixth form.
13. I believe that Buckley being one of the largest towns in Flintshire should have a 16-18 provision in the town. Besides transport to Mold would be provided for a limited time only.

#### **New responses received since 29/02/12**

14. I believe that Buckley should have the facility to have a sixth form.
15. From the 1970s, Elfed has offered high quality Sixth Form education. Removing the Sixth form is tantamount to decapitating the school. Removing Sixth form students exacerbates the surplus places problem. I am fully aware that per capita spending is greater on post GCSE students (I was a member of Elfed staff for almost 30 years) but this is a price worth paying. It is erroneous to argue that Westwood pupils move to Elfed to emphasise continuity if the Sixth form is removed
16. Minimal disruption to local schools and pupils.
17. This option means no disruption to other schools in the area. Elfed is under subscribed and has the space to accommodate Additional Learning and other needs.
18. Leaves Buckley area without post-16 provision 2. Mold Alyn sixth form already over-subscribed. 3. Reduction in staff at Elfed leading to a reduction in the breadth of curriculum available, particularly in KS4 4. Money spent converting building for a temporary period (until numbers rise once more based on housing being built) is wasteful 5. Does not realistically deal with the issue. 6. The Argoed building which was described as unfit for purpose would continue to be neglected, Argoed students

would continue to be taught in mobile classrooms ... where would the money be found to improve their 'unfit' building.

19. Where would you send the sixth formers, Mold Alun 6th form is already over subscribed. You've not thought through this well at all
20. Removing the Sixth Form from Elfed High will put a strain on Mold Alun resources.
21. Building too big , would provide community use
22. Leave the school as it is and disband with the sixth form and use the additional buildings for community use, perhaps use for workshops for skill building doing NVQ's etc rather than travelling to colleges.
23. it is successful as it is so no changes are needed
24. By limiting the places the Elfed wont be under subscribed.
25. I think Buckley should be able to keep their own high school and perhaps reduce the number of pupils attending this way they wont be under subscribed.
26. If the children in the catchment area went to the school there wouldn't be such a surplus "issue". Some of these children are attending Hawarden, Holywell, Alun, Castell or Argoed due their better exam results. Improve the Elfed's reputation.
27. Why change what already works well and has done for years?
28. I feel the Elfed would benefit from being developed into a community concern - the community would then depend on it and vice versa. It would be a total triumph if the Elfed had the backing of the parents of the children who attend it and of other local people. An additional learning needs provision has been removed from the area and I feel it would be right to create a similar provision in the area to compensate for this!
29. I work at Darland High school as an LSA and I have found from budget increase other children with additional learning needs have excelled. We now have the money to run Fair trade projects, forest school and outdoor education. We have been sending young students on college courses in Glyndwr and Llyfasi College teaching them life skills such as (working with money, mechanics and care courses). Children these days are tired of classroom atmosphere and most children cannot excel in this area. We have found children with behavioural needs such as ADHD worked much better given responsibility in a real life situation for example. Mechanical engineering etc. Some children are visual and kinaesthetic learners and with extra facilities for other education, leisure and cultural uses these children may get the chance to show teachers and parents what they can really do.
30. The school is not full to capacity.
31. A town the size of Buckley deserves to have sixth form provision with a varied range of subjects which are attractive to prospective students. The lack of sixth form provision would result in a diminishing of community cohesion and result in increased traffic within the county.
32. I think the school has great facilities and is clearly improving academically, but I feel this is not as favourable as option 2, because option 2 provides 16-18. I think it's important to offer an alternative to Mold Alun, to preserve student choice.
33. There would be no post-16 provision in the Buckley / Mynydd Isa area.
34. Elfed sixth form has less than 50 students at present and less than 10 minutes away is Mold Alun with the largest sixth form so it makes sense to move these students to the Alun. Also, with parts of the Elfed building currently unusable, this could be knocked down as the sixth form area would be able to be used as extra space.
35. Keeping Elfed would be a good idea, I don't think it needs a 6th form to be a successful school.
36. This does not provide sixth form education for the locality.
37. We need our sixth form at the Elfed.
38. Continuation of learning environment would be preferable through to A-level in one location.
39. Need the ability to stay on at school until 18 without disruption by having to move schools etc.
40. Buckley and surrounding areas is a growing area with a considerable amount of families. Provision of education within walking distance is a key factor for a cohesive school where pupils are considered as individuals. To have communities disrupted in order to rationalise sites does not make sense when Elfed already has the critical mass and facilities in order to provide pupils with a good standard of education. This survey is deeply flawed as it does not present any alternatives whatsoever and

therefore is canvassing opinion with no viable alternative proposed within the questionnaire. In my opinion this has completely undermined any credibility the council hoped to have in the eyes of the public and is simply wasting everyone's time and energy.

41. To remove Year 12/13 from Elfed could mean that the nearest provision would be at the Alun School. I am concerned that this would entail students having to compete for places with those from the Argoed. At the moment there is 'talk' of providing facilities at Deeside College but this cannot be guaranteed so if my child decided to continue to A' level I feel that her choices would be very limited or involve travel.
42. 16+ facility required.
43. A town the size of Buckley is desperate to retain its Sixth Form. Buckley is seen as a more prosperous area of the County and it is time that the considerable income from higher council taxed houses is kept in the community to improve our educational requirements rather than being spent in poorer towns.

#### **New responses received since 26/03/12**

44. I agree with this option because Elfed is the school with surplus places so there for the problem lies with them
45. Major concerns regarding the change of use of space. Spending £15.6m creating 'office' space is an utter waste of money. In difficult financial times the council must reconsider this expenditure. Much of the Review quotes Welsh Government expectations but they are not prepared to fund 'efficiencies' and spending such vast amounts on an unnecessary development, that would greatly harm the educational environment of our children, is outrageous. Will safeguard requirements be met given the proximity of external adults using the buildings? Standards are rising at the Elfed and, once the perception is rightly challenged that Mynydd Isa is more successful, numbers will rise at the Elfed and the surplus will be reduced. Every community has the right of access to 11-18 education and, according to the council's statistics; Buckley has more properties than any other area. It would be totally unreasonable to withdraw the opportunity for Buckley's young people to enjoy a 'local' post-16 education and the clear benefits this can bring (as witnessed recently by the terrific support for the schools' Sports Relief Mile by all ages and led by the sixth formers). Additionally, the recent improvements in standards at GCSE will result in greater numbers of successful students seeking post-16 education which the school should offer.
46. Closing the sixth form would be a short sighted decision. Given the amount of housing developments going on in Buckley, then a school which provides an established 6th form would obviously benefit the Elfed when attracting parents moving into the area. We have just relocated to Flintshire and our choice of Buckley, and the Elfed, was heavily weighted on the fact Buckley had a school that provided a sixth form for the future. This choice would enable our children to walk (healthily) to school and save on both costs and valuable time from not having to travel to the next nearest sixth form. Has this cost in both quality time and money been factored into your calculations are they simply being ignored?
47. post 16 provision in the area is to be taken away the only post 16 provision would be at the Alun High school, or at Deeside college, this is a lot for them to take on and unfair to the local children of Buckley.
48. There is a need for 11-16 provision in the area. However, there are other more effective options for 16-18 year olds in Deeside College or Mold Alun High School. Both facilities are accessible to people of Buckley. As these facilities are larger - especially Deeside College - they can offer a spectrum of vocational training as well as A levels. The support systems in place are also much more focused to the young adult.
49. I feel reducing the spaces, solves problem short term and allows room to grow when necessary, least disruption for pupils education and most cost effective.
50. No funding from welsh government, waste of council's money. Elfed sixth form having to move to Mold Alun, unfair.
51. Would like a sixth form option for my children.

52. If it only had 11-16 yrs old young people will have no option other than to go to Mold or Hawarden to further their education and a cost of travelling to parents or council.
53. Buckley town is growing, meaning Elfed will need space to grow. Reducing the spaces at Elfed temporary will allow them to regain space back when the town grows in the future.
54. I would ideally like Elfed to have a sixth form however, other options are available in the area.
55. I feel the option to keep the 6th form within the school is best for the local area so option 2.
56. It is important to retain an option/provision for 16-18 year olds within the local area. The current public transport system in any case is poor and would have to be improved significantly if the nearest 'sixth form' provision was in Mold.
57. Why office space? They have enough space!
58. This has worked for many years. I have children in both schools and strongly wish it to remain as it is.
59. Need more sixth form space in this area of Flintshire
60. I don't agree that Elfed High School sixth form should be closed. The sixth form is a very popular choice for pupils and the grades speak for themselves. The sixth form offers a great chance for Buckley pupils to move on to higher education i.e. university. I see this option as having no benefit for the pupils. I don't understand how these changes cost £15.6M either.
61. Perhaps the young adult would be better off going somewhere else to do their A Levels as there's not much subject choice at Elfed.
62. This is problem of secondary school numbers which should be addressed by secondary schools. Consider the Argoed and Mold Alun numbers and question why the numbers are low in Elfed.
63. Elfed's sixth form, albeit small, is an excellent tertiary education facility for Buckley and surrounding areas pupils, with an outstanding exam results rate, and provides a familiar, local, more disciplined tertiary educational facility which some children thrive on...to lose it would be detrimental. I also have concerns about what other educational, leisure and cultural facilities would share surplus space, with regards to Health and Safety of the children, as more traffic and parking problems will be created, adding to an already HUGE problem on site.....the children hardly have any outdoor space of their own, i.e.,-to use at break and lunch times, and constantly have to gingerly dodge traffic around site as it is.
64. The loss of a sixth form on the Elfed site could lead prospective students to consider other high school options where a sixth form is available, and therefore have a negative effect on the numbers of students moving on to secondary education at the Elfed from their respective primary schools. I support the RETENTION of a Sixth form at the Elfed; my reasoning otherwise for or against this option is such as put forward for Option 2.
65. The Elfed facilities should be kept as a high school with or without a sixth form if the problems with numbers persist in the Buckley area surely it would be more logical and practical to share some facilities/courses with the other high school in Buckley area The Argoed. Due to more houses being build the area in later years the surplus places will be filled. In Connah's Quay some children do certain GCSEs in Deeside college e.g. electrical surely this is something that could be looked at with the 2 high schools expand facilities and offer new courses.
66. I agree with this option as using the office space could create a source of income for the council renting out the space and despite your questionable projected cost it would involve less infrastructure changes to locate an office in the space as opposed to a primary school. Relocating an office would involve far less community/social problems such as 3-18 year olds potentially mixing travelling to the same location, security at the site and having 3 year olds mixing with the general public who are there to use the leisure facilities.
67. I think it is important for a growing town like Buckley should have a successful high school. But not at the risk of losing Westwood primary
68. 6TH FORM FAILING, ALLOW ELFED TO SORT ITSELF OUT, USE THE EXCESS SPACE FOR TEMPORARY OFFICES (WESTWOOD CENTRE) STORAGE, CONFERENCE FACILITY, TRAINING/ADULY LEARNING



69. If 6th form isn't working then close and move the 6th form elsewhere and allow Elfed to sort itself out, rationalise places and use the excess space for temporary services, office, conference, cultural centre - better for kids education as not disruption, safer also, not traffic issues, cost effective solution - allows for future growth as predicted
70. Supports existing schools in the local area. Provides space that could be reclaimed in the future should more than 600 places be needed, which projected pupil numbers after 2018 indicate will be likely. Removes the financial drain of an under used 6th form. Allows 6th formers to access a full range of subjects in an alternative setting.
71. Supports existing schools in the local area. Provides space that could be reclaimed in the future should more than 600 places be needed, which projected pupil numbers after 2018 indicate will be likely. Removes the financial drain of an under used 6th form. Allows 6th formers to access a full range of subjects in an alternative setting.
72. Supports existing schools in the local area. Provides space that could be reclaimed in the future should more than 600 places be needed, which projected pupil numbers after 2018 indicate will be likely. Removes the financial drain of an under used 6th form. Allows 6th formers to access a full range of subjects in an alternative setting.
73. Supports existing schools in the local area. Provides space that could be reclaimed in the future should more than 600 places be needed, which projected pupil numbers after 2018 indicate will be likely. Removes the financial drain of an under used 6th form. Allows 6th formers to access a full range of subjects in an alternative setting.
74. Official documents state that all Flintshire 6th forms are smaller than need to be and duplicate lessons. For this reason I agree that getting rid of 6th form, or moving 6th form to Deeside AC or new purpose built 6th form facility, and rationalising places on a TEMPORARY basis would be a good solution to the problem. It would allow the school to recover and when the school intake needs to expand it will have the room to proving the building space is taken up by temporary solutions. This would also provide a better cost option; space could be mothballed or rented out. Safer for the Elfed kids as they would not be subject to disruption caused by major re-model work and their education would be aided, as the demographics already show an increase in achievement at the school as its number have decreased. Also safer for Elfed pupils on the basis of no shared facility, no accusations of contact with young children, less people on one site, more space for them.
75. The communities of Buckley and Mynydd Isa should have 11 - 18 provision available in the local community. It is unthinkable for a community of this size not to have this provision.
76. I do not agree with all Elfed pupils and teachers moving into smaller space. Children will find learning with more noise and crowded areas difficult. To rent the other part to offices would mean a lot of police checks because not everyone is as nice as they might seem.
77. We need to provide young people with choices and opportunities and closing Elfed 6th form does not help this. We can't assume and send them to Mold Alun.
78. Education authority will do what they want anyway.
79. We strongly disagree due to the fact that no child in Buckley area will have the opportunity to go to a sixth form school in their home town. Buckley has a high population than most areas so should have the education facilities required. Very silly idea.
80. You suggest office space. Where will they park the increased volume of cars? What about congestion on Hawkesbury Road entrance? Who will bear the cost of travel to and from another sixth form?
81. The Elfed needs to retain its 6th form and try to attract people from Argoed and other areas to boost its numbers.
82. Disagree with people not involved with the school accessing the building.
83. Buckley children will have to travel and go out of area for 6th form education, surely this will put pressure on 6th form places in other areas.
84. It is important to have a local 6th form for a continuation of education. Also it would stop having to make extra bus or car journeys if we lost the 6th form.
85. The situation of surplus places will not be addressed at the Elfed, only make worse.
86. Increasing primary places and decreasing secondary doesn't make sense - for future planning.

87. This is the only sixth form within Buckley/Mynydd Isa. This is taking away pupils rights to an advance in their education.
88. Loss of sixth form would be bad for Buckley children.
89. This will do nothing to address the surplus places at the Elfed, if anything, this will only exacerbate the issue.
90. I do not understand how by freeing up space in this school it would cost £15.6 million! Surely in the long term if space is being rented out for office money will be brought in!
91. I don't think infants and junior school aged children should be forced to mix with senior pupils.
92. Shortening the learning years 11-16 would not solve the issue of reducing places, it would make the school even smaller.
93. I want 16-18 provision retained at the local school and the one the children have been in since 11 for continuity. There is no adapting to a new school with new people or having to travel via bus or car to a new facility to continue their education.
94. Think it makes sense to temporarily shrink the elder until demand increases again as demographics change.
95. This is by far the most effective option, and one which is most likely to succeed, both in terms of a funding bid, and popular community support. There are many far reaching and innovative uses of the additional space which rationalisation could free up, which could both cut expenditure, and raise further income streams for FCC. For example, leasing parts to popular and necessary external agencies with an impact on local communities, e.g. CAB, increasing accessibility and visibility in the community.
96. If school places were rationalised to solve the problem short term this would enable future growth as necessary to accommodate the new influx inline with new housing. As the 6th form is small it is not offering a good range of service and is not cost effective. Most 6th forms are failing due to size and perhaps the time has come to address that once and for all. Rationalising would create the least costly, least disruptive option to education of pupils.
97. Rationalising on short term would be easiest, cheapest and temporary option, enabling growth when needed but aiding the problem now, it would allow the school to recover its reputation and academic achievements and entice people back to it. Safer option with less disruption to education. Opens up another option for 6th form viability i.e. 6th form college elsewhere
98. This option is a sustainable option for the future of Elfed High School
99. DONT BRING ARGOED BACK INTO THE OPTIONS IT IS A FANTASTIC SCHOOL
100. There is documentation that states that 600 pupils is the minimum size required to be able to efficiently provide a broad and well balanced curriculum for students aged 11-16. To ensure that there is equality of opportunity for all students in the Buckley/Mynydd Isa consortium a school with a larger number of students on roll is required. The other problem with this option is the shared use of the site. There would be serious problems in ensuring the safety of students with regard to traffic and also the requirement to CRB check adults working in the vicinity of students.
101. We want the sixth form to remain in the school.
102. Feel that sixth form is an important aspect of the Elfed High school. Funding!!?
103. I think 6th form should be able to stay in the same school.
104. Would like to keep the 6th form in Buckley in a local high school.
105. Although loss of 16-18 provision would be disappointing. I feel that this would be the best option. Would like to see more opportunities/choice at GCSE level.
106. Removing the only sixth form school in Buckley would be totally inappropriate. Especially at the cost of £15.6 million and no guarantee the offices would be leasable.
107. Prefer provision to 18 at one location.
108. Disagree with closing sixth form.
109. I believe in 6th form provisions being available to all.
110. I believe the Elfed need a sixth form.
111. The pupils of Elfed High School should have the right to the provision of a 6th Form at the Elfed campus. It is an Educational need.
112. Nothing wrong with Elfed - leave the school alone just get rid of the useless 6th form.
113. Buckley does need a high school.

114. Possibly an option but I feel this would leave the whole modernisation progress OPEN for more debate in years to come when the council or councillors are looking to make money again.
115. I do not think you will find an option to suit all as it's a very sensitive area but his option seems the most logical in terms of catchment area affected. It would mean the least disruption to local people. It will rationalise the surplus places and provide for a variety of different educational needs.

**Q3 If you support Option 1 what do you think would be needed to make it work? What local issues would need to be considered?**

1. Do not agree at all with this option
2. Argued to merge into Elfed
3. n/a

**New responses received since 29/02/12**

4. Traffic congestion.
5. Traffic congestion in the area.
6. Actually taking young people What They d like i.e. skate park
7. Keep the Argoed as it is because this is also a successful school and any merges would affect it success
8. lifting the profile of the school in the local community so parents are willing to send their children there.
9. For it to work they need to raise the profile and reputation of the Elfed. More parents will be willing to send their children there if this is achieved.
10. Please see above. Improving the teaching provided.
11. The people involved need to be given a certain degree of ownership of the project - if the provision is going to support a variety of groups and gain the support of their families they need to trust and believe in it.
12. Sufficient staff and transport opportunities to reach locations that provide these resources. Taxi, Bus and parents would all have to work together on providing the transport needed to other colleges, whilst a range of staff would be beneficial to the involvement of the course. Local issues would be to give pupils a taster of work life. Whether it be local business's coming forward with placements or time. Or putting aside a budget capable of giving these pupils college course tasters. Local issues could include, environmental job opportunities and jobs in the local sector.
13. More needs to be done to address the perception of the Elfed as an unattractive option. There has been a steady drift of pupils away from the school since the arrival of the current headteacher. I feel that the school could flourish if it learnt lessons from its neighbouring schools re: pastoral care and academic attainment.
14. Transport to Mold Alun sixth form from Buckley rather than public transport.
15. Traffic problems desperately need looking at!
16. Nothing it works well at the moment.

**New responses received since 26/03/12**

17. This would mean 6th formers from Buckley having to travel to attend school or college. In these times of rising fuel costs then this doesn't make sense to me.
18. A concentrated approach to educational needs, a review of why people weren't choosing Elfed and how the school can grow again. Leisure Facility should not count in the costs!!
19. More offices - Any offices could be put into the Elfed, this would create rental for the council, this would be a cheaper solution to the problem, plus it would be easy to move out again if Elfed needs to grow. Training/adult learning centre - this could be an easy option and is fit for purpose now.
20. N/A
21. I support option 1 or 2 because it offers the flexibility to return the facility to education should the numbers increase which they will do over the next 10 years.

22. I support option 1 or 2 because it offers the flexibility to return the facility to education should the numbers increase which they will do over the next 10 years.
23. It seems to be the best idea, out of a bunch of stupid ones.
24. I do not support Option 1
25. Use some of the spare space at the Elfed as office space move the sure start and family facilities at Westwood into office space at Elfed and expand on the Westwood site as a infant and primary school ready for future demand.
26. Problems associated with increased traffic to the site would need to be considered and improved access to the site to accommodate the traffic for the office, leisure centre and also now the proposed health centre.
27. JUST CHANGE THE WAY SPACE IS USED SHORT TERM, DONT INSTALL A PERMANENT FIXTURE i.E. A PRIMARY AND THEN NEED A NEW PRIMARY IN FUTURE
28. Space used on a temporary basis by office, conference, cultural centre, library, police counter, kids centre (surestart) enables growth when needed. A 6th form facility could be made at Deeside ac or a new one build specifically.
29. Minor disruption to pupils and no change to educational outcomes. Very little local opposition. If the 'new' space was used for adult learning or a FCC training centre instead of using hotels, then very few alterations would be needed to the building. Lowest cost solution to addressing the issue of surplus places at Elfed.
30. Minor disruption to pupils and no change to educational outcomes. Very little local opposition. If the 'new' space was used for adult learning or a FCC training centre instead of using hotels, then very few alterations would be needed to the building. Lowest cost solution to addressing the issue of surplus places at Elfed.
31. Minor disruption to pupils and no change to educational outcomes. Very little local opposition. If the 'new' space was used for adult learning or a FCC training centre instead of using hotels, then very few alterations would be needed to the building. Lowest cost solution to addressing the issue of surplus places at Elfed.
32. Minor disruption to pupils and no change to educational outcomes. Very little local opposition. If the 'new' space was used for adult learning or a FCC training centre instead of using hotels, then very few alterations would be needed to the building. Lowest cost solution to addressing the issue of surplus places at Elfed.
33. The space not used by the school could be mothballed for future growth, or it could be utilised for office space (rental income), library, police counter, cultural centre, youth centre/Space, children's facility (surestart/genesis, training/adult learning, FCC office space, conference facility, storage for FCC. All a temporary measure to allow growth in future. For Elfed to recover, promotion of its own achievements and reputation is needed. Also, primary schools need to be feeding into Elfed, primary provisions need to grow to enable this, Westwood has the space and ability to grow and should be enhanced to support this.
34. Long term not viable solution.
35. This is not a viable long term solution. This would make the school less than 600 pupils, which meant it is not, in the eyes of WAG, a viable school.
36. Traffic congestion will always be an issue at the Elfed site, particularly with the new surgery planned. Perhaps a new entrance/ exit onto Bryn rd could alleviate this. Careful thought needs to be given to projected population figures in UDP to prevent rationalisation to such an extent that there is not a bigger problem created in terms of insufficient places for future generations.
37. 6th form provisions would need to be addressed by either the creation of a stand alone 6th form college or by enhancing current larger 6th forms. The spaces not required could be mothballed to enable future expansion, not permanently erased, maybe utilised by other services i.e. children's services, council premises.
38. Mothball space until future need, or use for other services such as Westwood centre office space, police counter, training/conference centre, council own use
39. Capacity of primary schools in Buckley and surrounding areas needs to be increased
40. Obviously how does the community still support 16-18 education.

**OPTION 2 - Retain 11-18 provision at Elfed High School. Rationalise to 750 places, to include Additional Learning Needs and other education, leisure and cultural uses.**

**Q4 How strongly do you agree or disagree with OPTION 2 (please tick ONE box only)**

Strongly Agree	=	106	59.9%
Tend to Agree	=	23	13.0%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	=	13	7.3%
Tend to Disagree	=	9	5.1%
Strongly Disagree	=	16	9.0%

**Q5 To help us understand why people agree or disagree with OPTION 2 please provide a short summary of your reasoning (250 words maximum)**

1. Concerned about losing a local secondary school.
2. As previous, sixth form is important to us. Also if there are empty rooms then rather than relocating a primary school (the oldest in Buckley), then rent could be brought in with office space.
3. It is inconceivable that the largest town in the County could have a high school with no 6th Form. Results have improved dramatically over recent years with last years being outstanding. This performance is set to improve and will, I am sure, attract parents who previously saw Elfed as a failing school; results show that this is simply not the case!
4. This would be the best solution for all, retain the current provision, with the view to higher pupil number from Sept 2013 onwards due to increase in school leaving age, plus move the Westwood Centre on to this site to take advantage of surplus floor space
5. do not change Elfed it is an excellent school and under no circumstances could a primary school be merged
6. Retaining 11-18 provision at the Elfed will be the best option. Buckley is expanding in relation to the amount of new homes being built, therefore, if the provision of places at the Elfed is reduced it simply does not add up. Having a Sixth Form at the Elfed is essential to the people of Buckley, especially the children. This provision is priceless to future prospective students of the Elfed who want to continue their education where they know the staff, who they would already have good relationships with. Not all children adapt well to moving to a different school and environment, even when they reach the age of 16. Taking away the choice where Elfed High School pupils continue with their studies is by no means fair. Presently, year 6 pupils in the Buckley area have the choice of attending schools outside the town such as Hawarden, Castell Alun etc. This is approved by Flintshire County Council, yet children who have decided to attend the High School where they live, i.e. "The Elfed" may not be able to study at "A Level" there. Maybe it could be a good idea for Flintshire County Council to remove the choice of Buckley children going to other School's in the County, therefore increasing the capacity at the Elfed!
7. This option would retain sixth form provision and mean that sixth form provision in the Buckley area would still be maintained. This is vital to the community as well as to the continuity of education provision. Parents would enter their children at Year 7 knowing that they could have a full and continuous education to the age of 18 in surroundings they are familiar with and also receive continuity of teaching. The sixth form would continue to play a large part in the life of the school and enable the school to maintain links with local businesses, aiding the employment prospects for many students. As a small sixth form, The Elfed sixth form would cater for those pupils who may feel 'lost' within larger sixth forms and thus enable them to perform to the best of their ability. The use of accommodation for other educational uses would make best use of resources and bring onto site educational services which would be able to share provision i.e. leisure and sport and integrate with the school on specialist education provision where necessary. Also the rooms to be used could be easily

adapted for this provision at minimal cost both upstairs and downstairs which would be an issue for other types of use. There are already provisions such as a purpose built lift in place which would support this. Rooms could also be adapted to allow for community access for parents, family education centres, mother and toddler groups, community meeting rooms (with points for ICT access) should any of these be deemed appropriate and would therefore allow the local community to make use of the provision and become involved in ensuring the ongoing success of the site

8. Buckley is the largest town by population in Flintshire; it is inconceivable not to have a 6th Form. Historically Elfed has always had a 6th Form, latest results are outstanding, why try to mend something that is not broken. Take away Elfed 6th Form then potentially you deny the chance to what all pupils and staff have ultimately worked so very hard towards - success and very proud achievers of the Elfed.
9. Same answer as question 1
10. I would like to see if possible more pupils coming from Ysgol Maes Hyfryd and benefiting from the resource class. The achievements the pupils already in this class have been made far greater than was anticipated.
11. Buckley residents pay more towards the education system, being one of the largest towns in Flintshire and deserve a provision for 11-18 year olds in the town.

### **New responses received since 29/02/12**

12. I agree that the school should have the facility to have students from the age of 11-18. Moving children from the school when they reach 6th form can be disruptive and the teaching may be different to what they are used to.
13. This maintains a continuity of post-primary education. The school has always had this structure from the 1970s when it moved from Senior High School status to being an autonomous High school with the loss of those pupils who were transferred to Elfed from Castell Alun and St. David's High schools when those schools developed their own autonomy.
14. As above
15. Again, no other schools in the area will be disrupted and there will be a another sixth form option in the area other than Mold Alun.
16. This is the best of a bad bunch, none of which actually deal with the issue of overcrowding. Money would be wasted converting which could be better spent on providing 21st century facilities for all young people in the Buckley and Mynydd Isa Area
17. Mold Alun 6th form is already over subscribed, so you go and close another sixth form where do future sixth formers go?! The Elfed is already over the viable number of 600, surely the problem is with over non-viable schools with less than this number in who continue to teach children in mobile classrooms? I.e. The Argoed
18. I feel strongly about the importance of retaining a sixth form at the Elfed. Shared with Mold Alun it will give older pupils a broader range of subjects. I dislike the rise in the number of pupils at any school, but understand the necessity.
19. Keep things the way they are. Pupils at Elfed don't want to be unsettled as much as pupils from Mynydd Isa don't want to move.
20. By reducing the number of places available at the Elfed the school wont be under scribed and so will not face the possibility of children having to go elsewhere for their education.
21. Sixth form provision is necessary in the vicinity and therefore this option would also be beneficial.
22. Although sixth form and college placements are very difficult to obtain, we should rationalise again to increase budget for those who need more help in other areas of their education. Those who work hard will eventually find themselves a place in sixth-form or college; however some of those who struggle and need additional learning needs maybe left behind in the rush and not offered the same in the ways of placement. So by increasing the number of places in our 16-18 sector it may not always be beneficial if the most isn't being produced from each pupil. Again for the same reasons in Q1 I do believe placements should be rationalised to offer other pupils a chance to reach a similar prospect to those more well off in their education.
23. same as above

24. Same reasons as Q2. Also, thought should be given to use of school outside school times. Music, art, sport, IT, drama facilities etc could be used by the wider community. I feel that the school and the county could do more to encourage this. In a time of financial strain, communities need to work together to benefit each other.
25. The school is clearly improving academically and has great facilities. I think it's important to provide a choice to 16-18 year olds. Mold Alun is a very large, and I feel, impersonal school, which doesn't suit all children. There is also evidence that teachers who teach a subject to A level are more likely to provide 'stretch' to more able GCSE pupils which can further drive up results at 16 and better prepare students for A levels.
26. Provides post-16 provision in Buckley and Mynydd Isa area and also allows for potential expansion of Elfed High School in future if population of high school age children in area increases.
27. The Elfed sixth form is nowhere near full and there are much fewer courses available there compared to the nearest sixth form in Mold Alun, therefore I cannot see a benefit of keeping the sixth form at Elfed considering the other available opportunities.
28. Any of these four options would do for me as none of them involve making any changes to the Argoed. Keep Argoed out of the options altogether.
29. As above, I don't tend to agree with keeping 6th form as there is an excellent college in Deeside where students can still study to an excellent standard.
30. This is the least worst option of the 4. There should be other options. However, consideration must be given to the community aspect of these options. A sixth form is essential for the locality. Students should not have to travel elsewhere to receive good quality, post-16 education. The school has an excellent academic record. The sixth form provides a quality learning environment for students in a familiar environment. The current sixth form numbers are reduced because some students, who wished to study there this academic year, were forced to travel to Mold to study their choice of 'A' levels. The school is successful. It should not be difficult to attract students to the sixth form, if only the courses are on offer. Even a 'consortium' type model would be possible, where students enrol at one school and travel to another for minority subjects. Thereby ensuring the roll numbers are maintained. Please also consider another reason that the Elfed has surplus places - the town has grown substantially in recent years, and the primary schools were unable to take the extra pupil numbers - for example the St Matthews Park Estate on Liverpool Road. Children from that estate were sent to Ewloe Green Junior School - this then becomes a feeder school for Hawarden High School = fewer children moving on to the Elfed from its catchment area.
31. To continue education from GCSE to A Level at one location, locally provides a more stable learning environment.
32. The Elfed needs support to continue its upturn in results and to improve its unwarranted reputation.
33. As 16+ education will be compulsory for future students, a town the size of Buckley should offer 16+ education, not force all Buckley 16+ pupils to travel elsewhere.
34. A town the size of Buckley is desperate to retain its Sixth Form. Buckley is seen as a more prosperous area of the County and it is time that the considerable income from higher council taxed houses is kept in the community to improve our educational requirements rather than being spent in poorer towns. It is disgraceful that councillors think it is acceptable for our youth to have to travel to Mold or Deeside instead of making Elfed THE sixth form in the area.

#### **New responses received since 26/03/12**

35. As with Option 1, there are major concerns regarding the changing of use of space. Spending £15.6m creating 'office' space remains an utter waste of money. In difficult financial times the council must reconsider this expenditure. Much of the Review quotes Welsh Government expectations but they are not prepared to fund 'efficiencies' and spending such vast amounts on an unnecessary development, that would greatly harm the educational environment of our children, is outrageous. Will safeguard requirements be met given the proximity of external adults using the

buildings? Standards are rising at the Elfed and, once the perception is rightly challenged that Mynydd Isa is more successful, numbers will rise at the Elfed and the surplus will be reduced. Option 2 is a slight improvement on Option 1 in that post-16 education is available.

36. We have just relocated to Flintshire and our choice of Buckley and the Elfed was heavily weighted on the fact Buckley had a school that provided a sixth form for the future. This choice would enable our children to walk (healthily) to school as save on costs and valuable time having to travel to and from the next nearest 6th form. Has this cost in both quality time and money been factored into your calculations are they simply being ignored?
37. retains all provision at Elfed site for Buckley area
38. you cant possible leave Buckley with no sixth form provision, it should be extended if anything it has a fine reputation and my daughter has had to go to Mold Alun because the performing arts course that she requires for the future is not provided at Elfed. My son did his sixth form education at Elfed and we were really pleased with his performance, judging the 2 sixth forms I would always go for the Elfed as I think it is smaller and more professionally run. Why is Argoed now out of the equation???
39. There is no need for 6th form provision at the School. They are not able to offer a full spectrum of courses so some students end up taking options that are not in the full interest of the student. The school cannot cater for all abilities with the courses they offer.
40. Reducing places solves the issue, cheaply, with least disruption and allows for growth when needed safest for all student involved and allows school to recap its lost pupils slowly.
41. Elfed keeping their sixth form. Providing additional needs and other education in local schools.
42. So my children can carry on their education in a 'local' environment through to sixth form. Still have places available there in the future.
43. Buckley Elfed has had a 16-18 provision for a long time and had results to be proud of Elfed has always had high standards when working with additional needs and should continue for many years.
44. If young people are expected to stay in education until the age of 18, if they have no job or apprenticeship then future growth of a sixth from will be essential.
45. This is my preferred options out of those that are available, as it is Elfed that seems to have the problem of surplus.
46. I feel this is the best option, but with a variation on moving the non educational sites from the Westwood site into the office space made on the Elfed site and to keep the 6th form for the local area, this will then provide more space for Westwood C.P. School to increase in size and provide more primary places for the Buckley area.
47. Retaining the 16-18 provision in Buckley is important for parents as this may have also influenced other factors such as the purchase of a house base on its proximity to schools. Moving this provision from the locality will no doubt have an effect on the local economy and the attractiveness of Buckley as a whole to perspective future residents/families.
48. This is the only reasonable option!
49. N/A
50. Retaining sixth form provision is important as the town grows, we need this in a town to Buckley's size.
51. ELFED NEEDS TO REMAIN A SCHOOL SERVING THE NEEDS OF 11 - 18 YEAR OLDS. MY TWO YOUNGEST CHILDREN HAD HAPPY YEARS UP UNTIL SIX FORM AT ELFED.
52. Buckley has the largest population in the county; there is a drive in every other aspect of the community life to improve services in the area - health, leisure and shopping for Buckley residents. Then supporting this proposal will offer education for the community on the same level as other areas with the flexibility to grow provision when numbers increase which they will do over the next 10 years.
53. Buckley has the largest population in the county; there is a drive in every other aspect of the community life to improve services in the area - health, leisure and shopping for Buckley residents. Then supporting this proposal will offer education for the



community on the same level as other areas with the flexibility to grow provision when numbers increase which they will do over the next 10 years.

54. You are going to close the sixth form anyway.....
55. Although this suggests the sixth form will be kept, which is what I want...won't the sixth form have to be bigger to be retained by the Welsh Gov????? Also, as above, I also have great concerns over the use of the surplus space in school, in turn making less space outdoors for Elfed pupils, which contradicts the WA Schools Mod. Policy that says,-outdoor space should be shared equally between motorists, cyclists and pedestrians.....the children have no 'nice' outdoor space to go as it is now, e.g. to eat their lunch, as the canteen is much too small, or just to simply get some healthy, relaxing fresh air.
56. -This option could see vacated space being utilised for office space, services, or as conference/training facilities, ensuring that should additional places be required in future at the Elfed (as is likely to be the case in view of the rising need for primary places currently) that the material of the building remains suitable for use for secondary education. Such facilities could also serve to provide additional income to the school and would be easier to relocate in future. Co-locating Westwood into the Elfed buildings would restrict the ability of the Elfed to expand in future as increasing demand for secondary places arises, and would require the moving of Westwood to alternative premises. -We encourage young people to stay in education, and retaining the sixth form at the Elfed will help to achieve this locally. - The consultation booklet states there is no funding from the Welsh Assembly for any of the Options, therefore the best option will be one that considers the long term education needs locally, not just a temporary solution to address the current surplus places.
57. Buckley is the biggest town in Flintshire we should have the facilities to send our children to a local sixth form. See above for same response as option 1
58. Buckley deserves a secondary school to compete with the excellent standard provided by the Argoed. The problem is at the Elfed and should be addressed at the Elfed. Closing the Argoed is not the answer.
59. This would be the most favourable option in my opinion. This would involve the least disruption to the education of the local 3-18 year olds which has to be the primary objective to this programme. The community could also benefit from any use of the space created. The space could be used for improved leisure facilities or relocating the library giving more space and the option of an improved variety of facilities. This would also alleviate the potential traffic problems created from the morning and afternoon rush hour times and with the health centre also being located there it would not be isolated from the community. Other options for uses of the space could be conference facilities for local businesses providing an income to the council, an adult learning provision or use as an exhibition facility for cultural projects.
60. A sixth form is important due to the rising travel cost, and future rules that children must stay on at school till they are 18 it is imperative that Elfed stays a further education high school.
61. CHANGE 6TH FORM TO VOCATIONAL, MUCH MORE UPTAKE BY PUPILS, GROW THE PRIMARIES TO FEED ELFED (WESTWOOD ENHANCEMENTS) SAFER FOR ALL, COST EFFECTIVE, NO TRAFFIC ISSUES, NO PROBLEMS WITH BULLYING OR SMALL KIDS AT RISK, NO SHARED FACILITIES OR STAGGERED STARTS
62. VARIATION OF OPTION - Enhance Westwood primary at current site to feed Elfed and turn 6th form into VOCATIONAL 6th form and move academic 6th form to ALUN. It would be least disruptive to education, cost effective solution, safer, better for traffic congestion, no shared educational facilities, less people on already multi use site,
63. Supports existing schools in the local area. Provides space that could be reclaimed in the future should more than 750 places be needed, which projected pupil numbers after 2018 indicate will be likely. Possibly merging Alun and Elfed 6th form and focusing a small number of courses on the Elfed site. Such as Performing Arts or Health & Social Care (for example). This would address some of the issues with an under used 6th form. This idea would also have a positive effect on the Elfed's public image.
64. Supports existing schools in the local area. Provides space that could be reclaimed in the future should more than 750 places be needed, which projected pupil numbers

after 2018 indicate will be likely. Possibly merging Alun and Elfed 6th form and focusing a small number of courses on the Elfed site. Such as Performing Arts or Health & Social Care (for example). This would address some of the issues with an under used 6th form. This idea would also have a positive effect on the Elfed's public image.

65. Supports existing schools in the local area. Provides space that could be reclaimed in the future should more than 750 places be needed, which projected pupil numbers after 2018 indicate will be likely. Possibly merging Alun and Elfed 6th form and focusing a small number of courses on the Elfed site. Such as Performing Arts or Health & Social Care (for example). This would address some of the issues with an under used 6th form. This idea would also have a positive effect on the Elfed's public image.
66. Supports existing schools in the local area. Provides space that could be reclaimed in the future should more than 750 places be needed, which projected pupil numbers after 2018 indicate will be likely. Possibly merging Alun and Elfed 6th form and focusing a small number of courses on the Elfed site. Such as Performing Arts or Health & Social Care (for example). This would address some of the issues with an under used 6th form. This idea would also have a positive effect on the Elfed's public image.
67. WITH VARIATION TO OPTION = Enhancements at Westwood school to enable its growth and feed into Elfed. I think the 6th form could be re-structured into a vocational 6th form and academic 6th form be re-located (Alun, Deeside AC) and rationalising places on a TEMPORARY basis would be a good solution to the problem. It would allow the school to recover and when the school intake needs to expand it will have the room to proving the building space is taken up by temporary solutions. Vocational 6th form could serve the local industries. The space could be mothballed or rented out. Safer for the Elfed kids as they would not be subject to disruption caused by major re-model work and their education would be aided, as the demographics already show an increase in achievement at the school as its number have decreased. Also safer for Elfed pupils on the basis of no shared facility, no accusations of contact with young children, less people on one site, more space for them.
68. Whilst on the surface, this is an attractive option because it retains the 11 - 18 provision in the area, the reality is with current and projected student numbers this is not a sustainable option and would not represent the best use of financial resources. THE BEST OPTION, WOULD BE TO REINSTATE OPTION FOUR FROM THE ORIGINAL CONSULTATION (I am baffled by the anti-democratic decision to stop that consultation period before it was completed because council members bowed to the anarchist approach of he who shouts the loudest gets heard. A single school solution, based on the current Elfed site represents the best possible option in terms of value for money, efficient use of resources and sustainable first class 11 - 18 educational provision in the community. This is not the time for short sighted, narrow minded protectionism of the status quo by councillors interested only in protecting their seats and allowances. As identified by Estyn, strong strategic leadership is required to provide the young people of Buckley/ Mynydd Isa with a 21st century education. There is no question that a single school solution is what is required.
69. I believe the sixth formers shouldn't have to change their schooling when there used to attending Elfed. I believe change is easier the younger you are.
70. I do not agree with all Elfed pupils and teachers moving into smaller space. Children will find learning with more noise and crowded areas difficult. To rent the other part to offices would mean a lot of police checks because not everyone is as nice as they might seem.
71. I feel that this would provide the most effective learning opportunities for young people in Buckley, which is what matters.
72. The school runs fine the way it is.
73. We strongly agree with keeping teenagers to sixth form together under one roof, to learn and progress in their education.
74. The sixth form allows continuation of education from teachers that the students know, and in a familiar environment.

75. I think the 6th form is an important part of the school. Pupils need a choice otherwise Mold Alun will be the only sixth form option.
76. Disagree with people not involved with the school accessing the building.
77. We really do need a local continuous up to & including 6th form for those who wish to carry on and maybe go to university.
78. Excellent sixth form facility providing excellent sixth form teaching and excellent results.
79. This is the best of a bad bunch, but the only reasonable one. I feel the school and its staff will not be secure long term.
80. Buckley is a large town and needs to retain its education centres.
81. Elfed High has always had a reputable reputation for 1--18 education in decades, to take this away would be highly irresponsible for the community.
82. Retains sixth form option. Better revenue from mother streams, with leisure and cultural options providing a centre for the Buckley community.
83. Of all 4 options, this is the only reasonable one; however, it is the best of a bad bunch! This will not secure the school, or its staff, in the long term.
84. Although this is still not an ideal solution it is the lesser of the evils of the four choices, and it means that the West Lea site will remain in educational use and not be lost to potential residential development.
85. This school has a very successful 6th form (100% pass rate in 2011). Although it is small it provides a personalised learning experience for students and gives them the best opportunities. It would be wrong to take the 6th form away from its pupils. To make it would the council collaborate with schools in local consortium to exchange pupils for certain courses e.g. Mold Alun for psychology and here for sciences alongside Mold Alun as Mold Alun runs large classes for 6th form (30 pupils) would make more sense to have smaller classes there.
86. I don't think infants and junior school aged children should be forced to mix with senior pupils.
87. Why send 6th form pupils somewhere else when Elfed is perfectly adequate. Elfed already struggles with access to and from it, add the Westwood primary children and traffic, plus the patients for the so called 'health centre' that Buckley is meant to be having is a recipe for disaster. Both option 1 & 3 are going to cost over 10 million, clearly the council does not have this funding. Again FCC is not thinking of its children and their future i.e. upsetting the Belmont children and still waiting for the health centre. Keep things as they are. What would become of the Westwood site? More housing that Buckley could not support with local amenities, doctors, dentists, schools etc. Surely the answer to the falling number of students at the Elfed needs to be looked in to and something done, not closing down a primary school and mixing them together is definitely not the way forward. I'm sure the majority of Buckley people will go with Option 2.
88. The economic climate makes it difficult for families to afford to send their children further from home to study in sixth form. Buckley is a town and as such should have a sixth form facility.
89. It would be better to just keep the 6th form and allocate certain areas for different needs. It would influence more people to come to Elfed.
90. This is the best of the 4 options provided this time. I do however feel that the original proposal to merge with Argoed High school in the Elfed building or a new purpose built building for 11-18 yr olds would be a better solution. The Argoed is in cramped conditions currently utilising mobile buildings for maths lessons at all times. The Elfed is in the heart of the town with easy access and good facilities with the leisure centre attached and space to accommodate nearly all the children currently at Argoed. It seems odd to take their school out of the options and would appear this has been done purely because they caused such a fuss about it. Elfed's results are on a par with them now and I feel it seems that there is an unjust bad attitude to the Elfed school that needs addressing.
91. Variation of this option would be best all around, less disruption to all parties, less cost, safer, education quality would be better. Reducing space and amending on temporary basis would allow future growth. Projected growth in the town and local area indicates a need for more primary places thus feeding secondary. Changing the

- 6th form provision into maybe a vocational 6th form rather than academic may appeal to a large pupil base.
92. Variation of option with 6th form being turned into a vocational 6th form and the Alun becoming the academic 6th form.
  93. Is 11-18 still realistic in terms of costs? Can Elfed High School sustain a sixth form with sufficient courses and resources at the school?
  94. DONT BRING ARGOED BACK INTO THE OPTIONS IT IS A FANTASTIC SCHOOL
  95. to spread 6th form places throughout the area rather than having all local 6th form places at the Alun High School.
  96. The school already has problems in recruiting a viable sixth form, rationalising the number of students to 750 would mean that the 11-16 population would not be big enough to generate a viable sixth form. The other problem with this option is the suggestion of shared use of the site. See above in response to option 1.
  97. It keeps things the same and children like to know that there is stability and routine.
  98. Buckley needs a sixth form.
  99. 3-16 is too much of an age gap. We need to keep primary and secondary schools separate for the sake of all the children for their safety.
  100. It's good that 6th form can stay.
  101. Have a child going into 6th form in Sept 2012 and would like to stay in Buckley. Also have a child starting Elfed in Sept 2012. Do not want to go to 6th form in Mold.
  102. Because they should keep learning needs.
  103. Prefer provision to 18 at one location.
  104. Sixth form! This seems to be best option.
  105. What other education, leisure and cultural uses will have to be carefully considered.
  106. I believe Elfed sixth form offers a service for the children of the area and it works.
  107. I agree completely with keeping the 6th Form at the Elfed High school available. The students benefit from continuity, therefore assisting with their ability to gain good grades and move on to university or employment.
  108. 6th form isn't working in Buckley - let the kids go to college, Mold Alun or work !
  109. Again, an unfair option I think, how much money can be saved using this option. If this option is chosen I fear it is taken by councillors as a temporary option until they can find a way to do override any objections given by the public. I will be monitoring options 1 & 2 closely over the coming years to see if my predictions are true.

**Q6 If you support Option 2 what do you think would be needed to make it work? What local issues would need to be considered?**

1. Ask pupils at Elfed their opinions!! 2. Possibly close local libraries and house them at Elfed.
2. We want to keep the sixth form and the school as it is!
3. Implement the proposal as suggested but make full use of the existing facility for education. The extra space provides opportunities for extra resource. Parents who have previously abandoned Elfed should be reminded just how good school now is. Perhaps the school should be selling itself more when considering the September intake, Similarly, County should be discouraging pupils from within the catchment from attending other schools.
4. 1.Maintain current provision to ensure spaces available for additional pupils aged 16+ who will be attending school from Sept 2013 onwards 2.Re locate Westwood centre from Westwood school site 3.Removal of Westwood centre provides Westwood school with opportunity to expand, as the current 2 buildings could be adjoined will relatively little outlay. This gives Westwood the scope to expand and increase pupil numbers. There are currently a number of new builds under construction with nowhere else for these new pupils to go. Mountain Lane is over subscribed and Southdown is nearly fully subscribed, these schools will not be in any position to accept a rise in pupil numbers, Westwood will be the only school able to provide provision. 4. Percentage wise, a greater number of pupils from Westwood go on to attend Elfed. Increasing pupil numbers in Westwood will increase pupil numbers in Elfed, therefore solving the current pupil shortfall

5. get a better head in e.g. someone like Phil Pearce who promoted the Elfed much more and get Argoed pupils to come to the Elfed for 6th form instead of the Alun which is already far too large, offer more course ranges to get pupils to stay at the Elfed, my daughter had to go to the Alun because the drama course was not offered there, and my son did extremely well at the Elfed high school
6. More investment for the school is needed, the more money that is spent on the Elfed, the more it will attract prospective students. I feel that not enough positive news is released to the people of Buckley and outside the area, especially the ever increasing exam results! Better relations between students and staff of the Argoed and Elfed, mainly to encourage Year 11 students to come to the Elfed to study at "A level".
7. Rationalisation of the building to ensure that education provision and other users provision is appropriate for their individual needs. This would require some building work but at a far lower level than that of the other proposals. Appropriate users would need to be identified and it may be that some of these used the building on a 'hirer' basis thus generating income. Good communication and understand between the school and other users would be essential but this option offers least disruption to the life of the school as rooms can be identified and 'isolated' as appropriate.
8. Implement exactly what is being suggested by rationalisation! Making parents aware and reminding them how good the school is now performing.
9. transport location child places
10. We would need to incorporate cultural, commercial and community activities into the spare spaces.
11. Cultural, commercial and community activities could be incorporated into the spare spaces.
12. Improve teaching standards in Elfed, making it appealing to families in the catchment area. Dealing with complaints about teachers and improve the reputation of the school.

#### **New responses received since 29/02/12**

13. Funding! The comparative funding figures for 2011 showed that, on average, £5,595 is spent per pupil in Wales compared to £6,200 in England - a difference of £605 per pupil. There is no justification for this long-standing imbalance.
14. Traffic congestion
15. Traffic congestion.
16. Investment in education in Buckley, Mynydd Isa and Mold is very important. Traffic issues to/from the Elfed require resolving.
17. The profile of Elfed in the surrounding community needs to be raised.
18. Work experience placements could be extended, longer college courses offering university points at the end of each course could persuade more pupils to stay in further education. If there is a larger additional need available, a larger mass of pupils may choose to stay on with this education and excel.
19. Same as Q3. I would like to see the issue of perceptions of the Elfed tackled concurrently with these proposals. Focussing solely on logistical issues ignores the problem if the perception persists that the school is not attractive to prospective students. If the issue of limited sixth form provision is not tackled URGENTLY then 11-18 provision is lost by default.
20. Transport to the school is difficult and limited. Range of options at A level School image and transport needs addressing to encourage Argoed pupils to select the Elfed instead of Mold Alun at a level (if standards continue to improve then this may happen anyway)
21. It already works. FCC needs to look at the historical reasons (as suggested above) as to why pupil numbers have fallen at the Elfed High School. There is no reason why this school cannot increase its intake in future years.
22. Consider why Buckley parents are sending children to other high schools out of the area rather than most local school.
23. Ensure Elfed offer a wider range of post 16 courses that are relevant to employment prospects as well as academic provision e.g. child care, sports sciences etc.
24. Whilst I accept that parents have the right to choose which school their child attends, I do not agree with the allocation process. Pupils living in the Buckley area have

been allowed to attend a recognised oversubscribed school (i.e. Argoed) and the LEA have been fully aware of dwindling numbers at the Elfed when this would have been the closest school. I do not feel that the LEA has worked closely enough with the school in terms of trying to 'sell it' as an alternative school of choice. Offer more subject choices at Years 12/13.

25. Instead of looking to 'do away with' something, why not look at why its not working, and aim to improve the facilities/subjects to attract more students.
26. Re-addressing why the Elfed Sixth Form isn't the Sixth Form of choice - whether it be a changing of subjects offered or results from the school. Buckley is a large town and we should have a school that supports the community and is seen as being an excellent school otherwise the situation will become ridiculous with more talented children constantly leaving primary schools in the town to attend secondary schools out of town, leaving Elfed with less able or unwilling pupils and parents

### **New responses received since 26/03/12**

27. This would allow Westwood to continue as it is. Elfed could continue pretty much as it is and the capacity could always be increased easily enough in the future should demand warrant it. It also means that the 6th form at Elfed is continued, and will also allow Argoed pupils from the vicinity to finish their education there rather than have to travel further distance, thereby reducing travel costs in these times of rising fuel costs. I would have thought that this was a no-brainer, but bearing in mind the suggestion last year that the Local Authority considered closing down one of the best achieving schools (Argoed) it does not fill me with confidence that the people making these suggestions and decisions are fit for purpose.
28. Keep up the good work currently being done by the staff at the Elfed! This will eventually show that it can attract pupils based on its improving performance; with patience the school will become a school of first choice. The stigma shown from the Argoed during their protests on merging with the Elfed is obviously based on out dated perceptions of the Elfed. Therefore the powers that be need to help support the efforts of the Elfed staff in overcoming these false perceptions of it being substandard. Look at the size of the school being too big as a positive opportunity to improve and attract pupils which would otherwise want to go to schools which are fully subscribed. These questionnaires and 'calls for change' only hinder the efforts in attracting pupils to the Elfed.
29. A review of subject offered and how pupils could choose in future. Locally, whatever moves into bid must be able to re-locate if Elfed needs to grow, it must also be safe for mixing with kids. Leisure costs should not be included in options, its schools issue!
30. Think you would need to look at and address why there are surplus spaces at Elfed and work on getting the school full again, or using the space for office? Then the space can be taken back for school if number increase in the future, if Westwood in space there will be no room for high school to grow again.
31. Find out reasons children are choosing not to attend Elfed but going elsewhere.
32. I actually feel option 2 could be added to, i.e. option 2a, use surplus Elfed space for offices, and re-locate the Westwood centre (surestart etc) at Elfed. As Elfed numbers grow, space can be taken back as required.
33. Nothing would need to be done as this is not needed to change the school
34. Out of all the options this is the only one to benefit pupils/teachers and the population of Buckley. Elfed high school and its sixth form is the centre of the town.
35. You need to consider all the "new builds" in Buckley, the population is set to grow.
36. I support option 1 or 2 because it offers the flexibility to return the facility to education should the numbers increase which they will do over the next 10 years. This has got to be the most efficient option to address the issue.
37. I support aspects of Option 2. The use of the 'spare ' space within the Elfed should serve to help retain and maintain the fabric of the building such that it could be returned for use by the Elfed as classrooms and facilities in future. Services such as those currently housed within the Westwood Centre that provide information and support to families and young people could be considered as possible services suitable for accommodation within the Elfed site. All options will need to consider the implications of increasing traffic with the new Health Centre and possible additional

leisure facilities on and around the Elfed site. Residents of Mill Lane in particular will be affected by any increase in traffic into the Elfed site. Options 1 and 2 will create less additional traffic than options 3 and 4.

38. More courses need to be made available for sixth forms and maybe the 2 high schools in area should be sharing facilities and courses we have been given no valid reasons why the Argoed has been taken out of the equation. The Elfed building needs to be modernised but surely this would be more cost effective than option 3 and 4. Build up the reputation of the Elfed with new housing developments in the area encourage more families to send their children to the school. Again use spare space for office facilities e.g. family centre etc and expand on primary school site. as option 1 comments
39. Judging by the inflated projected cost of using the space as an office a lot of these options would be more cost effective and so would need less financial injection. Other issues would be infrastructure around the site including access to the site which could potentially have 3 or 4 different uses.
40. AS ABOVE
41. Enhancement to WW primary, expanding it and move Westwood centre out to utilise space in Elfed, thus feeding Elfed long term and growing primary provision as needed for future projections. Re-structure the 6th form for vocational use, much more appealing to a lot of pupils.
42. Very minor disruption to pupils and no change to educational outcomes. No local opposition. If the 'new' space was used for adult learning or a FCC training centre instead of using hotels, then very few alterations would be needed to the building. Lowest cost solution to addressing the issue of surplus places at Elfed.
43. Very minor disruption to pupils and no change to educational outcomes. No local opposition. If the 'new' space was used for adult learning or a FCC training centre instead of using hotels, then very few alterations would be needed to the building. Lowest cost solution to addressing the issue of surplus places at Elfed.
44. Very minor disruption to pupils and no change to educational outcomes. No local opposition. If the 'new' space was used for adult learning or a FCC training centre instead of using hotels, then very few alterations would be needed to the building. Lowest cost solution to addressing the issue of surplus places at Elfed.
45. Very minor disruption to pupils and no change to educational outcomes. No local opposition. If the 'new' space was used for adult learning or a FCC training centre instead of using hotels, then very few alterations would be needed to the building. Lowest cost solution to addressing the issue of surplus places at Elfed.
46. The space not used by the school could be mothballed for future growth, or it could be utilised for office space (rental income), library, police counter, cultural centre, youth centre/Space, children's facility (surestart/genesis, training/adult learning, FCC office space, conference facility, storage for FCC. All a temporary measure to allow growth in future. For Elfed to recover, promotion of its own achievements and reputation is needed. Also, primary schools need to be feeding into Elfed, primary provisions need to grow to enable this, and Westwood has the space and ability to grow and should be enhanced to support this. Demographics show a need for more primary space, Westwood is perfect for it as opposed to the other local primaries, it has space and is a cost effective building according to building review - FCC stated that Buckley needs more primary as the housing developments grow, solve the problem all in 1 go!
47. I think that Elfed to have younger children would need to have one part of the school, so that all pupils aren't all mixed in together. e.g. a school within a school.
48. Careful planning. Talk to teachers and students.
49. Not sure, but resurfacing entrance footpath and widening the road would be an idea. You could use part of the Belmont site for this. Perhaps build a car park on Belmont field?
50. Offer more subjects and try to attract pupils from other schools.
51. Raise school profile. Introduce extended subjects.
52. A review of where the extra capacity is - sports facilities and technology and arts block. There is not sufficient suitable space to locate a primary school in the building unless you are proposing to teach lessons in the sports hall other than PE.

53. Other services using the site could be hazardous potentially dangerous even! Security of school pupils and staff if general public are allowed free access, would be a nightmare!
54. I support this option.
55. For other 'services' to use the site would be potentially dangerous to the students and staff - how can you guarantee the safety of everyone if the general public are allowed free access to the site?
56. It is important to retain 6th form education at Buckley and also keep the space available to re-expand the school if an upturn in the population (school age) occurs due to housing/residential development in the area.
57. If more primary places are required in the area, this can only mean that the Elfed will reach capacity within the next few years. Therefore, association with organisations that have no link to the education system would only be a short term solution. It is also paramount on that subject that young people's safety and well being comes first. The imminent regeneration programme to improve the towns shopping facilities, accompanied by the ongoing building of more affordable housing, as well as due to the economic down turn. Younger people having children/ possibly larger families, indicates that Buckley will continue to grow. Therefore, whilst the school is in need of modernisation, it is important that it remains a 11-18 facility for the increasing population of the town.
58. The use of the sports centre - when the school use it and who else uses it. Class sizes should be considered, students obviously learn best through smaller, more comfortable classes. Also parking space needs to be thoroughly considered.
59. I feel that this option should be modified to bring Argoed High School merger back into the equation. The existing Argoed site could be used to house both primary schools in Mynydd Isa freeing up two other school sites for other use. The two high schools together would give wider curriculum range to Elfed and solve the issue of overcrowding in the current Argoed site. It seems the logical answer to two problems to merge them in the Elfed building in the central town site.
60. Use spare space to move Westwood centre (surestart/fis etc) thus enabling rental potential and opportunity to grow Elfed as necessary over the years whilst downsizing on the short term. Make Elfed 6th form vocational and use Alun 6th form as academic, getting best out of both. Other uses could be any office space, training centre, conference facility, library, police counter, youth space, cultural centre
61. Mothball space for future growth or use temporarily for office space, police counter, training centre, library, cultural area, council use - take up the space by inserting Westwood centre into the building and allow Westwood school to grow thus feeding Elfed
62. The access to the school would need to be addressed
63. Keep things in the school as they are.
64. A strong business/marketing plan to make Elfed an attractable learning centre with excellent leisure and cultural elements,
65. Funding to support school infrastructure.

**OPTION 3 - Co- locate Westwood Primary School & Elfed High School on Elfed site establishing 3-16 provision on the campus.**

**Q7 How strongly do you agree or disagree with OPTION 3 (please tick ONE box only)**

Strongly Agree	=	12	6.8%
Tend to Agree	=	4	2.3%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	=	6	3.4%
Tend to Disagree	=	10	5.6%
Strongly Disagree	=	122	68.9%



**Q8 To help us understand why people agree or disagree with OPTION 3 please provide a short summary of your reasoning (250 words maximum)**

1. As a nursery nurse for over 20 years I feel that young 3-11 children should be kept happy and safe and stable. This would cause distress to pupils at present and very unnerved of being adjoined to a secondary school.
2. Two schools should be kept separately!
3. The infrastructure and access (numbers of vehicles collecting children would inevitably increase) at Elfed is not suitable for children of such a young age. The building itself is too imposing; young children should be educated in their own environment. The data from the most recently available Estyn Inspection (2006) detailed an overall attendance at Westwood of less than 92%. I firmly believe that would be reduced if the place of education is moved away from the main (south Buckley) catchment area.
4. I would not want my children to attend a school were there mixed from 3-18 year olds. For fear of bullying and intimidation from the older pupils, even though they wouldn't be mixed in school time. It's before an after school would be an issue. Reading the booklet it says you are going to look at how many children will attend Elfed in a few years time to know how many places you need. I live in Elfed catchment area and a lot of the children who live by me attend Argoed high. I think someone needs to look at the reason children are going out of the area as for many years most Buckley primary school children went straight to Elfed.
5. 1. There is no benefit to Westwood in this proposal at all. There is no evidence to suggest this option would increase the learning provision or teaching standards for the pupils of Westwood. This is a space filling exercise only and the same objective could be reached with far less upheaval and upset (as per my comments on Q6) 2. Safe-guarding issues 3. There would be no possibility in the future to re introduce catchment areas as all the primary schools would be located, roughly, in a line. There would be no schools this side of Buckley cross 4. Children's safety travelling to and from school. A large portion of pupils would have to cross a very busy main road in rush hour traffic. Their walk to school would be much further, increasing the danger for pupils who walk to and from school without adult supervision
6. it would not be good to put Westwood in the Elfed
7. Having a greater number of people in and around the Elfed campus, mainly very young children would be overwhelming. The extra traffic in the area would be extremely dangerous for everyone. This would also increase when the new Health Centre is built and the cost to the Council enormous, at a time when money is not so freely available!
8. As already stated, this would remove sixth form provision from the school which is totally unacceptable for the Buckley area. Reason have been outlined in detail in Option 1.
9. Infrastructure is wholly unsuitable for children of such a young age who should be educated in their own bespoke environment. Numbers of vehicles collecting children would increase with the added addition of a new doctors surgery planned on the same site, this could be extremely dangerous for all pupils, more so for younger children, a serious safety issue!
10. I personally think that Elfed and Westwood should co-locate but with the 6th form availability.
11. Too many traffic problems, longer distance for children to walk to school, health centre also coming to site.
12. With the health centre coming to the site alongside the Elfed School the traffic problems would be dreadful. Some pupils find it hard to get to school for 9.00 am and the distance to Elfed would make it even later when they arrive.
13. I think that primary schools should not be located next to a school where young adults attend.

**New responses received since 29/02/12**

14. I strongly disagree that children from the age of 3 should be mixing with older children. They would be bullied, pick up bad habits and see things they shouldn't.

15. I don't think that 3-11 year olds should be on the same site as 11-16 year olds
16. Again, the loss of the Sixth Form is unacceptable to me. (See my comment above.)
17. COMPLETELY INAPPROPRIATE building is unsuitable traffic ... to name a few
18. I would not feel comfortable with my 3 year old mixing with children 11 years old and above. I wouldn't put my child in that school and I don't think the school would be safe for the younger children. With all the additional houses you've allowed to be built all over Buckley don't you think this will eventually filter through to more children and you want to close a primary school and fill a high school? It absolutely shocks me at the lack of forward planning this council has. What would happen with the Westwood School and playing field????????? More houses would be by guess.
19. Building is not suited to primary school children, school run parents dropping younger children at school would increase the traffic at the Elfed and it is already mad during school opening and closing
20. The money for this would be better invested in modernising current schools.
21. Think that there is too much of an age group to be together. Not sure it would work personally. Think it would cost too much money to update the premises and make it appealing for younger children. Also there is access issues for transport too.
22. See option 1, the reputation at Westwood is a superior to the Elfed. The staff work as a family unit, raise funds within the school and should not be re-housed within a Secondary school where there will be increased "red tape" which in turn will mean the primary children will lose out. Everybody tends to throw funds at Secondary school as this is their "last chance" and on these grounds Westwood's pupils would be failed!!!!
23. I feel that co-locating a primary and senior school is a bad idea in any circumstance. I believe that children benefit from experiencing the transition from primary to secondary school and by co-locating the schools, children would not gain this experience.
24. It is ridiculous to put primary children into a high school; there are no provisions or safety for playtimes... The younger children will be bullied.
25. I have never experienced such an amalgamation but do feel it has some exciting opportunities to offer and feel that community spirit could definitely be developed creatively under such circumstances.
26. From one point of view this would make a shared use of resources available to one site and increase efficiency. Also high school children could be a constant role model to those in the primary school division. However, from another point of view, primary school children should in some ways be given their own safe place and environment to learn and grow as it's a crucial time in their education. Also congestion from parents and transport in the mornings and afternoons would increase and cause disruption having so many vehicles in one place at one time.
27. Combining both schools together will benefit those that will pass through the education system in the future in many different ways. When pupils reach 16 they can go to college or go to a specialised 6th form such as Mold Alun where the choices of subject are more diverse and the facilities more focused and modern.
28. It's wrong that children as young as 3 should not be going to school with teenagers (young adults). Traffic will be manic especially now the new Buckley health centre is going ahead on the same site. Westwood Primary is the only school in that part of Buckley. It would take me and my two children about 30 minutes to walk to Elfed if this goes ahead. Please Don't Move Westwood School !!
29. The logistical implications of relocating a primary school that caters for the south of the town together with the practicalities of accommodating such a wide age range within one site seems impractical. Traffic within the town would be almost unbearable and the Elfed site seems totally unsuitable.
30. This options seems to be driven from estate / premises factors rather than educational benefits o hard to comment (unless you can translate the financial savings into what t will mean for education e.g. £50 per uphill uplift etc
31. Having a through school for pupils of this age range would, in my opinion, not provide a suitable and nurturing environment for the infant age and younger junior age children, who would more likely than not feel intimidated by the high school pupils. Sectioning off part of the current Elfed high school to use as a primary school so that it was completely separate from the high school would be virtually impossible, and even if a solution was found, the building would have to be adapted for use by infant

- age children, this includes outdoor play areas which it would be difficult to accommodate especially as car parking areas may need to be increased to accommodate the increase in traffic and additional staff and parent parking - primary school parents take their children to school and often go into school with them - and not all would be able to travel on foot.
32. The Elfed building is partly unusable and if Westwood moved in too there would have to be serious and extensive building work which would be costly. The current Elfed school fit into the available building and Westwood fit it their existing school building.
  33. I totally disagree! This option would do nothing for our children. I feel that the transition between primary and secondary education is paramount to a child's mental growth. It prepares them for having to leave their school environment ready for example further education or work. Doing this option would take away this important developmental step from our children.
  34. Absolutely not appropriate for either school. Aside from other, well publicised worries, particularly from Westwood School, the site is not suitable for further numbers of pupils. The access is problematic at the moment. Traffic would necessarily be generated by pupils who would have walked to school at Westwood, being taken to the Elfed campus. The access to the sports centre and parking is already shocking and it is very surprising that this issue has not already been addressed. A Health Centre is also planned for this site. Further pressure on the access and parking etc. It is dangerous.
  35. The additional traffic combined with the Elfed and so close to Mountain Lane School would be absolute chaos and a misery for local residents.
  36. Primary education should be completely separate. It would be intimidating for young children to be sharing routs to school with teenagers. Increased traffic.
  37. The influence of 11 year olds on 3 year olds can be a worry at times, even when they are kept on separated areas of the grounds influence can filter through, so for them to be potentially exposed to young teenagers who stereotypically project hormonal issues and attitudes would be an immense worry to me as a parent.
  38. You cannot have children of the ages of around 3-10 mixing with children up to the age of 16. Bullying and intimidation in all schools is a problem and I feel the children under 10 are not going to be protected. The learning styles and what they learn are so vast they need to be protected.
  39. Access in to the school is already in a poor state and often heavily congested at start and end of school day in addition users of the leisure facilities. Add to this parents of primary aged children. The site will be chaotic and even more unsafe than it is at present. Cannot see how relocated primary school children will work. How will areas/facilities be segregated? Lunch times/breaks etc? Surely this will have massive costs implications? Students change considerably when they leave primary school and they start to act in a more grown up/adult manner as they are expected to do so. By co-locating a primary school within the Elfed you are taking away the next stages of maturity.
  40. Need a provision to age 18.
  41. The infra-structure is not appropriate to have 3 year old children and 16 year old adults - not just in the case of entering the building but in terms of traffic; walking to school; the huge size of Elfed from a 3 year old perspective; language and smoking on the way to school. The whole idea is awful and could do lasting damage to a child's early years and whole attitude to school.

#### **New responses received since 26/03/12**

42. Spending £11.5m creating a new primary area within the existing buildings is a complete waste of money. In difficult financial times the council should reconsider this expenditure and possibly examine the difference that just a fraction of such a large amount would make to all the primary schools in the county. Surely it would be more prudent to invest in the existing Westwood site. Standards are rising at the Elfed and, once the perception is rightly challenged that Mynydd Isa is more successful, the surplus will be reduced as greater recruitment is witnessed at the Elfed. Every community has the right of access to 11-18 education and, according to the council's statistics; Buckley has more properties than any other area. It would be

- totally unreasonable to withdraw the opportunity for Buckley's young people to enjoy a 'local' post-16 education and the clear benefits this can bring. Additionally, the recent improvements in standards at GCSE will result in greater numbers of successful students seeking post-16 education which the school should offer.
43. Combining a Primary School and a High School is wrong on so many levels. It is unfair for both sets of students, particularly those of primary age. They are likely to come into unsupervised contact with much older children and I fear that this could lead to difficulties. I think there are real Health & Safety issues here and if anything was to happen then the Local Authority would surely be culpable. If this was to be a realistic proposition then it should have happened when the Belmont building was still standing. This was a school building, but it was sufficiently far from the Elfed. This has now been sold which, now that these options are being considered, shows a complete lack of foresight on the behalf of the Local Authority.
  44. Co-locating both primary and secondary schools can never be a good idea even if it has been done elsewhere. Mixing young children with older ones during start/finish times will lead to obvious problems; groups of teenagers have their ways that are best separated from primary age children. Moreover, it should go without saying that Westwood is the only primary school located to serve the half of Buckley south of the major road running through the town. I am currently happy to allow my child to walk to the Westwood school site, as this teaches her independence. Asking her to walk across and along a busy main road to the Elfed site, which has teenagers being teenagers following the same pavements, would be totally unsatisfactory. Would anyone be able to live with themselves or their simplistic 'risk assessment forms' if god forbid a young child was injured or killed crossing the busy roads to the Elfed site.
  45. It is unfair for children of 3 to 10 year olds to be exposed to the behaviours of older more mature children. These children are at a very influential age and behaviours /language would be copied, or questioned. Children are exposed to so much in the media and around the town that the school is the one place where they should be able to be safe and sheltered from such issues, to be able to be children. There would also be a major issue with entrance and exiting the site due to the vast number of children who need to be taken/collected.
  46. I can see the logic in this proposal. Especially if the old junior school can be sold to help support the new build. My only concern would be the segregation of infant and junior school children from the older high school children.
  47. Co-locating would change catchment locations for all schools, prove difficult to allow either schools to grow in future. Safeguarding issues, traffic and environmental issues, too many services on one site, cost implications, stress for all pupils, reduced quality of education.
  48. Potential loss of jobs. Older students will be a bad influence on younger ones. Peer pressure will begin at an earlier age, swearing, smoking, drugs, bullying etc. Elfed sixth form moving to Mold Alun, unfair. Roads near Elfed would be very dangerous for the younger children. Traffic is bad enough already merging the schools will only make this worse and more dangerous.
  49. Safety of children = walking in corridors with older children, shared canteen area? Louder age of drinking, drugs, sexual activities, swearing etc... Walking to school would take me 30 minutes (too long for young ones) if I had to walk to Elfed High School and it would mean my two young children would be walking amongst teenagers which they would find very intimidating. The road in front of the school is very busy and path narrow and is very hard to walk along at anytime with pushchair and needing to hold young child's hand. I believe there is going to be a healthy centre at the site as well as the sports centre which is going to make access to the school even more difficult. I don't want to have to drive to school, that's one of the reasons I picked Westwood primary because it is the closest to my home so I can walk my children. When my child moved from reception class to year 1 she moved from the early years unit at Westwood to the main building and it took her 4 months to adjust to a new building, corridors, older children and she was upset every night and morning until she settled in, if you moved her to another school - a high school I believe it will disturb her education for more that 4 months and her education is very important to me and at a young age I cant risk missing any of it because she would

- be adjusting to new environment. Children like routine and this would be too much for them, it would also take away that exciting time when they move to high school at age 11.
50. Location - Travelling times to take children to school would change; more parents would have to drive due to further distance. It would be dangerous for walking parents, especially parents with buggies, very narrow paths on Mill Lane. Shared facilities would be highly disruptive to all children, staggered times could cause problems for parents who walk.
  51. I don't believe 3-16 year olds in the same school area is a good idea.
  52. If there is extra need for primary school places in the Buckley area, then Westwood is the only primary school with the scope to grow and extend. Also co-locating Westwood will mean that all Buckley primary schools are all within a small area, what happens to the other half of Buckley pupils.
  53. The primary reason behind such a proposal is clearly cost saving above all else. Cost saving itself would appear admirable but not when it is to the detriment of child welfare provision or educational needs.
  54. No 3 year olds should mix with older kids. Not good.
  55. I totally disagree with combining primary and secondary school. I feel this would be totally detrimental to pupils learning and personal growth. I would move my child rather than accept this option.
  56. Three years olds mixing with 16 year olds is a bad idea. Staggering school starts not good for working parents. Parking safety of children with more cars around.
  57. This is a ridiculous idea, children aged 3-16 can not and should not be mixed. Arriving and leaving the school will be a major problem. This site is not big enough to cater for all that traffic. There is only one way in and out of the school (by car). Again the sixth form is needed at the school.
  58. I will not be sending my daughter to a make-shift school with young adults.
  59. This cannot work. There is no other co-joined provision - which has not been new build - that has any kind of research that proves there is an education benefit to any of the children concerned. There is no scope to grow either primary or secondary on the same site when numbers increase, which they will within 10 years. Neither governing body support this view and none of the local councillors do either, which tells the real feelings and support within the community.
  60. This cannot work. There is no other co-joined provision - which has not been new build - that has any kind of research that proves there is an education benefit to any of the children concerned. There is no scope to grow either primary or secondary on the same site when numbers increase, which they will within 10 years. Neither governing body support this view and none of the local councillors do either, which tells the real feelings and support within the community.
  61. It is beyond comprehension how you could think of doing such a thing as putting young children on same site as adolescents....it isn't safe! And whoever came up with this needs the sack.
  62. Any option of co-location of Westwood CP to the Elfed site is wrong on so many levels, especially as there will be no new-builds...the Elfed building and outdoor site is barely fit for the pupils that are there now, never mind another school of small children being there as well! It is wrong; - morally, health and safety wise, logistically...the list goes on.....and importantly, it will NOT enhance the education of Westwood children. It is far better to leave them where they are happy, safe, and central to town and doing extremely well academically! That school would benefit more from enhancing the educational facilities where it is, upping pupil intake which due to the rapid growth of Buckley will be needed, and in turn will feed more pupils to Elfed.
  63. -Many families currently walk to Westwood School. Co-location would require more families to drive to an already congested school campus, which is likely to become more so with the building of new Health Centre. This will also have an environmental impact and raises concerns for the safety of that would choose to walk. -Westwood is the only primary in South Buckley. With co-location, more southern households choose primary provision elsewhere in view of increased distances to their local primary. The uncertainty that this process has caused is already having an effect. - There are safe-guarding issues with 3-16 and 3-18 education on one site, as well as

those attending the new Health centre and leisure facilities. -Co-locations read of to date that are successful are associated with 'Free-schools' where the process was initiated by the secondary involved, and accommodation was purpose built premises; this would not be the case in the proposal of relocation/co-location of Westwood to the Elfed site. (Additional points recorded with Option 4)

64. The Elfed building is certainly not suitable for infant school children. As a mother of 2 young children in Westwood I would rather home school my children than send them to the Elfed site. This is not reflection on the Elfed but it is unsuitable for small children. The safety of our children is always a main concern on the Elfed site is sports centre and health centre, heavy traffic, high school children should not mix with very young children the toilet facilities should not be shared, surely there is child protection issues. Not once have we heard any information that proves our children will benefit, apart from maybe half an hour a week in a computer room. The walking route and paths to Elfed are unsuitable and unsafe for very young children, its further away, the corridors would be very big for 3year old primary schools are purpose built for small people. I feel our children's innocence will be taken. And our children should not be used as part of this experiment nt.
65. This type of co location is unproven and the only other examples are either on a purpose built campus or are proposed options similar to this one. Co locating such a large age range has a variety of serious social and safety issues, which cannot be reliably resolved with all children using school facilities such as canteens, libraries and leisure. I have had no definitive answer at the consultations as to how 16 year olds and 3 year olds can be sufficiently segregated when using the same facilities on the same campus. Safety would be compromised travelling to and from school and during school with general public also accessing the site to use the leisure facilities. Other serious issues with this option are road safety from increased traffic, no option of increasing the primary or secondary provision in the future, when not if, all the proposed housing developments are completed and families are relocating to the area and want a local school to attend. Your future projections on this issue from the consultations are guesses and are not based on facts. The outcome of this option and option 4 are a significant decrease in the quality of the education for all ages involved.
66. I strongly disagree with Co-locating Westwood primary school and Elfed High due to various reasons. Location no primary at the heart of the community. Traffic issue that will be caused on mill lane its bad enough as it is now, with health centre as well it will be terrible. I DON'T want my children mixing with older children and hear language that's associated with teenagers. I believe that primary children should have their own school in their own grounds, so they can grow as they should without being pushed into growing up to early.
67. DISRUPTION IN EDUCATION, COSTLY, PERMANENT CHANGE WHEN SCHOOLS WILL NEED TO GROW TO ACCOMODATE FUTURE TOWN EXPANSION, SAFEGUARDING OF KIDS, TRAFFIC/ENVIRO IMPACT, LOCATION OF PRIMARY, PEER PRESSURE, SARED FACILTIES, BUILDING UNSUITABILTY FOR SMALL KIDS, LOSS OF STAFF AND CLUBS (AFTER SCHOOL/BREAKFAST/PENGUINS)
68. DISRUPTION IN EDUCATION, COSTLY, PERMANENT CHANGE WHEN SCHOOLS WILL NEED TO GROW TO ACCOMODATE FUTURE TOWN EXPANSION, SAFEGUARDING OF KIDS, TRAFFIC/ENVIRO IMPACT, LOCATION OF PRIMARY, PEER PRESSURE, SARED FACILTIES, BUILDING UNSUITABILTY FOR SMALL KIDS, LOSS OF STAFF AND CLUBS (AFTER SCHOOL/BREAKFAST/PENGUINS)
69. Destroys the hard work Westwood has done in the last couple of years to improve the school. Will damage the education for a large number of pupils. Removes the financial drain of an under used 6th form. Allows 6th formers to access a full range of subjects in an alternative setting. Only option to gain extra space after 2018 is to build a new school, costly and unnecessary. Will the numbers from Westwood actually fill the surplus places at Elfed should the 6th form close? It will be difficult to overcome local opposition.
70. Destroys the hard work Westwood has done in the last couple of years to improve the school. Will damage the education for a large number of pupils. Removes the

financial drain of an under used 6th form. Allows 6th formers to access a full range of subjects in an alternative setting. Only option to gain extra space after 2018 is to build a new school, costly and unnecessary. Will the numbers from Westwood actually fill the surplus places at Elfed should the 6th form close? It will be difficult to overcome local opposition.

71. Destroys the hard work Westwood has done in the last couple of years to improve the school. Will damage the education for a large number of pupils. Removes the financial drain of an under used 6th form. Allows 6th formers to access a full range of subjects in an alternative setting. Only option to gain extra space after 2018 is to build a new school, costly and unnecessary. Will the numbers from Westwood actually fill the surplus places at Elfed should the 6th form close? It will be difficult to overcome local opposition.
72. Destroys the hard work Westwood has done in the last couple of years to improve the school. Will damage the education for a large number of pupils. Removes the financial drain of an under used 6th form. Allows 6th formers to access a full range of subjects in an alternative setting. Only option to gain extra space after 2018 is to build a new school, costly and unnecessary. Will the numbers from Westwood actually fill the surplus places at Elfed should the 6th form close? It will be difficult to overcome local opposition.
73. Diminishment of educational quality for Elfed/Westwood, Safeguarding of kids, traffic congestion, environmental impact, too many people accessing one site (health/leisure), cost implications for re-model, shared facilities will cause access problems and also reduce size of school areas, staggered start times not feasible for working parents, location - South Buckley needs a school, peer pressure - small children are impressionable and would copy the older kids (smoking, drugs, swearing, sex, inappropriate behaviour) Health and safety for building as its designed for young adults not small kids it would need major re-model of toilets, classrooms everything!, loss of staff as would not need as many support/cleaning staff, breakfast/after school clubs - valuable resource to us, would they continue, playgroups - would not need 2 in same location! THIS IS NOT A VIABLE OPTION AND SHOULD BE TOTALLY DISREGARDED
74. The best option to support both Elfed and Westwood is to grow Westwood on its current site. The reduction in capacity was a large factor in the initial fall in numbers at Elfed. The current buildings at Elfed don't provide suitable accommodation for a primary school; the resources required to ensure it is are better direct to the current Westwood site. Moving Westwood from its current site provides a geographical imbalance in primary provision in Buckley. There would be serious concerns with very young children crossing the main road to get to the Elfed site.
75. I do not agree with all Elfed pupils and teachers moving into smaller space. Children will find learning with more noise and crowded areas difficult. To rent the other part to offices would mean a lot of police checks because not everyone is as nice as they might seem. To put Westwood school in Elfed I feel is not a good option as noise levels would affect learning and not all the older children are going to turn out to be good and in today's world the risk of drugs and other bad things would be more worrying in a school joining together.
76. I don't feel that a shared site would be of any benefit to learners. I can not think of any positive impact that this will have on young people in Buckley.
77. Because there will be too many pupils of different ages, and not enough room on site, therefore causing severe over crowding.
78. We strongly disagree to this plan as young children should not be educated together as the environment is totally different. They would have to eat in the same canteen and teenagers have a totally different vocabulary. This would be very frightening for any little 3 year old! Strongly strongly disagree. Very silly idea.
79. Why would you want to lose Westwood? It is very nearly perfect for primary school children. I dread to think of mums with prams and toddlers escorting their children along Hawkesbury Road at 8.45 am along with all the high school students.
80. I don't think its a good idea that children as young as three share a school with older pupils even if the areas are separate.
81. Why bring primary school in then not allowing the children to finish their education by doing away with the sixth form, forcing them to travel.

82. Traffic congestion due to increased number of pupils and parents. No divide for primary children mixing with older students.
83. A local sixth form with easy access and no extra bus or car journeys - will the school provide free buses?
84. Total unworkable option, both schools would face huge upheaval and the problem would not be solved!
85. It will mean that there is no primary education resource in the town centre. Increasing transport problems in the morning and end of the school day.
86. I think it is inappropriate to combine a primary and secondary school as such young pupils require different social skills to older pupils, to mix this would cause social imbalance.
87. Loss of sixth form and unfair having 3-16 on site, segregated or not. Sound carries and behaviours can be observed.
88. This is a completely in workable option, it would create massive upheaval for both schools and would not solve the problem!
89. Traffic is already an issue - a lot of work would need to be done to resolve these issues. A vast amount of money would be spent. Not feasible to split current building into 2!! Where would play area for primary go? Too many cars, parking not ideal.
90. Due to the sometimes forced lack of discipline in homes and schools, I think the mixing of pupils with such an age difference would be detrimental to all. It could have a devastating effect on the impressionable youngsters and cause disruption to the concentration and study of the older pupils. It would be virtually impossible to segregate them completely. I also think the little one's would see and hear things that we would have no control over.
91. Worse idea ever! Not only would it reduce places from losing 17-18 ages, but having 3-11 ages in the same building and area would influence them into negative habits and many children would be afraid of these old children. I work with ages 2-4 so I know that this would not benefit the primary school. Also there most definitely wouldn't be enough parking space.
92. Traffic in the area, I live to far and don't drive. Age 3 mixing with 16 year olds walking to and from school. What is wrong with Westwood now? Happy with the school, teachers and area!! Why move us. Mountain lane is near to Elfed.
93. I do not feel that this will benefit the Elfed's profile as its results are now on a par with the other so called better schools in the area and this should improve its standing in the community. However, Westwood also has a bad reputation in the community maybe unjustly and to merge the two would make peoples opinions even stronger to move to other high schools. It would not aid the Elfed in its striving to wins round people opinions to send their children there for high school education.
94. In the previous consultation exercise , it was acknowledged that provision across such a wide ranging age band would be inappropriate on the one site
95. Quality of education for all, safety, wellbeing, traffic, environmental impact, peer pressure, shared services, staggered start/finish, location, multi use site - too easy for random people to access, building suitability for small children, breakfast/after school clubs, playgroup provisions, **TOO MANY THINGS THAT COULD GO WRONG, COSTLY FOR ALTERATIONS, TOO MUCH CRAMMED IN!** It would be a permanent move and in a few yrs time with projected house growth a new school may have to be built! **ENHANCE WESTWOOD TO FEED ELFED!!!**
96. **SAFETY, EDUCATION QUALITY, SHARED FACILITY, PEER PRESSURE, TRAFFIC CONGESTION, ENVIRO IMPACT, BULLYING, SAFEGUARDING, MULTI USE SITE TO MUCH FREEDOM FOR RANDOM PEOPLE, - ENHANCE WESTWOOD TO FEED ELFED**
97. **DONT BRING ARGOED BACK INTO THE OPTIONS IT IS A FANTASTIC SCHOOL**
98. Westwood School is the only primary school within the consortium which is in the south of Buckley. It is important that the all residents of Buckley have easy access to primary school. Moving the school to the Elfed site would mean that more very young students would have to cross at least one major road. There is also the issue of traffic on the Elfed site. This will be even more difficult when the new health centre is built on the old Belmont site. Almost half of the Elfed site is on the first floor. The staircases at the school are relatively narrow and be impossible for very young children to access the first floor.



99. It is not safe, there are limited case studies that can support whether a co-location will work unless the school has been specifically designed for the purpose.
100. Younger children need their own space to learn, not amongst older students.
101. I don't agree with high school and primary children together, even though in school they will be separate. It would be intimidating for younger children going into and after school. The traffic is bad enough now.
102. Logistical nightmare - access to/from Elfed site. Is the Elfed site suitable for early years provision??
103. I'm unsure how it would work e.g. traffic.
104. Concerned about having young primary age children and older high school pupils on same site. Also about traffic access on one access route used by primary/high school and leisure centre. Traffic already bad.
105. Not feasible, school would require major alterations and the budget of 11.5 million is underestimated.
106. I think they should not have 3 year olds with 16 year olds.
107. Prefer provision to 18 at one location.
108. Sixth form closing.
109. High school has different standards of learning compared to primary schools. This high school primary school together will not work the way you think it would work, but 9-16 would be different.
110. 6th form provision should be retained and 3 year olds educated on site with 16 year olds would be difficult.
111. I don't believe it is a good idea to place youngsters of 3 and 4 with older high school aged children.
112. Primary school children should NOT be co-located into a high school. There is absolutely no 'Educational' benefit for either primary or secondary school pupils for this to happen. In addition to this, the volume of traffic entering and leaving the Elfed site would add to the already severe traffic issues surrounding Mill Lane. Facilities at the Elfed site are not entirely suitable to teach primary children and the cost of altering the Elfed site will be very significant, funds that should be spent on upgrading the educational facilities at Westwood in order to attract more pupils, who will in turn 'feed' the Elfed.

**Q9 If you support Option 3 what do you think would be needed to make it work? What local issues would need to be considered?**

1. Also as stated previous we picked Elfed for its 6th form.
2. Do not support this option
3. nothing
4. Same as above.

**New responses received since 29/02/12**

5. Won't work
6. see above
7. It cannot work..
8. Larger parking and multiple entry and exit roads into the area. also the number of facilities would need to increase on site.
9. It would not work
10. N/A
11. Entirely different buildings as far apart as possible on the grounds

**New responses received since 26/03/12**

12. Much thought needs to be put into the design and layout to make this option work for infant, junior and high school children.
13. NO SUPPORT AT ALL
14. N/A

15. There will be no children left in Westwood to move if this proposal goes ahead as all the parents will move their children before it happens and either home educate or look for provision in another area.
16. I do not support Option 3
17. NO SUPPORT
18. NO SUPPORT
19. NO SUPPORT FOR OPTION 3
20. Would not work.
21. It wouldn't work.
22. It would not work.
23. NO SUPPORT FOR OPTION 3
24. NO SUPPORT FOR OPTION 3
25. I am 5 years old and my sister often takes me to school and picks me up - I would love to go to the same school as my sisters :-)
26. Buckley community spirit needs to be brought back - bring all kids together !
27. As a parent of children aged 5 - 14 I simply can not see the reasoning as to why it would cause problem or concern to bring all these children in the same community together? Surely it can only improve attendance records, parent/teacher communication and save money now and in the future. I think this is more that a viable option which from a business point of view should be considered by councillors.

**OPTION 4 - Co-locate Westwood Primary School & Elfed High School on Elfed site establishing 3-18 provision on the campus.**

**Q10 How strongly do you agree or disagree with OPTION 4 (please tick ONE box only).**

Strongly Agree	=	12	6.8%
Tend to Agree	=	6	3.4%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	=	7	4.0%
Tend to Disagree	=	16	9.0%
Strongly Disagree	=	117	66.1%

**Q11 To help us understand why people agree or disagree with OPTION 4 please provide a short summary of your reasoning (250 words maximum).**

1. Why hasn't Drury infant school been considered amalgamating into Westwood and free that building
2. As stated above the infrastructure etc is unsuitable. Introducing 3-18 education would be even more chaotic.
3. Same as above
4. Safe guarding issues. As per above but with additional safe guarding issues. I am aware of proposed staggered start times, lunches and playtimes, however, you will never be able to give any parent the guarantee that their child aged 3+ will never come into contact with a child aged 18+ whilst within the new site. Therefore, it is unworkable, and is not an option on any level.
5. high schools and junior schools should stay separate
6. It would be very congested in an area already struggling to cope. As it is now there is the Elfed, Buckley Sports Centre and soon to be a new Health Centre.
7. This option retains the sixth form provision which is vital but bringing a primary school onto the site can have difficulties. The site does not naturally lend itself to Primary school provision as the building is on two floors, which would be difficult to adapt for Primary education. The cost of making such adaptations would be significant and may well prove to be detrimental to any proposed savings from the initiative. Also, with Mountain Lane in the immediate vicinity, there is the issue of 'competition' and the souring of relationships and it would also remove all primary education from the side of Buckley where Westwood is currently located, forcing parents to travel a greater distance to get pupils to school. With 2 schools on site, there would obviously be greatly increased safety issues i.e. traffic and road crossing which would have to be given careful thought and planning. Again, it may be that significant money would

- need to be spent on such things as access arrangements which would diminish any potential scheme savings.
8. Infrastructure is wholly unsuitable for children of such a young age who should be educated in their own bespoke environment
  9. I think that this option would work best for both schools, and also gives the junior school better facilities to utilise.
  10. As above
  11. As above
  12. I am really against this idea. It was scary enough sending my 11 year old daughter to high school, knowing that there are 18 year olds in the same school.

#### **New responses received since 29/02/12**

13. Children being in school from the age of 3 mixing with pupils of 18 is disgraceful. We all know what goes on in schools, we have all been there. Some teachers don't have respect from some pupils, so young children seeing that, they will think it is ok to do that.
14. I don't think that 3-11 year olds should be on the same site as 11-18 year olds
15. I have no objection to this as a principle. However, a great deal of concern has been expressed about very young children being intimidated by the presence of much older students. Any possible effect might be ameliorated with a division of the Elfed building into distinct areas. Even better would be separate entrances, even separate driveways, so that students of primary age do not mix with older pupils. This is perhaps a way of assuaging to some extent the anger and concern of Westwood parents but it mitigates against the principle of education being a continuous process which a 3-18 school would enshrine. Whether there is any justification for the parental fears outlined above is uncertain. I remember when Ysgol Belmont was opened that I was concerned that Belmont students at night might be worried about several hundred Elfed pupils passing their school each day. To my knowledge, this fear proved groundless since I cannot remember a single occasion where Elfed students were anything other than supportive.
16. COMPLETELY INAPPROPRIATE building is unsuitable traffic ... to name a few
17. I would not feel comfortable with my 3 year old mixing with children 11 years old and above. I wouldn't put my child in that school and I don't think the school would be safe for the younger children. With all the additional houses you've allowed to be built all over Buckley don't you think this will eventually filter through to more children and you want to close a primary school and fill a high school? It absolutely shocks me at the lack of forward planning this council has. What would happen with the Westwood School and playing field????????? More houses would be by guess.
18. Younger children will gain their own habits, bad habits, in their own time, they do not need to be encouraged by teenagers at an earlier age, i.e. swearing, smoking. Although this may be only a small amount of pupils.
19. Building is not suited to primary school children, school run parents dropping younger children at school would increase the traffic at the Elfed and it is already mad during school opening and closing
20. Disruption to pupils cannot be a good thing. The money to relocate would be better spent on modernising current schools.
21. Again I think that there is too much of an age group to be together. Not sure it would work personally. Think it would cost too much money to update the premises and make it appealing for younger children. Also there is access issues for transport too.
22. please see option 4
23. As I stated in option 3, plus I don't think that is appropriate to have children from such a wide age range being educated so closely
24. as above
25. I feel any of the above options, if developed fully and sympathetically, could be beneficial to the schools involved and the local community.
26. the majority of children who attend Westwood school progress to the Elfed, by relocating them as a separate school within the Elfed site would fill the vacant places, keep a 6th form and improve a school already in existence.

27. It's wrong that children as young as 3 should not be going to school with teenagers (young adults). Traffic will be manic especially now the new Buckley health centre is going ahead on the same site. Westwood Primary is the only school in that part of Buckley. It would take me and my two children about 30 minutes to walk to Elfed if this goes ahead. Please Do Not Move Westwood School !!
28. See Q8
29. This option I feel serves the community as a whole better. The land from Westwood school could be freed up to put the new Drs surgery in.
30. Option 2 still referred but this could be an alternative, particularly if it combines educational and premises benefits.
31. Please see above (under option 3)
32. There is not sufficient room for both primary, secondary and further education in the Elfed building and the existing sixth form at Elfed is highly undersubscribed so keeping it at the school is not rational with Mold Alun sixth form so near. Westwood would also need separate space from the secondary school area due to the 1 buoys differences with education at primary and secondary level.
33. My opinion as above.
34. As above. Not appropriate.
35. The additional traffic combined with the Elfed and so close to Mountain Lane School would be absolute chaos and a misery for local residents.
36. As above.
37. As for Option 3
38. Same reasons as above
39. Not sure co-location of vast ages will work.
40. The infra-structure is not appropriate to have 3 year old children and 16 year old adults - not just in the case of entering the building but in terms of traffic; walking to school; the huge size of Elfed from a 3 year old perspective; language and smoking on the way to school. The whole idea is awful and could do lasting damage to a child's early years and whole attitude to school.

**New responses received since 26/03/12.**

41. Both schools are below capacity so by merging the two schools it will free up funding and enable the council to use the building which now houses Westwood for some other purpose.
42. As with Option 3, spending £11.5m creating a new primary area within the existing buildings is a complete waste of money. In difficult financial times the council should reconsider this expenditure and possibly examine the difference that just a fraction of such a large amount would make to all the primary schools in the county. Surely it would be more prudent to invest in the existing Westwood site. Standards are rising at the Elfed and, once the perception is rightly challenged that Mynydd Isa is more successful, the surplus will be reduced as greater recruitment is witnessed at the Elfed. Option 4 is an improvement on 3 since the post-16 provision is retained but serious questions must be raised regarding the effective use of space and the wisdom of 3 year olds being educated in the proximity of 16-18 year olds with their vastly different needs and outlooks.
43. Combining a Primary School and a High School is wrong on so many levels. It is unfair for both sets of students, particularly those of primary age. They are likely to come into unsupervised contact with much older children and I fear that this could lead to difficulties. I think there are real Health & Safety issues here and if anything was to happen then the Local Authority would surely be culpable. If this was to be a realistic proposition then it should have happened when the Belmont building was still standing. This was a school building, but it was sufficiently far from the Elfed. This has now been sold which, now that these options are being considered, shows a complete lack of foresight on the behalf of the Local Authority.
44. Co-locating both primary and secondary schools can never be a good idea even if it has been done elsewhere. Mixing young children with older ones during start/finish times will lead to obvious problems; groups of teenagers have their ways that are best separated from primary age children. Moreover, it should go without saying that Westwood is the only primary school located to serve the half of Buckley south of the

major road running through the town. I am currently happy to allow my child to walk to the Westwood school site, as this teaches her independence. Asking her to walk across and along a busy main road to the Elfed site, which has teenagers being teenagers following the same pavements, would be totally unsatisfactory. Would anyone be able to live with themselves or their simplistic 'risk assessment forms' if god forbid a young child was injured or killed crossing the busy roads to the Elfed site.

45. It is unfair for children of 3 to 10 year olds to be exposed to the behaviours of older more mature children. These children are at a very influential age and behaviours /language would be copied, or questioned. Children are exposed to so much in the media and around the town that the school is the one place where they should be able to be safe and sheltered from such issues, to be able to be children. There would also be a major issue with entrance and exiting the site due to the vast number of children who need to be taken/collected.
46. The majority of the children who attend the Westwood School would go on to attend the Elfed. They would not be losing their local school and having to move out of the area. The school would just be moving to a new site with in walking distance of the old one. They would gain a new school adapted to cater for the needs of all the children with in the local community.
47. Same as above, plus staggered starts would not work for working parents, multiuse site would be too dangerous, shared services wouldn't suit small kids, loss in primary identity and no space for grow, bid unsuitable.
48. Potential loss of jobs. Older students will be a bad influence on younger ones (even more so with 16-18 year olds on the premises). Peer pressure will being at an earlier age, swearing, smoking, drugs, bullying etc. Would result in no space in the Elfed for new pupils (from all the new housing estates being built locally). Not enough space (canteen, play time space). Would be over crowded, as most Elfed pupils are expected to remain on site at break and lunch. Different break times for high school and primary school pupils would not work well due to disruption of lessons. This would be unfair on all pupils of the schools, as it will disrupt their education. No funding from the Welsh Government. Due to the bad influence of older pupils, disruptive behaviour will begin at an earlier age. This will not only affect other pupils, and anyone involved during school hours (disruptive behaviour in class for example). It will disrupt teachers in their attempts to do their jobs, but also the education of other pupils. This behaviour is likely to continue outside of school in both homes and in the local community. Disrupting children's familiar grounds, and potentially their education. This is very unfair! Will be very intimidating to young pupils, and they're a target for older ones. More inconvenient for younger pupils parents, as they are likely to have to walk children to school due to roads being busier by Elfed.
49. As above. Don't know why its got anything to do with Westwood if the high school is not full and Westwood should not be involve, you need to sort out high school problems not involve Westwood.
50. The infant children will not be isolated completely from young adults and I feel this will be very unnerving for them. 2. The traffic around the school site is extremely busy now and I know you say you will make provisions for the extra cars but I think the site is only big enough to deal with so much change. 3. The pavement along mill lane is very narrow and the majority of parents have young children in buggies so this will cause potential dangers. 4. The canteen, theatre and I'm sure many other places in high school will be quite over whelming for small children to deal with.
51. I strongly disagree to this option. There are too many safety and child welfare issues to maintain. Would all over 16s be CRB checked? (Peer pressure) Children's safety and welfare is paramount and this option would jeopardise this immensely. Traffic and parking would be a major factor that would need addressing as its directly a problem.
52. I don't believe this is appropriate for very young children to be mixing socialising with 11-18 year olds.
53. If there is a need for extra primary places, then surely there will be a need for secondary places in a few years so a variation on option 2 would be the best to a full school to utilise places.
54. The retention of 16-18 year old education locally appeals.

55. Keep Westwood going.
56. I totally disagree with combining primary and secondary school. I feel this would be totally detrimental to pupils learning and personal growth. I would move my child rather than accept this option.
57. As above
58. Same reasons as question 8.
59. Having two schools on our side does not work. Over time numbers will decline, again a town the size of Buckley needs independent / separate primary schools.
60. I DONT AGREE WITH THIS OPTION HAVING HAD 3 CHILDREN WHO ARE NOW ADULTS ALL ATTENDING WEST LEA AND BUCKLEY C.P AND AS A MOTHER WHO DOESNT DRIVE OR OWN A CAR THE DISTANCE FROM WHERE I LIVE WOULD HAVE BEEN A BIG DIFFERENCE TO WALK WITH 3 YOUNG CHILDREN.
61. Be relocating Westwood to Elfed you will in no way enhance my daughters education.
62. This cannot work. There is no other co-joined provision - which has not been new build - that has any kind of research that proves there is an education benefit to any of the children concerned. There is no scope to grow either primary of secondary on the same site when numbers increase, which they will within 10 years. Neither governing body support this view and none of the local councillors do either, which tells the real feelings and support within the community.
63. This cannot work. There is no other co-joined provision - which has not been new build - that has any kind of research that proves there is an education benefit to any of the children concerned. There is no scope to grow either primary of secondary on the same site when numbers increase, which they will within 10 years. Neither governing body support this view and none of the local councillors do either, which tells the real feelings and support within the community.
64. As above!!
65. For reasons stated above!!
66. As for option 3, I have traffic/transport concerns; the geographical distribution of the primary schools would be such that they would all be in North Buckley; Options suggest alteration of existing buildings and NOT purpose built ones (it is unclear how the site would be adapted); increasing need for primary school places, so why include a primary in the Options put forward. In addition- - In Blaenau Gwent, the NASUWT raised concerns that a 3-16 school was not as suitable model for young pupils; The authority stated that proposed sites were separated by 1/2 a mile with a sports centre at the centre. This separation would not be possible at the Elfed site. - Housing development in Buckley is increasing the need for primary places. Westwood is currently the only primary with scope to expand, but this would be restricted if not impossible with co-location. -Educationally it is unclear how co-location would benefit either school. No evidence has been put forward to suggest that co-location of Westwood will help raise standards or provide better choices in either school.
67. All the same reasons above. Surely it would make more sense to keep Westwood where it is and expand using the sure start centre as part of the school as it was years ago as we are the only primary school in Buckley with the facilities to expand.
68. This option has all the same serious issues as option 3. In addition to this there are pollution issues with the increased traffic possibly leading to health problems especially in the young physically developing children. There would be a lack of space for all age groups giving the feeling of overcrowding. The school catchments would change affecting not only Westwood but the other primary schools in Buckley.
69. Co-locating primary and high school would be a security nightmare, you cant CRB check every 18yr old in the school. And it's not right. I strongly disagree with Co-locating Westwood primary school and Elfed High due to various reasons. Location no primary at the heart of the community. Traffic issue that will be caused on mill lane its bad enough as it is now, with health centre as well it will be terrible. I DON'T want my children mixing with older children and hear language that's associated with teenagers. I believe that primary children should have their own school in their own grounds, so they can grow as they should without being pushed into growing up to early.
70. DISRUPTION IN EDUCATION, COSTLY, PERMANENT CHANGE WHEN SCHOOLS WILL NEED TO GROW TO ACCOMODATE FUTURE TOWN EXPANSION, SAFEGUARDING OF KIDS, TRAFFIC/ENVIRO IMPACT, LOCATION

- OF PRIMARY, PEER PRESSURE, SARED FACILTIES, BUILDING UNSUITABILTY FOR SMALL KIDS, LOSS OF STAFF AND CLUBS (AFTER SCHOOL/BREAKFAST/PENGUINS)
71. DISRUPTION IN EDUCATION, COSTLY, PERMANENT CHANGE WHEN SCHOOLS WILL NEED TO GROW TO ACCOMODATE FUTURE TOWN EXPANSION, SAFEGUARDING OF KIDS, TRAFFIC/ENVIRO IMPACT, LOCATION OF PRIMARY, PEER PRESSURE, SARED FACILTIES, BUILDING UNSUITABILTY FOR SMALL KIDS, LOSS OF STAFF AND CLUBS (AFTER SCHOOL/BREAKFAST/PENGUINS)
  72. Destroys the hard work Westwood has done in the last couple of years to improve the school. Will damage the education of a large number of pupils. Only option to gain extra space after 2018 is to build a new school, costly and unnecessary. Possibly merging Alun and Elfed 6th form and focusing a small number of courses on the Elfed site. Such as Performing Arts or Health & Social Care (for example). This would address some of the issues with an under used 6th form. This idea would also have a positive effect on the Elfed's public image. It will be difficult to overcome local opposition.
  73. Destroys the hard work Westwood has done in the last couple of years to improve the school. Will damage the education of a large number of pupils. Only option to gain extra space after 2018 is to build a new school, costly and unnecessary. Possibly merging Alun and Elfed 6th form and focusing a small number of courses on the Elfed site. Such as Performing Arts or Health & Social Care (for example). This would address some of the issues with an under used 6th form. This idea would also have a positive effect on the Elfed's public image. It will be difficult to overcome local opposition.
  74. Destroys the hard work Westwood has done in the last couple of years to improve the school. Will damage the education of a large number of pupils. Only option to gain extra space after 2018 is to build a new school, costly and unnecessary. Possibly merging Alun and Elfed 6th form and focusing a small number of courses on the Elfed site. Such as Performing Arts or Health & Social Care (for example). This would address some of the issues with an under used 6th form. This idea would also have a positive effect on the Elfed's public image. It will be difficult to overcome local opposition.
  75. Destroys the hard work Westwood has done in the last couple of years to improve the school. Will damage the education of a large number of pupils. Only option to gain extra space after 2018 is to build a new school, costly and unnecessary. Possibly merging Alun and Elfed 6th form and focusing a small number of courses on the Elfed site. Such as Performing Arts or Health & Social Care (for example). This would address some of the issues with an under used 6th form. This idea would also have a positive effect on the Elfed's public image. It will be difficult to overcome local opposition.
  76. Diminishment of educational quality for Elfed/Westwood, Safeguarding of kids, traffic congestion, environmental impact, too many people accessing one site (health/leisure), cost implications for re-model, shared facilities will cause access problems and also reduce size of school areas, staggered start times not feasible for working parents, location - South Buckley needs a school, peer pressure - small children are impressionable and would copy the older kids (smoking, drugs, swearing, sex, inappropriate behaviour) Health and safety for building as its designed for young adults not small kids it would need major re-model of toilets, classrooms everything!, loss of staff as would not need as many support/cleaning staff, breakfast/after school clubs - valuable resource to us, would they continue, playgroups - would not need 2 in same location! THIS IS NOT A VIABLE OPTION ADN SHOULD BE TOTALLY DISREGARDED
  77. See above, same applies.
  78. If Westwood does move to Elfed I don't think it should be a move that's detrimental to the education of the sixth formers.
  79. I don't feel that a shared site would be of any benefit to learners. I can not think of any positive impact that this will have on young people in Buckley.
  80. Because the age gap between 3-18 is too great, and I think bullying would certainly increase.

81. Strongly disagree to this plan due to congestion for parents getting all these children to school. Also do not agree with 3 years old being in the same school as 18 year olds! very silly idea.
82. Elfed is too big and distracting for primary school children in my point of view. Westwood is much better.
83. I don't think its a good idea that children as young as three share a school with older pupils even if the areas are separate.
84. Feel primary age children may be overwhelmed for many issues if primary and secondary pupils are mixed together.
85. No feelings either way.
86. Would not work a with option 3.
87. It will mean that there is no primary education resource in the town centre. Increasing transport problems in the morning and end of the school day.
88. Again I disagree with this option to the same as option 3.
89. Better that sixth form is retained but having 3 - 18 yr olds on site, sound carries and behaviours observed.
90. Again, same as option 3 this would not work.
91. This seems to be the only option that keeps things close to how they are now, with the added provision of Westwood Primary School. However, it seems I have to choose an option and in the lack of NO CHANGE option available, then option 4 is my choice.
92. I think financially this would be the best option for the two schools. A similar scheme work in Deeside.
93. Traffic is already an issue - a lot of work would need to be done to resolve these issues. A vast amount of money would be spent. Not feasible to split current building into 2!! Where would play area for primary go? Too many cars, parking not ideal.
94. Due to the sometimes forced lack of discipline in homes and schools, I think the mixing of pupils with such an age difference would be detrimental to all. It could have a devastating effect on the impressionable youngsters and cause disruption to the concentration and study of the older pupils. It would be virtually impossible to segregate them completely. I also think the little one's would see and hear things that we would have no control over.
95. Worse idea ever! Not only would it reduce places from losing 17-18 ages, but having 3-11 ages in the same building and area would influence them into negative habits and many children would be afraid of these old children. I work with ages 2-4 so I know that this would not benefit the primary school. Also there most definitely wouldn't be enough parking spaces. 3-11 years should not be taught with the same building as 11-18 years.
96. Traffic in the area, I live to far and don't drive. Age 3 mixing with 16 year olds walking to and from school. What is wrong with Westwood now? Happy with the school, teachers and area!! Why move us. Mountain lane is near to Elfed. Why move the offices in Westwood to Elfed as numbers are very big now. (last 2 years, 32 in my child's class!
97. As my reasons above for Option 3.
98. Quality of education for all, safety, wellbeing, traffic, environmental impact, peer pressure, shared services, staggered start/finish, location, multi use site - too easy for random people to access, building suitability for small children, breakfast/after school clubs, playgroup provisions, TOO MANY THINGS THAT COULD GO WRONG, COSTLY FOR ALTERATIONS, TOO MUCH CRAMMED IN! It would be a permanent move and in a few yrs time with projected house growth a new school may have to be built. ENHANCE WESTWOOD TO FEED ELFED
99. SAFETY, EDUCATION QUALITY, SHARED FACILITY, PEER PRESSURE, TRAFFIC CONGESTION, ENVIRO IMPACT, BULLYING, SAFEGUARDING, MULTI USE SITE TO MUCH FREEDOM FOR RANDOM PEOPLE, - ENHANCE WESTWOOD TO FEED ELFED
100. DONT BRING ARGOED BACK INTO THE OPTIONS IT IS A FANTASTIC SCHOOL
101. See the comments for option 3.
102. It is not safe, there are limited case studies that can support whether a co-location will work unless the school has been specifically designed for the purpose.
103. It is not safe for the younger children to mix with older ones.



104. Logistical nightmare - access to/from Elfed site. Is the Elfed site suitable for early years provision??
105. Concerned about having young primary age children and older high school pupils on same site. Also about traffic access on one access route used by primary/high school and leisure centre. Traffic already bad
106. Not feasible, school would require major alterations and the budget of 11.5 million is underestimated.
107. I think they should not have 3 year olds with 16 year olds
108. Still provides provision to 18 at one location.
109. It is unsuitable to have very young children in the same area as teenagers - due to language etc.
110. + Sixth form! - primary school.
111. As above, but 18-19 year olds educated on site with 3 year olds.
112. The younger generation could be scared of school when seeing all the bigger children.
113. As option 3
114. Obviously this is only my personal thoughts, but after 16 children are ready to move on in the world, be that further studying or working. They should be treated as young adults and be given the opportunity of choice, by either attending a college to help them mature or find adequate employment to help them further their career as chosen. I think we should seriously start outsourcing further education to colleges wrexham/chester/deeside and prepare these young adults to 'the real world'.

**Q12 If you support Option 4 what do you think would be needed to make it work? What local issues would need to be considered?**

1. Do not support this option
2. see above

**New responses received since 29/02/12**

3. Maybe some method of segregation, with a common building but separate institutions within that building.
4. Again won't work
5. It cannot work. there will be nothing but problems..
6. N/A
7. You would need to re-model the site so that the younger pupils would be completely separate from the older pupils. It would be easier for parents as well having all their children on one site.
8. Transport access would be is horrendous!

**New responses received since 26/03/12**

9. Money could be spent to enhance Westwood at current sites, to attract more pupils and therefore feed Elfed. ADITIONAL My suggested option would be to go along with Option 1 or 2, dependant on the requirement for sixth form in future. To use the space at Elfed, I would include use for either office space such as the services currently at Westwood Centre, moving such 'family' services would make them more accessible to all when medical centre is completed. Another use for space would be as a training facility or adult learning centre, which could be provided by current Elfed staff. The space could also be used for council staff, to save on rental of hotels and conference facilities. Other uses could be: - Police Counter - Library - Museum - Storage - Office Rental
10. N/A
11. I do not support Option 4
12. NO SUPPORT
13. NO SUPPORT
14. NO SUPPORT FOR OPTION 4

15. I think the school should be separated into certain areas e.g. 1. The youngest under 5's. 2. Westwood pupils. 3. Elfed pupils. 4. 6th formers. It would also be good to keep the sixth formers on Elfed's site as they can teach a lot to young children and they can also learn a lot through doing it. Would also be beneficial if someone wanted to do childcare, or teaching as a career.
16. My son has gone through high school at the Elfed and wishes to attend sixth form on the school site which we strongly agree with.
17. Absolutely nothing would make this option work!! (Only viable option would be to merge Elfed High with Argoed, securing pupil numbers, saving the 6th form and ensuring staff jobs.)
18. (Could you tell me what Argoed occupancy is? Is Bryn y Baal and Argoed merging?)
19. Nothing would make this option work!! (The only long term viable option would be to merge Elfed High School with Argoed High School, this would secure pupil numbers (including the 6th form) in the long term and ensure staff jobs.
20. The only issue needing to be considered is our children's education. It is inevitable that there will be disruption and building work going on during term time. As long as the children's education is not disrupted and stays the same or better still IMPROVES, then you can change what you like.
21. To be honest everybody is from Buckley and the primary school children should logically move into Elfed for their high school provision. So I don't understand why there should be any local issues. I still feel moving the Argoed and Elfed together would have been the best option.
22. Maybe the answer would be to relocate the Elfed pupils to one of the Junior school premises, and all infants and junior school pupils under one roof at the Elfed school premises.
23. NO SUPPORT FOR OPTION 4
24. NO SUPPORT
25. Funding.
26. By placing younger children in any high school would not help in preparing young adults for employment within the adult world.

## Q12c Postcode

1.	CH4 0HP	58.	CH7 2SA
2.	CH4 0QW	59.	CH7 3AJ
3.	CH4 0SZ	60.	CH7 3BE
4.	CH4 8SJ	61.	CH7 3BL
5.	CH5 1PJ	62.	CH7 3BW
6.	CH5 2AZ	63.	CH7 3BZ (4)
7.	CH5 3DA	64.	CH7 3ES
8.	CH5 3HZ	65.	CH7 3HE
9.	CH66 4LE	66.	CH7 3HQ
10.	CH7 1GJ	67.	CH7 3HU (2)
11.	CH7 2AB	68.	CH7 3JA
12.	CH7 2AE	69.	CH7 3JN
13.	CH7 2AG (2)	70.	CH7 3JT
14.	CH7 2AN (2)	71.	CH7 3LD
15.	CH7 2AQ	72.	CH7 3LH (4)
16.	CH7 2AR (2)	73.	CH7 3LJ (2)
17.	CH7 2AU	74.	CH7 3LR
18.	CH7 2AX	75.	CH7 3NH
19.	CH7 2AY	76.	CH7 3NL
20.	CH7 2BB (2)	77.	CH7 3PB (4)
21.	CH7 2BH	78.	CH7 3PR
22.	CH7 2DA	79.	CH7 3PX
23.	CH7 2DF (2)	80.	CH7 3QA (3)
24.	CH7 2DY (3)	81.	CH7 3QG
25.	CH7 2EE	82.	CH7 3QL
26.	CH7 2EH	83.	CH7 4DS
27.	CH7 2GA	84.	CH7 4LB
28.	CH7 2GD	85.	CH7 4UA
29.	CH7 2HP	86.	CH7 5DZ
30.	CH7 2HX	87.	CH7 6BJ
31.	CH7 2JF	88.	CH7 6EE (3)
32.	CH7 2JL (3)	89.	CH7 6HA
33.	CH7 2JN (4)	90.	CH7 6NL (2)
34.	CH7 2JR	91.	CH7 6QE (2)
35.	CH7 2JS	92.	CH7 6RY (2)
36.	CH7 2LB	93.	CH7 6RZ
37.	CH7 2LE	94.	CH7 6SD
38.	CH7 2LF	95.	CH7 6SW
39.	CH7 2LG	96.	CH7 6TB
40.	CH7 2LH (8)	97.	CH7 6TD
41.	CH7 2LQ	98.	CH7 6TE
42.	CH7 2LW	99.	CH7 6TR
43.	CH7 2NB	100.	CH7 6TW (2)
44.	CH7 2ND	101.	CH7 6TY
45.	CH7 2PH (2)	102.	CH7 6UB
46.	CH7 2PW	103.	CH7 6UG (5)
47.	CH7 2PY	104.	CH7 6UZ (5)
48.	CH7 2PZ	105.	CH7 6WG (4)
49.	CH7 2QA	106.	CH7 6XQ
50.	CH7 2QF (3)	107.	CH7 6XW (2)
51.	CH7 2QJ (3)	108.	CH7 6XY (2)
52.	CH7 2QL	109.	CH7 6YN (2)
53.	CH7 2QN	110.	CH7 6yy
54.	CH7 2QP (2)	111.	CH8 7BP
55.	CH7 2QR	112.	LL15 1HD
56.	CH7 2QT		
57.	CH7 2QW		

**Q13 Are you....? Please tick all that apply**

Parent or carer of Elfed High School pupil	62	35.0%
Parent or Carer of Argoed High School pupil (progressing)	31	17.5%
Parent or Carer of Ysgol Mynydd Isa pupil	19	10.7%
Parent or Carer of Drury Primary School pupil	0	0.0%
Teacher (Westwood Primary School)	0	0.0%
School Staff (Westwood Primary School)	8	4.5%
School Governor (Westwood Primary School)	3	1.7%
Parent of Carer of Westwood Primary School pupil	33	18.6%
Parent or Carer of Southdown Primary School pupil	8	4.5%
Parent or Carer of Mountain Lane Primary School pupil	11	6.2%
Teacher (Elfed High School)	6	3.4%
School Staff (Elfed High School)	3	1.7%
School Governor (Elfed High School)	2	1.1%

**Other please specify**

1. In charge of Ju-Jitsu club at Westwood Centre in free time.
2. Governor at Mountain Lane Primary School
3. None, but having had 2 children go through Elfed, in 6th form at Elfed and one is now at the Alun (only because course wasn't offered at Elfed).
4. Retired staff member of Elfed High School.
5. Starting a family
6. teacher at Argoed
7. Staff from another school
8. Children progressing to Argoed so future post 16
9. Also Teaching Assistant at Ysgol Mynydd Isa
10. Argoed High School student in year 11
11. local resident (5)
12. Teacher and Parent Governor @ Mountain Lane
13. Parent of child who is 8 months and considering which school to attend
14. Previous pupil of Argoed
15. teacher Mountain Lane Primary school
16. ex pupils father
17. One child progressing into secondary education
18. ELFED 6TH FORM PUPIL AND AUNT TO WESTWOOD PUPIL
19. GRANDPARENT
20. pupil Argoed High School
21. pupil Ysgol Mynydd Isa
22. Governor (Ysgol Mynydd Isa)
23. Grandparent Elfed and 2 Primaries
24. Staff at Hawkesbury Play Group next to Elfed.
25. GRANDPARENT
26. Ex Argoed Pupil
27. Parent pupil Ewloe Green
28. Ysgol Mynydd Isa Child
29. School child (2)
30. I attended Elfed
31. My sisters attend Elfed.

**Flintshire County Council**

# **Lifelong Learning**

**Area Schools Review 2012**

## **Queensferry, Shotton and Connah's Quay**

**Responses received by 30/04/12 = English 198 / Welsh 1**

### **Final Report**

## Area Schools Review 2012

### Queensferry, Shotton and Connah's Quay

#### John Summers and Connah's Quay High Schools Consultation Form Responses.

198 received by 30/04/12

#### OPTION 1 - Replace John Summers High School with a new school building (11-16 school and Post- 16 hub at Connah's Quay High School)

##### Q1 How strongly do you agree or disagree with OPTION 1 (please tick ONE box only)

Strongly Agree	=	25	12.7%
Tend to Agree	=	27	13.7%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	=	22	11.2%
Tend to Disagree	=	15	7.6%
Strongly Disagree	=	90	45.7%

##### Q2 To help us understand why people agree or disagree with OPTION 1 please provide a short summary of your reasoning (250 words maximum).

1. Too Expensive
2. Option 1 is likely to attract more learners to the school once the new build is in place. This could, but may not, alleviate the issues with the school being under target numbers. This would however be more beneficial to learners than the current building, Estyn usually agree that learners tend to do better if they are learning in a nicer environment. Connah's Quay High learners would not benefit at all unless their class sizes were reduced by students favouring the new school.
3. why should we waste money on that
4. The idea of this whole programme is to save money. How would spending £20million+ on a new secondary school save any money at all?
5. Why replace the building with a new one when the existing building could be brought up to a decent standard in phases with less disruption to all, also less funding would be needed?
6. I appreciate that John Summers is more central for the areas around Deeside but my year 8 daughter really enjoys going to Connah's Quay High School, has a wide group of friends and has never had any trouble whilst she has been there. Not only am I concerned about the disruption this will have to her education and whether or not she will be placed with friends in classes, as a working family, it puts more pressure on the travelling to and from school. By the time a decision has been made, my daughter who is in year 8 at present will be at a critical point of her education and I find it totally unfair that this potential move may have a detrimental effect on her grades. The traffic through Shotton has always been horrendous so to put a school on this stretch of road for the number of pupils you are suggesting attend does not bear thinking about.
7. I am for this option, though it is not my preferred, because it retains 11-16 education in Queensferry. I believe, as a resident of Deeside who has had three children attend John Summers, that the school serves the community well. Moreover it improves, as evidenced by Estyn, and has excellent prospects for the future. The family ethos and nurturing which goes on there is non-pareil. I look forward to my grand-children attending. I would be very unhappy for them to go to Connah's Quay before reaching 6th. form age. I feel the school needs to keep hold of its strong identity, and this is only to be done by allowing it to be self-contained i.e. not amalgamated with Connah's Quay High - or whatever the Council proposes to call such a school. Queensferry is a very challenging area to run a school, and John Summers rises to those challenges. This is not to be thrown away. The people here need this school.

Some of the children have a difficult life, to say the least, and this should be the over-riding factor.

#### **Responses received since 05/03/12.**

8. The presence of a school on the John Summers site is extremely important as it serves an area of extreme deprivation and a catchment which is expected to grow dramatically with the new gateway development in Garden City. I have no comments either way regarding the post 16 hub at Connah's Quay. The school has a distinctive Ethos and a committed professional staff and as the latest Estyn inspection will testify has a great deal to offer
9. JSHS has the potential to become a fore-runner of new school builds in North Wales. A new build would enable us to embrace the money-saving and forward thinking practices that are available.
10. Make the site more attractive for prospective families in the forthcoming massive housing development in Sealand. Flintshire needs a modern secondary school.
11. This would alleviate the problem of surplus places - is there adequate money for this option though. The new build would need to take into account the northern gateway project and its proposed new housing developments.
12. This would be very nice to have a new build but concerned that, when it came down to it, would there be enough money available to support option.
13. Currently as the building stands at JSHS it does not meet the needs of a 21st century school. There is money available for this from Sealand developers.
14. JS needs improving to be 'fit' for purpose. JS will continue to serve its community in a purpose built facility fit for purpose. JS would be ready for the anticipated increases in pupil numbers.
15. Option 1 and option 3 would be most favourable for JSHS community. A new school building would provide up to date facilities and resources benefiting the Queensferry pupils and community as a whole. Facilities that can be accessed by all. Financial support from council/Welsh Assembly, parental support. new places made available for the housing development (education needed).
16. A combination of option 1 and 3 would be most favourable, it would provide up to date facilities benefitting the local community and providing community based education, addresses JSHS building issues.
17. Option 1 would be an investment for the future of John Summers High School and the community. Ideally it could be combined with option 3 to make a 3-16 facility.
18. New 3-16 facility for John Summers. New start Fresh new state of the art school fit for the 21st century. Admittedly big expense, but would pay off in the long term. New approach to education; transition difficulties of the past would be eliminated.
19. Further investment required in this area. The primary school is relatively new, a new build would address the surplus places and allow a purpose built building be ready for gateway transformation of the area.
20. Flintshire schools across the board need to move into the 21st century and combine this with option 3, you have the potential for a very exciting innovative school.
21. JSHS remaining open as it provides a focal point for the community. The school has library and resource facilities attached where everyone from the area can take part. JSHS was modelled on community learning primary and secondary and adult classes in the community.
22. John Summers High School provides excellent education for learners aged between 11-18. To combine and develop further this excellence, a new build would be highly beneficial and accommodate learning and progression within the 21st Century.
23. Although I agree with the idea of JSHS remaining open, I feel that the expense of a new building makes this an unlikely option. On these grounds I tend to disagree.
24. Where is the savings with this option? Where would the money come from for the new building? It does not address the issue of surplus places at John Summers.
25. This is the most expensive and most ridiculous option. Why do you need to replace a relatively good school when you have already offered in option 2 to refurbish said school? This is throwing away good money the "council" can ill afford.
26. There is no new modern secondary school in Flintshire, so this option is exciting. This option acknowledges that the Northern Gateway Project will ensure an increase in

students wanting to attend JSHS. Significant funding should be available from the project.

27. All would benefit from a rebuilt, including benefiting the local economy via jobs.
28. Has some merits, although the loss of post 16 would be disappointing. Ideal situation - new build taking into consideration of Northern Gateway Project.
29. £25m of local tax payers money could be better spent in other areas as the present school building is proving adequate at present and the council is obviously short of money to spend on social/affordable housing, attracting employment etc.
30. Obviously a top option, it wouldn't be very cost effective, unless it offered a 3 to 16 facility.
31. A new build would serve the area very well and would allow all the good work done at this school to be rewarded.
32. Current building is good. Just needs improvements.
33. Expensive, Existing building adequate.
34. In the long term pupil numbers will increase, particularly as a result of the Northern Gateway Project.
35. All would benefit from a rebuild. It would provide an education provision in the two communities also boosting the economy.
36. I would prefer option 5 develop 3-16 facility at JSHS with new building to deliver education fit for the 21st century. One governing body and one management structure.
37. Building already here, appears to be a strange decision (option)
38. A new school building would maintain a high school at the heart of the local community. Together with the existing 'campus' facilities this would provide a fantastic resource for many years to come.
39. Loses yr 12-13 at JSHS - successful and shows good role models to younger pupils. Like new building aspect - would make facilities more user friendly and up to date for 21st century. Negative = building period disruption.
40. I believe that this option would ideally be combined with option 3. A facility like this would be the heart of a community such as Queensferry.
41. The local community is in need of a school building which is fit for the 21st century and to inspire learners to contribute fully to the wider community industries as they continue to grow.
42. Maintain secondary education in the community.
43. I do not understand how this option would save any money. This would involve spending millions of pounds rebuilding John Summers High School, however it would not address the issue relating to surplus places within the school.
44. John Summers High School has too many surplus places, so redeveloping the site is a waste of money. Ian Budd and Tom Davies were unable to make clear who would be teaching in the 6th form hub, and how it would currently affect the people who teach 6th form within the relevant schools. What's the point of a 6th form hub being erected right next door to Deeside College - makes no sense.
45. Rebuilding the school will not solve the problem of surplus places - waste of 25 Million pounds - where has that figure come from???? - The size of this cost would suggest that this is in fact NOT an option. Ian Budd and Tom Davies were unable to make clear who would be teaching in the 6th form hub, and how it would currently affect the people who teach 6th form within the relevant schools. What's the point of a 6th form hub being erected right next door to Deeside College - makes no sense.
46. John Summers High School has lots of surplus places so there is no point in redeveloping the site. This will waste rather than save money.
47. JOHN SUMMERS HIGH SCHOOL HAS TOO MANY SURPLUS PLACES. SO REDEVELOPING IS A WASTE OF MONEY. IAN BUDD AND TOM DAVIES WERE UNABLE TO MAKE CLEAR WHO WOULD BE TEACHING IN THE 6TH FORM HUB, AND HOW IT WOULD CURRENTLY AFFECT THE PEOPLE WHO TEACH THE 6TH FORM WITHIN THE RELEVANT SCHOOLS. WHAT IS THE POINT OF A HUB ON THE DEESIDE COLLEGE SIGHT WHEN IT TAKES AWAY THE CHOICE OF LEARNERS TO BE EDUCATED AT THEIR SCHOOL.
48. The amount of money needed to replace John Summers with a new building would be far too much. It would not increase the number of learners attending so we would



end up paying over 20 million pounds for a school that will still have more than 25% surplus places and a small 6th form with no indication that this will increase.

49. This does not make sense. There would still be surplus places and the cost is far too high with absolutely no benefit.
50. I don't see how demolishing John Summers and building a new building would increase the numbers attending John Summers and increase numbers in sixth form and decrease surplus. Also, does CQHS have a sixth form or is it with the college? This is unclear. It seems a completely ridiculous cost for something I doubt would improve the situation. Due to John Summers' "short life span", surely the best option would be to shut John Summers and distribute the students around the local area, providing transport to school for learners and support for these students.

#### **New response received since 09/03/12**

51. This option is not sustainable. It will never happen as the money is not there to replace the building. It does not address the issues of surplus places at John Summers High School
52. Extremely expensive for council tax payers.
53. Not enough pupils to support the school and seems a lot of money to take down the existing building to rebuild and still not have the funding for the education because of the surplus places
54. I sent my child to Connah's Quay because I thought it was a good school. If you put JSHS in with them, there would be too many pupils. My daughter will be going into year 10 and we do not want the disruption.
55. The school environment would be a better experience more conducive to learning.
56. Unnecessary cost.
57. The school is already there. Pointless building another one.
58. Due to cost.
59. Costs are too excessive to run this option. Surplus costs would be met from local authority funds ultimately tax payers.
60. This is a very expensive option to replace a school.
61. Willing to listen to suggestions for a post 16 hub at CQHS but have major concerns about it. Transport is a major issue with the traffic problems between Connah's Quay and Shotton. Concerns about the impact on 11-16 at CQHS if post 16 hub based there.
62. This is meant to be a cost effective exercise. How is building a new school cost effective? Where is the money coming from?
63. Would this affect pupils at Connah's Quay? Doesn't actually say if Connah's Quay High School will be closing apart from Option 4.
64. Connah's Quay own produced form for and Alternative Option: - Maybe Hawarden High should be in the frame, it is closer to Queensferry High. I really do not think pupils should be sent 3 times as far away to CQHS (should be Qferry School Close). It will impact on the pupils after school activities, where as Hawarden is within walking distance to Queensferry school. CQHS is ticking along nicely, my son is happy there, why try to mess with a school that is doing well as it is. A post 16 hub is a good idea. I know pupils hate having to go to different places +16. That is why my son will go to Deeside College in 2015 when he is +16. Not to be bussed to other schools to follow A Levels
65. I strongly disagree as there is nothing wrong with the building as it is.
66. Transport for 6th form to Connah's Quay would be a problem. Mixing people from JSHS and CQ would be a bad idea. There is a lot of rivalry between both schools, it wouldn't go down well at all.
67. Holding a 6th form at Connah's Quay would seem pointless as Connah's Quay High School is so close to the college 6th form students may as well just go to Deeside College.
68. Connah's Quay High School is a very successful school and it is also part of a very successful Post 16 6th Form consortium. It is also located next door to Deeside College; therefore, the post 16 hub is not needed. John Summers High School is undersubscribed, this will not change just because it has a new building.
69. Might as well just send us all to the college, not enough money to replace the school.

70. Getting rid of our sixth form would mean it would be harder to get to sixth form in CQ.
71. The cost to the tax payer
72. I would like to see this happen but understand that in the current climate the funds that would be required are not available.
73. It would be very nice to have a brand new high school over on the site. I think this option would just work out far to expensive.
74. Cost would be too much in this current climate.
75. John Summers is in an ideal position for the Deeside area.
76. Think the council will have a lack of funding to do this.
77. Although it would be very nice to have a brand new school, I think it would be too expensive of an option.
78. It will not fill the surplus places that they have now. It will be too expensive for the council to 25 million.
79. Unable to see this option being viable at this time. With the economy as it is.
80. This is an ideal option, when there is plenty of money in the pot. Surely a replacement would boost pupil ratio.
81. This is an ideal option, when there is plenty of money in the pot. Surely a replacement would boost pupil ratio.
82. This would be expensive to be rebuild a whole school.
83. the building is in need of repair
84. Too expensive to rebuild whole school, would cost more than save.
85. Does not meet criteria of saving money.
86. School is badly in need of a revamp, I understand this is a very expensive option but a new school would attract more pupils from more parents who would otherwise send their children to other schools, giving the numbers needed to sustain the school. Also could the 3-16 facility be used in this option? GENERAL OBSERVATION It seems inevitable to me that there will be job losses what ever option we choose, I have chosen the options which I think will lead to the least jobs losses.
87. Building a new school will not change the fact that the school has less than 600 pupils. A waste of money. Will not be an 'effective use of resources'.
88. A lot of money will be wasted with this.
89. From local knowledge very few parents are happy to send their children to John Summers High School so to spend so much money replacing it when there's no guarantee it will work is a sheer waste of resources.
90. Cost/Economics. John Summers numbers are ridiculously small. Connah's Quay HS should not even be in this 'plan'.
91. Modernisation
92. I DO NOT THINK IT REQUIRES A WHOLE NEW BUILDING
93. Connah's Quay is fine as it is - no need to change.

#### **New responses received since 26/03/12.**

94. Would be a financially ambiguous option!
95. John summers high school offers its pupils a small, safe and friendly learning atmosphere, where teachers know the names of 90% of all pupils within the school. They offer great support for children that need extra help to achieve their full potential. My daughter is a quiet ,well behaved pupil ,who I feel would be lost in the crowd in a large school like Connah's s Quay ,and not encouraged to reach her full potential thus it would be deplorable to her education.
96. The issue of the post -16 hub does not seem to be fully planned. How will it be staffed? What will the role of the consortium be? How will learners education come first.
97. Cost of replacement of John Summers does not meet the Counties guidelines.
98. Does not address cost and surplus places.
99. As a teacher at Connah's Quay high school, it would be inappropriate of me to comment on the future of John Summers High School
100. Tend to disagree with this option as it would be more money being used up and I'm sure a remodel would do the job adequately.
101. I am opposing the Post-16-Hub being built in Connah's Quay. I do not see why Connah's Quay has to have the monopoly on Post-16 education. The Town already

has this facility provided by Deeside College whilst Shotton, Queensferry and Garden City are all being left without the facility and as such a fair and equal opportunity to be able to educate their young people past 16 years old, depriving them of a fair and equal opportunity to better themselves.

102. I strongly disagree with the amalgamation process as this is just going to cause stress confusion worry for parents and children involved as many people do know that quay high an john summers high DO NOT GET ON with one another ....
103. In my view I think this would not be a cost effective option.
104. MY PREVIOUS COMMENTS DISAPPEARED AND SUBMITTED INCOMPLETE, PLEASE TAKE NOTE, I WANT MY OPINIONS TO COUNT. What a waste of money, the savings will be where exactly. How can you put more money into building a new school on the John Summer's site when it is still undersubscribed? Ridiculous!!!! Only positive comment is building a Post 16 Hub at Connah's Quay. A must, this is the opportunity to make Flintshire shine and link to the excellent work from Connah's Quay High and Deeside College. Leave everything else alone just build the HUB.
105. John Summers is under occupied now, why would you throw more money at this school when numbers are low. I strongly agree with building a Post 16 hub at Connah's Quay high school though, this is a must. Do not replace John Summers with a new school building, waste of public money and WILL NOT result in any savings at all. Cannot believe this has been put as an option.
106. This is a very expensive option that can possibly result in a reduction of surplus places if the new school is built to accommodate the current/projected numbers of learners (i.e. something around 400). However it does not address the issue that there will still not be enough learners in the school to make it a viable secondary school. As stated in FCC documentation for a high school to be viable there needs to be 600 or more learners. I would argue that even this number is insufficient if a school is to be able to provide an appropriate curriculum in line with the WG Learning and Skills Measure. I believe that elected members have either not been sufficiently briefed or do not fully understand the important learning and teaching elements that need to be considered in this review. It appears that it is more about making sure that there is a school in Queensferry at all costs even though there is no logical argument for this to be the case

**Q3 If you support Option 1 what do you think would be needed to make it work? What local issues would need to be considered?**

1. Apart from the obvious costs involved surely the existing learners would need to be re-housed while the new school was built? Where would this be? If they continue attending on the same site this could be potentially dangerous and disruptive.
2. It would need money, and the will of the Council (it already has the will of the people locally.) The issue of no sixth form would have to be considered, but plans for this to happen in Connah's Quay would seem to be well in hand. This option would definitely work, because it does already.

**Responses received since 05/03/12.**

3. To incorporate any money saving eco ideas (e.g. solar panels/heating etc) would need to be embraced by the local public.
4. Funding from WG and housing development. If it's not done now it never will be. Now is the chance.
5. Adequate resource. Disruption to the existing site during the rebuild.
6. Enough capital to do the job properly. Would need to consider disruption on the site, disruption to primary school and most importantly, the disruption to pupils being 're-housed' as work goes ahead.
7. You would only need one governing body. There will be a higher intake due to new developments and higher intake through primary schools.
8. Financial support from county/WAG, parental support. More places for increased pupil numbers from new housing development.

9. Where would lessons be taught etc while the new building was being constructed? Logistics of rebuilding would therefore have to be considered.
10. New pupils moving to the area. Particularly in the context of the Northern Gateway Project. Potential new home buyers would expect a decent modern school for their children.
11. Financial support. Local councillors opening their eyes to local needs. If possible I would rather keep the consortium post 16 as it is too.
12. Have a new school for what in the near future will be a growing population.
13. Financial input is up to date or upgrade the building.
14. Higher intake from new developments therefore need to accommodate - new build.
15. A vast amount of money would have to be made available from Welsh Government.
16. There is considerably high deprivation rate in this area, so our students deserve and need a supportive new environment that will help them achieve their goals.
17. Sixth form - as pupils to stay in full time education until 18 - the only way to monitor would be via a school.
18. Loss of post 16 education within the community is a disappointing blow.
19. The issues of providing ongoing education whilst rebuilding would have to be addressed. Should be possible to do this with out too much disruption utilising the existing facilities.
20. Would need funding for rebuilding. Would prove to be good value for money over time.
21. Local issues would include the increase in the birth rate in the area and the new housing development nearby which will provide not only houses but jobs for people in years to come.

#### **New responses received since 09/03/12**

22. Due to the number of surplus places this option could be developed without too much disruption to the existing school.
23. n/a
24. The building needs additional work done to smarten it up, they need to give the school more resources to promote them selves better and to up their reputation.
25. A lot of funding would be required and this is not in the budget of the Welsh Government or the local authority.
26. To make this option work there would have to be a lot of funds available but to think that all the new housing being built in the area should be taken into consideration.
27. Consider the expanding population.
28. Money and commitment to the project
29. The council would have to work with the staff and pupils too see what their views of how many they want their school to be.
30. This would mean no job losses and no pupil disruption. No extra traffic would be created.
31. This would mean no job losses and no pupil disruption. No extra traffic would be created.
32. Use local businesses to do the work, better road system for entrance and exit to the school.

#### **New responses received since 26/03/12**

33. Cost and housing of pupils during rebuilding. Further explanation of post-16 provision is required.
34. The Post-16-Hub being located at the Shotton/Queensferry/Garden City end of Deeside, the land is available at the moment where the old RAF housing/ buildings have been knocked down recently.

## **OPTION 2 - Remodel John Summers High School (11-16 school and Post 16 hub at Connah's Quay High School).**

### **Q4 How strongly do you agree or disagree with OPTION 2 (please tick ONE box only)**

Strongly Agree	=	15	7.6%
Tend to Agree	=	37	18.8%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	=	33	16.8%
Tend to Disagree	=	23	11.7%
Strongly Disagree	=	72	36.5%

### **Q5 To help us understand why people agree or disagree with OPTION 2 please provide a short summary of your reasoning (250 words maximum)**

1. Still far too much outlay for the council
2. Views are very similar to that of Option 1 but as the costs are significantly reduced, in the short term this would appear a better option. I'm assuming that it could be a phased development and therefore less disruptive to current learners? However, would we be back to square one in a few years time therefore costing the tax payers more in the long run than if we just bear the costs of a new build now?
3. It is my opinion that this would be the best option from those available as it gives the least disruption and upset to staff, pupils and families. It makes good use of the existing facilities and lessens the worry about the extra traffic that would be needed to transport all children to and from Shotton to Connah's Quay on a daily basis, using roads that can barely cope with the existing traffic.
4. I appreciate that John Summers is more central for the areas around Deeside but my year 8 daughter really enjoys going to Connah's Quay High School, has a wide group of friends and has never had any trouble whilst she has been there. Not only am I concerned about the disruption this will have to her education and whether or not she will be placed with friends in classes, as a working family, it puts more pressure on the travelling to and from school. The traffic issues through Shotton has always been horrendous so to put a school on this stretch of road for the number of pupils you are suggesting attend does not bear thinking about.
5. Again, not my preferred option, but another which retains 11-16 education in Queensferry - reasons for tending to agree are same as for Option 1. I cannot reiterate too strongly that these children need to stay in their own area. They will be disrupted and upset transferring to a bigger school in Connah's Quay after only two or three years.

### **Responses received since 05/03/12.**

6. Is this solution imaginative enough?
7. Does not receive any funding from WG. We need a new school.
8. This is not quite as attractive as option 1 and would probably cost just as much money. It would enable the school to make adjustments for disabled access and possibly improve sports/science facilities.
9. Feel that unless remodel was done extremely well it could end up as any money available being swallowed up with a disappoint outcome.
10. Does not address any of the current issues that this school requires to be a 21st century school. It will just result in more surplus places.
11. JS needs to be upgraded to become a school fit for purpose. Simple remodelling is not enough.
12. Remodel would improve the school initially but replacing JSHS would provide long term efficiency, raise standards and continue to improve results. Raise moral of the local community.
13. Remodelling would improve school facilities, however, option 1 (new school building) would be more favourable as it would raise moral of local community, improve standards and results, addresses JSHS building issues.

14. Although option 2 has its benefits, they are 'short term' in comparison with the benefits of option 1, which would be more of an investment in the long term.
15. In the long run, just a remodel could be more expensive than a new school building.
16. If money was available for this option I would feel it wasted if additional funding could not be found to upgrade to option 1 or 3.
17. JSHS is already a working community school where parents attend after school club with their children. The school is a community and to take that away from a deprived area would make the area lack a focus that we provide.
18. As previously stated with a higher intake from a new development the school will need to accommodate. It would make more sense to build a brand new school (and probably be more cost effective).
19. It is not financially feasible for the council to fund this option.
20. Option 1 is too expensive; Option 3 is not suitable for primary school children to be close to secondary school children. They should be kept separated. Therefore feel that this is the best option for John Summers High School.
21. Again how would this address surplus numbers? Do councillors think that learners that live in the local area to John Summers but go to Hawarden will then decide to go to John Summers because of a refurb?
22. The refurbishment of John Summers is a considerable option. There are areas which are in need of improvement. Providing this is done for the benefit of the school, with input from the headmaster and the teaching staff.
23. If funding is available for this option then surely additional funding could be sourced to invest in replacing JSHS? Option would be better if it was 11-18.
24. A modernised building would benefit all.
25. Re-modelling is so much more disruptive and probably quite costly, but at least it recognises the need to maintain a High School in Queensferry.
26. Same reasons of cost to council and public. The school is already doing well in its present building. The council could well spend the money on housing etc as when the pupils leave school and develop into adults they will need to live somewhere.
27. I would like to see the opportunity for change maximised, this option does not do that.
28. 'Fit for Purpose' school. However, we would lose out 6th form which will reduce numbers on roll.
29. This would only work if a full re-furb was to take place.
30. Could be an option, building in place, but appears to be wasting a lot of money.
31. Extensive refurbishment would be required. More economical to rebuild.
32. Similar reasons to option 1 but negative is no new improved facilities (or on a big scale anyway), positive is the fact there would be relative continuity.
33. Same reasons as for Option 1. However, although up front funding would be less, this may cost more in the long run.
34. Although I tend to agree I am concerned that in the long run remodelling the school gradually would cost more than a complete rebuild - especially taking into account the need to make the building disabled friendly.
35. This option would be slightly cheaper than the option suggested within option 1. However, it still does not address the main issues relating to the school modernisation process as this would not decrease the number of surplus places within John Summers High School. John Summers High School does not have a very long life span, therefore it seems pointless to invest a huge amount of money into a school that will likely not exist in the future.
36. John Summers High School has too many surplus places so would be a waste of money. Ian Budd and Tom Davies were unable to make clear who would be teaching in the 6th form hub, and how it would currently affect the people who teach 6th form within the relevant schools. What's the point of a 6th form hub being erected right next door to Deeside College - makes no sense.
37. Remodelling the school will not solve the problem of surplus places - waste of 13 million - again, where has this figure come from?? - again the size of this cost would suggest that this is in fact NOT an option. Ian Budd and Tom Davies were unable to make clear who would be teaching in the 6th form hub, and how it would currently affect the people who teach 6th form within the relevant schools. What's the point of a 6th form hub being erected right next door to Deeside College - makes no sense.
38. As Above.

39. A waste of money if John Summers is to be remodelled a high school. IAN BUD AND TOM DAVIES WERE UNABLE TO MAKE CLEAR WHO WOULD BE TEACHING IN THE 6TH FORM HUB, AND HOW IT WOULD CURRENTLY AFFECT THE PEOPLE WHO TEACH THE 6TH FORM WITHIN THE RELEVANT SCHOOLS. WHAT IS THE POINT OF A HUB ON THE DEESIDE COLLEGE SITE WHEN IT TAKES AWAY THE CHOICE OF LEARNERS TO BE EDUCATED AT THEIR SCHOOL.
40. Although the amount of money needed to remodel John Summers would be less than rebuilding, it would still be far too much and would not address the issues that have brought about this process in the first place. It would not increase the number of learners attending so we would end up paying millions of pounds for a school that will still have more than 25% surplus places and a small 6th form with no indication that this will increase.
41. This does not make sense. There would still be surplus places and the cost is far too high with absolutely no benefit.
42. What comes into 'remodelling' the school? What is involved in this and how would it increase numbers of students and decrease surplus? Again, what is the real situation

#### **New responses since 09/03/12**

43. This also is unsustainable. It will not address the issue of surplus places at John Summers High School
44. Expensive for council tax payers.
45. Again this will not help with the surplus places in the school and the money being spent could be spent more wisely
46. There are too many children to put into one school. There will be rivalry between the two schools.
47. Cheapest option.
48. Similar to option 1 but might be easier and more cost effective to knock down and rebuild rather than play around with existing building.
49. Provide school suitable for learners within that area of Deeside.
50. Seems a reasonable option although bearing a cost should be the least disruptive.
51. More expense again - and John Summers is not a sustainable school for 21st Century Life Long Learning. The closure of J.S is the only option.
52. Willing to listen to suggestions for a post 16 hub at CQHS but have major concerns about it. Transport is a major issue with the traffic problems between Connah's Quay and Shotton. Concerns about the impact on 11-16 at CQHS if post 16 hub based there.
53. Again its a cost cutting exercise to spend on a building that is "not sustainable for the 21st century" Where is the money coming from?
54. Would this affect pupils at Connah's Quay High School?
55. Our school is fine as it is no changes are needed since I moved here in year 7 our school has improved amazingly.
56. Remodelling is a good idea, but same reason as above.
57. This option is the same as option 1 with less being done to the school. It poses the same problems for 6th form students and wouldn't really save anything.
58. Connah's Quay High School is a very successful school and it is also part of a very successful Post 16 6th Form consortium. It is also located next door to Deeside College; therefore, the post 16 hub is not needed. John Summers High School is undersubscribed, this will not change just because it has been remodelled.
59. Might as well send all sixth form students to college as its right next to Connah's Quay High School.
60. The refurbishment would be very good for JSHS as it is needed in some areas of the school although the merge with CQ sixth form is not food due to transport and near environments.
61. As above
62. Think this could be a far more achievable option. Both in time limits and cost.
63. There would be far too many pupils attending one school. The reason we chose JSHS because it was a small school and we do not want our three children to travel

- to Connah's Quay everyday they currently walk to school. If I want my children to attend Connah's Quay High School, I would have sent to there.
64. Think this could be an option with good funding. It would save us joining CQHS.
  65. I think the pupils, staff and other members of the community will benefit more if the school was remodelled and certain areas brought up to a higher standard.
  66. Still won't fill surplus places and if you are going to the expense of a refurbishment you might as well build a new building.
  67. I understand this option needs numbers of pupils to increase. Surely a remodel, would like option 1 encourages more pupils.
  68. I understand this option needs numbers of pupils to increase. Surely a remodel, would like option 1 encourage more pupils.
  69. This would mean that the school would only be patched up and not sustainable into 21st century life long learning.
  70. the building is in need of repair
  71. John Summers would not be fit to go forward in the 21st century with what amounts to a 'Patch up job'.
  72. Does not meet criteria of saving money.
  73. Possibly a better option than option 1, less disruption involved. Why not 3-16 option as well?
  74. Again, remodelling will improve the school but not address the fact that less than 600 pupils attend the school.
  75. Post 16 hub is ok idea. How much will this remodelling cost? Will it improve the school for a long term period?
  76. What would this achieve? other schools in the area need refurbishment etc so what makes this school so special!
  77. Connah's Quay is not affected so unsure why this would improve our school

#### **New responses received since 26/03/12.**

78. I feel it would be fruitless to spend money on a school that should be ploughing existing energies into campaigns that encourage future learners through the door by better advertising, moral boosters.
79. by 16 my daughter would have the option of going to college to continue her education ,so not affected by this change .
80. Again how does this serve to reduce cost and surplus places?
81. Does not address cost and surplus places.
82. Option is too short term and would still require further work or rebuilding in the near future. This is only a temporary solution. This does not address the number of surplus places at John Summers High School at the 11-16 age groups. Further explanation of post-16 provision is required.
83. This would be a better option than to totally rebuild in my view.
84. I am opposing the Post-16-Hub being built in Connah's Quay. I do not see why Connah's Quay has to have the monopoly on Post-16 education. The Town already has this facility provided by Deeside College whilst Shotton, Queensferry and Garden City are all being left without the facility and as such a fair and equal opportunity to be able to educate their young people past 16 years old, depriving them of a fair and equal opportunity to better themselves.
85. What is the difference between remodel and replace in this instance.
86. Again, I cannot see how this would be cost effective.
87. How does this option help with the undersubscribed No in John Summer's? Where is Hawarden High in this, St David's Saltney? If there is any movement of John Summers pupils it should be to these schools not Connah's Quay High. Yes to Post-Hub at Connah's Quay High.
88. Similar to option 1 above. It is obviously a cheaper option, but the viability argument is the same.



**Q6 If you support Option 2 what do you think would be needed to make it work? What local issues would need to be considered?**

1. Similar to Option 1 taking above concerns into account.
2. Locally, I don't see issues. The issues are with the Council and Welsh Government - there seems to be a view that the buildings will not stand modernisation. Having served in the past as a Parent Governor for two terms of office, I know that money has been wisely spent on buildings improvements. The school compares favourably to other schools in Flintshire. This should be brought out in discussions. Nonetheless, in an ideal situation where money could be made available, then of course there should be a re-build.

**Responses received since 05/03/12.**

3. Probably as much money as for option 1. Plans to minimize disruption whilst the remodelling is going on. Health and safety consideration e.g. dust and rubble.
4. Financial support, parental support, more places in school needs to be made available for the new housing development.
5. Financial support from county/WAG. Parental support more places for increased pupil numbers from new housing development.
6. Similar to option 1, logistics of re-modelling would have to be considered.
7. Financial input is up grade the building. The county need to recognise that JSHS is unique in the area. At the present most children can walk to school so if you make it that they have to be bussed to school then financial constraints will present some parents taking them to school (they won't pay the bus fare).
8. You would need to attract the learners that currently attend Hawarden but live closer to John Summers back to the school. If Hawarden is over prescribed why are these learners not going to John Summers?
9. Sixth form - as pupils to stay in full time education until 18 - the only way to monitor would be via a school.
10. I would also be concerned about the disruption to the school and the learning environment while the work took place if it was a gradual process.

**New responses received since 09/03/12**

11. I feel this option in my opinion to resolve the forthcoming situation as due to funding in the current climate, this will save money and be more convenient for both schools in the future if attending Deeside College.
12. Keep costs down. Retain 2 separately run high schools.
13. n/a
14. As above
15. Money and Commitment again.
16. More opportunities for the students, state of the art learning facilities to give them the best chance of receiving a high quality of education.
17. New housing i.e. on RAF Sealand would bump up pupil numbers.
18. New housing i.e. on RAF Sealand would bump up pupil numbers

**New responses received since 26/03/12**

19. The Post-16-Hub being located at the Shotton/Queensferry/Garden City end of Deeside. The land is available at the moment where the old RAF housing/ buildings have been knocked down recently

### **OPTION 3 – Develop 3 - 16 facility at John Summers High School with a post 16 hub at Connah's Quay High School.**

**Q7 How strongly do you agree or disagree with OPTION 3 (please tick ONE box only)**

Strongly Agree	=	80	40.6%
Tend to Agree	=	22	11.2%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	=	19	9.6%
Tend to Disagree	=	13	6.6%
Strongly Disagree	=	56	28.4%

**Q8 To help us understand why people agree or disagree with OPTION 3 please provide a short summary of your reasoning (250 words maximum)**

1. All things considered this appears to be the best option. Something has to be done at John Summers as free capacity of 30 % needs addressing.
2. I don't see the benefit with this option at all. Learners would still favour other schools if the facilities remain outdated and in need of repair so the school would continue to run inefficiently.
3. Remodelling John Summers High School I feel is the way forward for 3-16 or 11-16 the school has been part of the community for a long time and is in need of developing. A post 16 hub at Connah's Quay is a good idea as this is where John Summers High School falls down by only having a small amount of 16+ students (49) this would be money well spent as more and more students are staying in full time education and will encourage more students to do so. This will give limited interruption to the students at an important time in their education Connah's Quay has the space available and good facilities around and in the area.
4. With Queensferry Primary School already located next to John Summers High School I don't see what difference this would make. Except exceed the 600 students for the whole school. Even then I don't think that there would be enough students to fulfil a variety of successful GCSE programmes.
5. Although the age groups would be separated into classes/playgrounds, parents and carers would have no option but to have their younger children listen to the everyday banter that goes on between older children and little ones would soon pick up on words or phrases that they may not normally hear on a day to day basis. Some smaller children or in some cases even some young parents would find it very intimidating or even quite frightening to have no option but to walk by groups of noisy teenagers at regular times every day to take their children to school. Much thought went into the school age groups and they were set up as such for reasons unknown to me but it works, if it works why try to fix it?
6. I appreciate that John Summers is more central for the areas around Deeside but my year 8 daughter really enjoys going to Connah's Quay High School, has a wide group of friends and has never had any trouble whilst she has been there. Not only am I concerned about the disruption this will have to her education and whether or not she will be placed with friends in classes, as a working family, it puts more pressure on the travelling to and from school. The traffic through Shotton has always been horrendous so to put a school on this stretch of road for the number of pupils you are suggesting attend does not bear thinking about.
7. My preferred option. This is to a large extent what we have already on Campus, so it is a natural progression to bring a nursery on site. We can just carry on doing what we are doing and go from strength to strength. Estyn inspectors had an appreciation of the particular nature of the school - how it is integral to the community, and provides support and cohesion. Let us have children from age three, therefore, and innovate by looking after them all the way through in a way which is timely, caring and consistent. Let us have the whole child.

## New responses received since 05/03/12.

8. We need to look at delivery education fit for the 21st century. This option supports value for money, curriculum planning effective management and pupils progression it does away with all the difficulties associated with the transition process.
9. This is an opportunity for Flintshire to truly visionary, to utilise a skilled workforce, excellent management structures and an enhanced curriculum based on a new "Super School" 3-16 facility. A truly community based educational facility. Go for it! This would maintain an iconic presence and facility in Shotton in a part of the community where that presence is needed most and could be seen as a way forward in educational practice. A real Community School. To maintain good practice, this needs to be based around one Head and Governing Body. This would be better served however by a new build. Could this be option 5?
10. All of the elements are already here on John Summer Campus - we just need a suitable base to operate from! JSHS and Campus has excellent educational facilities already in place from the age of two onwards. Tiddlers Playgroup takes children from the age of two+ and is extremely proud of the achievements and governmental reports they have achieved. Since I have also worked in the Primary School (Queensferry) and now in the High School I have seen first hand the importance of continuity, especially in the lives of some children. I believe a new centre of education (3-16) would only improve this, at the very least, by incorporating a new Nursery Centre here on the Campus. There are other excellent classes/facilities and services already on site including a modern fully equipped library, a well equipped Resource centre, mother and baby clinic, health Visitors, Education Support Services, Adult Education Classes, Second Chance skills classes just to name a few - all of them working together in one place for e Community and education advancement of the area. JSHS is a part of this. I believe that it is possible to completely dispel the negativity that has surrounded this school in the past. Teachers, support staff and those here on Campus have worked very hard to produce results with both children and the community. This can only be more beneficial for the area at large. They are results we are all proud. If we had a modern green place to do it in it would make it even better. To sum up an option is to build some kind of super school in another area. Let's not forget that there on this campus we already have it. The infrastructure is already in place, we would not have to 'convince' anyone of the benefits or merits of this, unlike elsewhere. We (the campus) have succeeded with what we have - now we would like a building worthy of that effort and the results achieved.
11. A new idea an interesting idea, quite a revolutionary idea. Would support the local community in a fashion that is desperately needed - a cohesive, inclusive, supportive environment and curriculum from 3-16.
12. This is by far my favoured option. It provides a very exciting possibility for curriculum and educational change. It would alleviate transition difficulties, would allow for vertical, as opposed to horizontal groupings and would offer enormous professional development opportunities for staff in all key stages. One governing body and management team though.
13. This would be an innovative move forward for pupils of the schools and for community as a whole. It would provide ownership to the community and status for the school as new project moving forward.
14. This is innovative and offers exciting prospects to streamline education in the local area. It would give the opportunity to improve transition issues. It would improve primary education by providing specialist knowledge.
15. Established strong community campus. Transition between key stages would be much easier. A continuous provision integrated and planned. Improved facilities for all (particularly 3-5).
16. Provide a future community school for the long term to provide local education of a high standard for all pupils. 3-16 provides consistency of teaching and learning and staff support local to the areas needs. Foundation for further learning post 16 - County suggested that buildings of JSHS was not fit for purpose.
17. To provide community based education at JSHS of a high standard. 3-16 provides staff support to meet areas needs and consistent high standards.

18. Option 3 is an innovative idea, which would have extremely positive implications for the community and the education of pupils in John Summers catchment area. Even better would be to combine option 3 with option 1 or option 2.
19. Works well with what we already have - buildings and staffing wise.
20. This is a fantastic chance to move into the 21st century with a new idea. One School.
21. An innovative approach to delivering education in the 21st century pupil progression, curriculum planning, effective management and value for money.
22. This needs to link with option 1. A combination of option 1 and 3 would be best suited for pupils, staff and other members of the local community. One headteacher and one governing body is the most sensible and effective option to lead this new build/school. Summary: New school building : One governing body : One headteacher : 3-16 and post 16.
23. This would be an innovative approach to teaching and learning. It would enable the site to remain open for existing and future pupils. It would not cause disruption or upheaval for what is an area of disadvantage.
24. John Summers' numbers would drop even lower if the school did not offer sixth form and a post 16 hub in Connah's Quay was built. Surely there would still be surplus places even if it became a 3-16 facility. Also with sixth form provision being moved to a different site this would have a knock on effect for all sixth forms in the area and schools such as St David's and Flint High already having a large number of surplus places would have buildings too big due to sixth form being relocated. Also learners want to stay in their high schools for sixth form otherwise they would have chosen to go to Deeside College.
25. This option of adding nursery places to the primary school is one option to consider. This would provide the younger children with a continuity of education, this could also help the parents who have nursery age and primary age children in school.
26. This option is exciting and innovative. It will provide an education fit for the 21st century that supports pupil progression and effective curriculum planning. This option provides continuity and cohesive curriculum that will suit local children. This option would be even better if it was tailored to 3-18 years.
27. It is an innovative approach to delivering education fit for the 21st century. It supports pupil progression, curriculum planning, effective management and value for money. Minimum disruption for learners. Develop 3-18 for the whole education system in one place.
28. 3-18 would be the best option and in a new school building to accommodate increase in pupil numbers from Northern Gateway Project. Current JSHS has made excellent progress and with further investment in young people, would help with raising levels of aspiration and investment by Industry in the community.
29. As the area is already struggling in many ways it would be good to see an influx of new buildings to give everyone a sense of pride. It would be a good for a family to be able to have their child in the one building at the beginning of their child's education and see it through to the end.
30. This option would be the most effective way of improving John Summers and offering parents and children a whole of life in just one school, giving both the learning and security from 3 to 16 under one roof.
31. This would be the best option save a rebuild.
32. It would seem to be the most economical thing to do.
33. It encourages a more rounded and developed curriculum across all key stages. Enables very exciting/undaunting transitions, also plenty of room for prof.development.
34. I strongly agree with option 3 as this is my preferred option.
35. An innovative approach to deliver education which is fit for the 21st century. Eliminates any issues with transition from primary to secondary school.
36. I consider this as the best option.
37. I think this option is the best way forward for the school.
38. This is the only option I feel is suitable for teaching staff and pupils of John Summers High School.
39. To support the local community and as least disruption to the children and parents. A 'one site suits all' would be perfect for 3-16 yrs.
40. I think that this is the best option.

41. This is an innovative approach which supports pupils progression, curriculum planning and value for money.
42. This is the obvious option but should just have one headteacher and one governing body but would benefit from a new build, perhaps this could be option 5.
43. Facilities already on site.
44. This situation almost exists already. The campus has a playgroup for 2.5 yr olds, a primary school, high school, education support centre, community centre and resource centre.
45. This is the best option although the post 16 hub at CQ is a negative for me.
46. It would be an innovative option, forward looking having a school that begins at nursery age and goes through to GCSE (16). We already have the primary school, secondary school, library and adult learning centre on the same site and this would be a natural progression. Would be an asset to the community of Queensferry and would be even more effective if combined with option 1 or 2.
47. A 3-16 facility would allow learners a complete and stable transition from one school stage to another. The pupils would also be more familiar with their environments, reducing the apprehensions involved in moving to 'big school'.
48. I think developing a 3-16 facility is a very modern streamlined approach to education in line with other countries. The children's wellbeing should be first and foremost over and above any cost saving implications.
49. Develop a 3-18 facility. To enhance transition between key stages. To ensure local pupils have access to a wide range of educational and community first facilities. One headteacher, one governing body. Minimum disruption to learning and ensure progression.
50. A simple 3-16 school with 1 governing body and 1 head would be both educationally and financially beneficial, and this option also solves post 16 concerns. Educationally innovative with many benefits.
51. This still does not solve the problem of surplus places and John Summers school building has a very short life span. This is probably the cheapest option of the four but still does not address any of the problems which have brought about this process.
52. This still does not solve the problem of surplus places and John Summers school building has a very short life span. This is probably the cheapest option of the four but still does not address any of the problems which have brought about this process. Ian Budd and Tom Davies were unable to make clear who would be teaching in the 6th form hub, and how it would currently affect the people who teach 6th form within the relevant schools. What is the point of a 6th form hub being erected right next door to Deeside college - makes no sense.
53. This still does not solve the problem of surplus places and John Summers school building still has a very short life span. This is probably the cheapest option of the four but still does not address any of the problems which have brought about this process. Ian Budd and Tom Davies were unable to make clear who would be teaching in the 6th form hub, and how it would currently affect the people who teach 6th form within the relevant schools. What's the point of a 6th form hub being erected right next door to Deeside College - makes no sense.
54. This still does not solve the problem of surplus places and John Summers school building has a very short life span. This is probably the cheapest option but still does not address any of the problems which have brought about this process.
55. This still does not solve the problem of surplus places and John Summers school building has a very short life span. This is probably the cheapest option of the four but it still does not address any of the problems which have brought about this process. IAN BUDD AND TOM DAVIES WERE UNABLE TO MAKE CLEAR WHO WOULD BE TEACHING IN THE 6TH FORM HUB, AND HOW IT WOULD CURRENTLY AFFECT THE PEOPLE WHO TEACH THE 6TH FORM WITHIN THE RELEVANT SCHOOLS. WHAT IS THE POINT OF A HUB ON THE DEESIDE COLLEGE SIGHT WHEN IT TAKES AWAY THE CHOICE OF LEARNERS TO BE EDUCATED AT THEIR SCHOOL.
56. This still does not solve the problem of surplus places and John Summers school building has a very short life span. This is probably the cheapest option of the four but still does not address any of the problems which have brought about this process.

57. This does not address the problem that John Summers High School has a short life span, and that money would have to be spent continuously on the building. Surely it is better to close John Summers High School and send the pupils to their nearest secondary school.
58. I do not know if this would work due to not understanding whether the '600 learners attending' is just across ks3/4 or would it be across the school? Even so the financial situation of extending to a primary school seems illogical when there are many primary schools in the Flintshire area for learners to attend. Again, what is the situation with the CQHS sixth form? This still does not solve the issues that have been raised.

#### **New responses received since 09/03/12**

59. This is a possibility but thought would need to be considered about how this would work. The proposal in the booklet does not appear to have been thought through fully.
60. I don't understand why Queensferry CP isn't like most other primary schools in having a nursery. I think all primary schools should have nursery provision. Is Hawarden High oversubscribed? maybe some pupils i.e. Sandycroft should fee to John Summers to balance numbers.
61. I don't know how this will affect the younger age group as my younger child goes to Custom House school.
62. This is an insight why I do not agree to amalgamation between the two schools. I won a case in the appeals courts many years ago as the pass rates at C.Quay and John Summers was abysmal, the A/C pass rates were dreadful and they agreed. Hence I won my case for my two older children to go to Mold Alun. The A/C pass rates now at C.Quay High school are very good and now my son attends C.Quay high school. As from Sept 2011 he is in all top sets and a change for him and other pupils could be very detrimental. Keep it as it is as there could be a downward spiral. Bring back for parents evening that you should see each of your child's teachers individually for feedback on how well your child is doing, not on the say so of the tutor presenting a piece of paper indicating targets and behaviour.
63. If there has to be a choice, I would pick this one up. Although I would prefer the two schools to be separate.
64. This would alone not address the surplus places unless the school is down sized or another local school is closed and brought into JSHS.
65. Unnecessary cost.
66. Good idea, closing primary school, everyone in the same area.
67. Don't believe viable due to complex needs of both ages.
68. Again a reasonable solution.
69. Not cost effective as this school is not sustainable for 21st Century Life Long Learning.
70. I did not send my elder children to John summers due to its reputation and the heads attitude towards complaints made against pupils! They are always smoking and swearing when I go to pick up my children from Queensferry cp & will not move for people to pass! You can't complain as Mr. Rashud is unapproachable!! My 4 sons have all attended Queensferry cp but I feel so strongly against this that if it goes ahead I will find an alternative school for my one year old daughter, & move my 2 younger children if it occurs before they leave Queensferry! I put my older sons in Hawarden so they were not part of John summers so will therefore not support this option!
71. Willing to listen to suggestions for a post 16 hub at CQHS but have major concerns about it. Transport is a major issue with the traffic problems between Connah's Quay and Shotton. Concerns about the impact on 11-16 at CQHS if post 16 hub based there.
72. The building is in need of repair and modernisation -for inclusion. This is obviously at a substantial cost, from where? Will it then last or will we be facing the same problem in a few years time. Closure of a school is inevitable I feel. If Johns Summers needs major work or even a rebuild- why are we considering it? Not cost effective. I understand the implications that it has for the community, students and teachers. It's

a hard decision one where we have to be open minded - but we all know it comes down to money at the end of the day. Do we have enough in the pot to comprehend options 1-3.

73. Would this affect pupils at Connah's Quay High School?
74. I strongly agree about this because everyone will have a wide variety of facilities such as leisure centre and library.
75. Would be better 3-18 and to keep JSHS sixth form.
76. This would be the best option for John Summers High School and also ease the transition between Primary School and High Schools. However, I feel that the best option would be to make it a 3-18 school as the hub in Connah's Quay is pointless being next to Deeside College.
77. This may increase the numbers in John Summers High School and make the building more cost effective. Again, the post 16 hub would need clarity - is it part of Connah's Quay High School? Is it just on the same site but independent? Who will staff it? What will happen to the consortium provision already provided by Flintshire schools in the area?
78. I think that option three would be the best for John Summers high school, however, I think it would be more appropriate if it was 3-18 years. This option would ease the transition from primary to secondary education.
79. The idea would be good if it was from 3-18 instead of 16.
80. The best outcome for John Summers. It would be the least changed. John Summers doesn't need to change as their recent report was 'excellent'. The state of the building isn't affecting the learning and pass rates.
81. Because there's nothing wrong with this school!
82. Seemed to be the preferred option for people affected in this area
83. There will be one head teacher and one governing body for the schools. It would be easier for the children to be in one school.
84. 1 headteacher and governing body for all key stages. Community would still have access to campus.
85. There will be one headteacher for all key stages and also one governing body.
86. There would be 1 headteacher and 1 governing body for all key stages.
87. This is the option I see working best. John Summers High School has turned a corner and replaced its poor reputation with a good one. This has been done thanks to the hard work of all the staff and governing body, especially that of the headmaster Mr Rashud. I do not feel that enough support is shown for this achievement by the LEA, would like to be proved wrong with this point, with John Summers being allowed to grow as a school. I have 2 children attending this school year 7 and 9. The school I believe can grow as a 3-16 facility and become not only one of the best schools in the area but one of the best schools in Wales and one to be proud of by everybody associated with it. Hopefully this option will be the one that is chosen and with the backing of all staff, parents and the LEA the school will go on to achieve its full potential.
88. This could be the best option for the school to bring it right into the 21st century and carry it on for many years into the future. Also it is a proven way to go forwards in many European countries.
89. There are plenty of good primary schools in the area, no need to have another.
90. John Summers HS has now got a good reputation and has come a long way in recent years.
91. Think this is the best option
92. It would bring Queensferry/Shotton into the 21st century with education. It would be a centre for the children. Great idea.
93. I think this option will work as the facilities are already in place, and the money could be spend on improving the areas of the schools that need it rather than losing a valuable part of a community. Also it makes it easier for the children to move through the stages.
94. This option would be a brilliant opportunity for Flintshire to be apart of the modern educating system, causing
95. 1 headteacher of the schools and 1 governing body for all key stages.
96. This option would be a brilliant opportunity for Flintshire to be apart of the modern educating system, causing the least disruption to all pupils and staff.

97. The buildings would not be suitable and therefore the reason is it would be patched up and not sustainable into 21st century life long learning.
98. I agree to this because it's a similar set up to how it is now. Which will be the least disruption to the children.
99. Much better use of existing buildings.
100. This would be a costly venture for the L.A. and would not actually solve any problems. There is already a primary school onsite & the deficit would remain.
101. Developing a 3-16 facility is a very strong reason to support Op. 3. Relatively low cost. Maintain QF Campus.
102. Does not meet criteria of saving money.
103. Seems to be the obvious choice, would go along with this option if people were not going to lose their jobs. Would the school get a make-over
104. This is the best option out of the 4 for now. It will give the school an opportunity to focus an education from 3-16. However, the building is not 'fit for purpose' and will therefore trigger a review in a year or so anyway. This option needs funding. The building does not even have proper wheelchair access!!
105. Building life is unlimited. Will this cause further disruption in next few years?
106. Best way forward for John Summers High School we need good quality school in this area.
107. I feel that this would be the best option for the school as with options 1 and 2 there is insufficient funds to either rebuild or remodel the school and this option is the way forward for John Summers.
108. Connah's Quay High is proven to be one of the best in Flintshire. Staff and pupils have worked hard to achieve this so why jeopardise it! If I wanted my children to attend a school in Queensferry then I would have sent them there in the first place.
109. The only good thing from option 1-3 is the new build of a sixth form. This would provide a central building for the youngsters of Deeside. That makes sense.
110. THE FACILITIES AT JOHN SUMMERS SEEM TO MAKE THIS THE EASIEST, CHEAPEST AND SAFEST OPTION FOR EVERYONE INVOLVED
111. No need to include Connah's Quay High - affects John Summers and Hawarden High School.
112. There would be one head teacher and one governing body for all key stages.

**New responses received since 26/03/12.**

113. Would boost numbers of learners therefore providing eligible funding.
114. If it kept John Summers school separate from Connah's Quay I would not mind this option. Already has a Junior school on the campus, so I don't think adding an infant school would change it too much. Think this option would make life easier for parents who have children of different ages.
115. This does not address the issue - saving money.
116. I would only agree with this option if Connah's Quay High School remained an independent school and the post 16 hub at Connah's Quay High School was run by Connah's Quay High School Staff
117. I would only agree with this option if Connah's Quay High School remained an independent school and the post 16 hub at Connah's Quay High School was run by Connah's Quay High School Staff
118. Does not address surplus places and cost.
119. Does not address cost and surplus places.
120. Which primary schools would be affected? Further explanation of post-16 provision is required.
121. This would be a totally inappropriate action to take, as we already have a perfectly working, caring, welcoming nursery called The Croft Nursery in Aston. This nursery is fantastic, parents past and present highly rate this school. The staff work amazingly with the children and it seems crazy to even consider closing such a thriving institution. My boy attended this nursery in 2007 and now my little girl has just started last week, I don't know anybody who has a bad word to say about The Croft. It goes without saying, the loss of the staff's jobs will be lost also - SO FOR THAT REASON PLEASE SAVE THE CROFT NURSERY!



122. This is the best plan as the facility already operates; this plan would just make it formal. Although I think a remodel of the John Summers School building should still be an option here. I am opposing the Post-16-Hub being built in Connah's Quay. I do not see why Connah's Quay has to have the monopoly on Post-16 education. The Town already has this facility provided by Deeside College whilst Shotton, Queensferry and Garden City are all being left without the facility and as such a fair and equal opportunity to be able to educate their young people past 16 years old, depriving them of a fair and equal opportunity to better themselves.
123. I really am shocked to the core hearing that the much loved croft nursery school will be closed due to the amalgamation process of putting a nursery at the Queensferry campus the croft is the only nursery school round the area that has been running for many yrs has helped prepare thousands of children for school and has given all our kids the VERY BEST START TO SCHOOL LIFE.I SAY SAVE THE CROFT FULL STOP !!!!
124. In my view this is probably the most cost effective option, and the one of most benefit to learners.
125. Well once again I have looked into the advantages of this and the money saving possibilities, my opinion there aren't any.
126. This still does not lead to a viable school in terms of numbers in particular year groups/key stages. It seems to be yet another desperate attempt to keep a school open when all logic and rational decision making would lead to this being dismissed as an option. I know that schools of this nature can bring some benefits in terms of continuity of learning, but the population is simply not big enough to make it work. The reference to the Northern Gateway that is often made is again a desperate attempt to justify this and other options. The numbers associated with this do not stack up to make this or any of the other option viable. There would have to be some sort of astonishing economic up turn both locally and globally if the top end projections are to become a reality, and even then the overall numbers are not sufficient to lead to a viable school.

**Q9 If you support Option 3 what do you think would be needed to make it work? What local issues would need to be considered?**

1. Ideally, a rebuild would be wonderful. Failing that, a re-model. So, this is bringing in options 1 or 2 in addition. Failing both those, it would still be possible. The people of Sealand would need re-assurance that this would not pose a threat to Sealand C.P.

**Responses received since 05/03/12.**

2. It would only work with a 'single governing body', 'one head'. This option is meaningless without these. This also maximizes staff effectiveness, so crucial within education.
3. I have answered that I think in the paragraph above
4. A newly build 3-16 school would really kick start the project and give it purpose. However two governing bodies and two headteachers would not work if it is to cohesive between key stages.
5. Little in terms of financial input. However it may necessitate the closure of the Croft Nursery and the provision of nursing facilities at Queensferry CP and St.Ethelwold's CA primary school, negligible cost I should think.
6. Possible problems with transition would be averted as there would be no movement for pupils across different sites. Parents/carer would be served better by one site. Would be good if some refurbishment/remodel could be part of this option.
7. You would need only one head and one governing body. To rebuild and produce a new and innovative school.
8. Refurbishment/rebuild of John Summers. Rebuild/extend age 3-5 provision at Queensferry CP.
9. Support of feeder schools and staff, financial support. More places need to be made available for the new housing development - investment in the future.

10. Support from Queensferry primary school financial support from county/WAG more places for increased pupil numbers from new housing development.
11. To make it possible, and to save money, 3-16 facility would have one headteacher and one governing body. Better management/even better pupil/teacher relationship.
12. I would even promote a 3-18 facility. Careful consideration of teachers pay and conditions would be necessary.
13. An area that has continually been deprived of jobs, development and investment now has a chance to save a hub of the community and invest for the future.
14. Single governing body and one management structure maximises staff effectiveness.
15. An acceptable financial contribution from the local council. One management structure and one governing body.
16. Even with proposed developments such as the northern link projections do not see a huge increase in pupil numbers. To make this option work you need more pupils wanting to go to John Summers.
17. For this option to work effectively there must be only one governing body and one headmaster. The Northern Gateway Project should be considered.
18. One headteacher and one governing body to oversee the school. Adapting the buildings to be fit for the purpose via a rebuild.
19. Construct new nursery on site. Provided childcare provision.
20. The building appears to be adequate at present, catering for pupils from ages 3-16 years would mean no interruption in their education and would enhance the school's position as an integral part of the community. Where it already promotes opportunity and respect.
21. Making the school the hub of the community, easier access, refurbishments of rooms, and public areas, enhancing of sports facilities.
22. In order to enhance this some building adjustment/refurbishment would help in pushing new boundaries.
23. Consideration needs to be taken with the new affordable housing planned and to accommodate the local community in a local school. It would have a massive detrimental effect on our community as 'bussing' to and from school would be both costly and impractical.
24. Smoother transition. Total school cohesion.
25. Even more effective transition liaison. Bear in mind large new housing development locally. Less disruption between yr 6 and yr 7 for pupils.
26. Forward thinking. There would also need to be expansion to existing facilities but this would be offset by not having to run a separate nursery building.
27. I feel that for the facility to be complete it would require one, rather than two headteachers and governing body so that it became more cohesive rather than remaining as two separate entities.
28. Decisions should be made jointly with staff and the head at John Summers. Consideration should be made to current housing plans especially given that many more children locally may need school places at John Summers and emphasis should be placed on current Estyn reports.
29. Investment or some refurbishment of school facilities would be needed to ensure that learners have access to 21st century facilities. Local economy/jobs. Sixth form would offer local pupils the opportunity to stay in post 16 education, in an environment in which they are familiar.
30. Refurbishment of JSHS, 2. One Governing body, 3. Senior management team.

#### **New responses received since 09/03/12**

31. I think having a post 16 hub on one site is a good idea but wonder how this will fit in with 'A' level provision at Deeside College. The provision of 'A' levels across 4 sites as the consortium doesn't work well and puts pupils off applying due to bus journeys.
32. n/a
33. Sixth form should be kept in the consortium.
34. JSHS definitely needs a sixth form, because there is a great relationship between teachers and pupils. Subjects are taught in a familiar environment, which keeps pupils on track with peers and work.

35. Changing the plan from 3-16 to 3-18 as this would be the best option for the school and its pupils. This would cost less than building a 6th form hub and cost students less time and money due to travel.
36. Make it a 3-18, would be cheaper and wouldn't involve so much travelling and money towards transport.
37. JSHS would need a refurb for this whole 3-18 idea, with out our sixth form it would be a major loss to our community and make a lot more problems for students to get to school.
38. Having the funding for the post 16 hub. Also transport issues to and from the hub for further away schools. And the whole point of sixth form is to stay with the environment they are used to. Might as well go to the college if this was to happen.
39. Disability stuff new windows and leaking.
40. Community support, money to invest. The community would still have access to the campus. Also we would like to keep the sixth form at John Summers.
41. Community support needed, remodel school. Post 16hub is pointless, might as well go to college. Need the sixth form attached to school.
42. Community support, remodel the school also. We would have consider our sixth form as a sixth form student consortium as well established and it would effect the schools potential grades.
43. Community support remodel the school, +16 hub will be a bloody shambles. It removes the purpose of 6th form. Also transport will be a right kerfuffle.
44. Funding as always is a big issue that needs to be addressed. It is important that the school gets full support.
45. Extra funding.
46. In my view it would only work under one head, one governing body (too many chiefs and all that!)
47. Upgrade the facilities so it benefits all students whether nursery pupils or high school students.
48. Makes sense to utilize what we have already got. The cost would be realistic for the council to meet.
49. I agree with this option as it is a step forward for Shotton. I feel it would work better with one head and one governing body.
50. I feel this option would be more successful with 1 headteacher and 1 governing body. Remembering the great Estyn report the present Headteacher has achieved.
51. Community support, money put into school fund, re-model of the school. Other community members will still have access to the campus which they need. Keep the sixth form attached to the school for a friendly environment.
52. I feel this option would be more successful with 1 headteacher and 1 governing body. Remembering the great Estyn report the present Headteacher has achieved.
53. This option by far the best for Shotton and the pupils. Would like to see a united approach to the running of the school, with one head and one governing body.
54. I understand this could create more traffic morning and afternoons. So perhaps using the North Street entrance for nursery or older pupils could ease possible problems.
55. The primary phase and secondary phase to remain separate with a Head for each
56. Funding is needed and work must begin on raising funds.
57. Remodelling?
58. We would have to have funding to remodelise the high school i.e. new windows, also there may be some concern over the traffic flow on the residential area at back on school.
59. Community support, remodel the school. The community will still have access the rest of the campus such as the library and the clinic. Pupils at John Summers need a sixth form attached because it is a friendly environment. You are able to reach your full potential as you are able to form a better connection with the teachers.

**New responses received since 26/03/12.**

60. Funding
61. The Post-16-Hub being located at the Shotton/Queensferry/Garden City end of Deeside. The land is available at the moment where the old RAF housing/ buildings have been knocked down recently.

**OPTION 4 – Amalgamate John Summers High School with Connah's Quay High School (one Headteacher and one Governing Body, involving the closure of two schools and the creation of one new school on the existing sites.**

**Q10 How strongly do you agree or disagree with OPTION 4 (please tick ONE box only.**

Strongly Agree	=	4	2.0%
Tend to Agree	=	3	1.5%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	=	4	2.0%
Tend to Disagree	=	9	4.6%
Strongly Disagree	=	161	81.7 %

**Q11 To help us understand why people agree or disagree with OPTION 4 please provide a short summary of your reasoning (250 words maximum).**

1. Best alternate option.
2. This seems the most sensible. I can't talk about John Summers but I know that the management team at Connah's Quay High have improved the reputation and success of the school significantly. It would surely make sense to share these skills and create a single school that benefits learners by providing an education based, in theory, on twice the amount of experience and expertise that exists now for each school. This option is the only one that will allow best practice from both schools to be shared, and thus improve the education for learners from both high schools.
3. I strongly disagree with amalgamating the two schools, and using two sites. Connah's Quay high had two sites previously years 7 and 8 at Rowleys drive and as a previous student at Connah's Quay High I feel this is detrimental to the education of the students, it did not work before and I don't feel will work again. Connah's Quay High is an excellent school and has changed a lot over the past 15 years it is now an up and coming school with good teachers and fast improving results I feel this is down to the whole of the 11-16 being in one place under one head teacher. To use both sites under one name is still going to cost money, surely the same amount. If the amalgamation does go ahead my 9 year old will not be going to the new one and will be placed elsewhere. I am strongly opposed to this amalgamation.
4. because it will wreck a good school ( Connah's Quay High ) by putting a bad one ( John Summers ) with it
5. I think it is unfair that Connah's Quay High School have been included in this modernisation programme. Connah's Quay is a fantastic school with only 10% surplus places. The school has almost 1000 students and includes a sixth form of over 137. All of these exceed the criteria required for a school to be put under review. I would like to know why other schools with higher surplus places have not been included. I feel these plans would severely disrupt the running of a perfectly operating school just because it would save 'a bit' of money. I think this process needs to be reconsidered.
6. This would bring even more traffic chaos than already exists on roads that are barely able to cope now. The children that attend both schools come from varied family, social and economical backgrounds and there are many that do not mix outside of school hours. There has been for many years a strong pride in families and pupils choice of school; this has brought about a normal, healthy rivalry. Many families have very strong views on children being forced to be schooled together as this could turn some (now petty) issues into major problems between rival pupils and their families both in and out of school. These problems do not always go away as a pupil leaves school but pass on to the next generation as it has done for years both here and in many, many areas.
7. This is not a solution to anything, but will actually create a host of problems. It takes no account of the social problems of many families this end of Deeside. These pupils and their many needs will be lost. How are families of pupils coming up after those registered at the time of change going to afford the bus fares? Also, logistically and operationally it simply doesn't work. I remember the split site that there was for the

then new Connah's Quay High School (late 1970's). It was nothing but a mix-up and a nightmare, and the lower school in Shotton Rowley's Drive finally closed. (A much nicer building than the new one in Connah's Quay. It was the first Haddow school in Wales, and is still now put to good use as Deeside Enterprise Centre.)

Amalgamation, similarly, will be the thin end of the wedge for John Summers High - just a slower way to close it. This isn't right. It isn't just. Can I draw your attention to a study which came out last July from the New Policies Institute and commissioned by the Joseph Rowntree Foundation? It stated that the new objective of Welsh Government to bring child poverty to 5% (previously 10%) according to statistical trends had not a hope of being met. It concluded that what authorities should do, therefore, is to make children's existence more tolerable. We should give them the services they need, where they need them. Thank-you.

#### **Responses received since 05/03/12.**

8. Logistically not possible because of the ongoing traffic problems from Queensferry to Connah's Quay A498. Transportation of the pupils would be a nightmare.
9. NO benefits. Would create a sense of "Pulling out" of the most deprived part of Flintshire. Amalgamation is a knee jerk response with little proven success. Transport issues and the gridlock on Chester Road make this a non starter.
10. Option 3 with the incorporate of option 1 would resolve issues not just for the immediate future but for many years to come with the development (large scale) of the Deeside area. Option 4 would do very little to address these.
11. Don't understand how this helps the problem of 10% too few places. Creates a lot of unneeded stress when there are better options. As a parent within the area, I do not want this.
12. Would not alleviate the surplus place issue. Would cause enormous disruption to two communities. Transport along the already congested A548 coast road would make it enormously difficult for pupils. In an area of deprivation like this it would be an act of catastrophic proportions to rip the heart out of the community. This is a community school and belongs in the community.
13. Don't think this would work at all.
14. Really bad idea. Does not address any issues of transport problems, transition issues, from primary to secondary. No good for the community.
15. This will not serve any purpose. Two sites do not work logistically. This will not be beneficial for the local communities.
16. Transport issues would be a considerable problem. Integration of pupils could pose difficulties, affecting learning. Negative impact on the local Queensferry community. County suggested that JSBS building was not fit for purpose.
17. Transport issues and traffic would be a major problem, negative impacts in local community, integration issues leading to long term effects on their learning, this option does not address JSBS building issues 'not fit for purpose'.
18. I do not believe this option would be of any benefit, as it does not address any of the problems raised i.e. surplus places.
19. Damaging on two communities. Over congestion on roads/traffic queues/pollution. More pupils playing truant. Possible anti-social behaviour/crime. Poor punctuality.
20. Poor idea. The fact that this is even an option shows how some people with decisions making authority know absolutely nothing about education and what communities want.
21. Yet again a school closure would lead to major issues in many areas. Transport - the congestion is already horrendous. SEN provision at CQHS is an issue, we have over 30% on SEN register.
22. Disruptions to two very different communities who have a long history together. It would disadvantage JSBS pupils due to financial constraint, parents could not afford to bus pupils. A498 is already a very congested road and does not need further traffic problems.
23. Strong disagree : Poor transition : Job losses : Poor transport links : Probably the worst option available.
24. Amalgamation is disruptive and would create further difficulties for a community first area.

25. THERE IS ABSOLUTELY NO BENEFIT FOR CONNAHS QUAY STUDENTS IN THIS OPTION. I DO NOT WANT MY CHILDREN TRAVELLING TO ANOTHER SITE AS I'M SURE THAT PARENTS OF JOHN SUMMERS SCHOOL DO NOT WANT THEIR CHILDREN TRAVELLING TO A DIFFERENT SITE. CONNAHS QUAY HIGH SCHOOL HAS IMPROVED DRAMATICALLY OVER THE LAST FEW YEARS AND I DO NOT WANT TO SEE ANY CHANGES TO THE SCHOOL WHICH WILL PREVENT FURTHER SUCCESS WHICH I FEEL THAT THIS OPTION WOULD. I HAVE ALREADY CONTACTED MARK TAMI REGARDING MY CONCERNS AND WILL BE DOING SO AGAIN HAVING ATTENDED THE MEETING HELD AT CONNAHS QUAY SCHOOL ON 5/3/2012. I WILL ALSO BE ATTENDING THE MEETING AT DEESIDE LEISURE CENTRE ON 12/3/2012. IN THE MEETING HELD ON 5/3/2012 IT WAS STATED A NUMBER OF TIMES THAT LOCAL COUNCILLORS HAD PUT THESE FOUR PROPOSALS TOGETHER, I WANT TO KNOW WHO THEY ARE AND THE COMMUNITIES THEY REPRESENT AS I DO NOT BELIEVE THAT COULCILLORS REPRESENTING THESE 2 SCHOOLS AND SURROUNDING AREAS WOULD HAVE AGREED TO THIS PROPOSAL. WAS CONNAHS QUAY AND QUEENSFERRY REPRESENTED FAIRLY? I WANT THIS INFORMATION AVAILABLE AT THE MEETING ON 12/3/2012. I HAVE NEVER BEEN INVOLVED IN ANY FORM OF PROTEST BUT THIS IS ONE PROTEST THAT I WILL GIVE 100%. MY CHILDRENS EDUCATION IS AT STAKE IF THIS OPTION IS IMPLEMENTED AND I WOULD SERIOUSLY CONSIDER SENDING MY YOUNGER CHILD TO A DIFFERENT HIGH SCHOOL WHEN THE TIME COMES.
26. This is not an option as it does not address surplus places. Also it does not address the issue of the poor building of John Summers. It would save a headteacher's salary but this is not a saving in the scheme of things. Surely it is unfair to make teachers at CQHS re-apply for their jobs. CQHS school had an excellent Estyn report, results keep getting better and it does not meet the criteria for an area review so why put staff under considerable stress that work hard and are successful?
27. I believe that one school spread over two sites would not work. How can having one governing body, one headteacher possibly give 100% attention to both sites at the same time? It is imperative that the headmaster is in-situ to oversee each and every aspect of their school.
28. This option would disrupt the education of students from 2 communities. Students performance would be significantly harmed.
29. Loss of community services and school would affect whole community. Disruption to pupils learning.
30. Disruption of two communities: Would take the heart out of the local community. Further disadvantage areas of Q Ferry, Shotton and Sealand that are already disadvantaged.
31. This option shows that the buildings are obviously fit for the purpose to support option three. Bussing of children and staff has been tried at many places in the past and is a logistical nightmare in practice.
32. This would cause too much traffic on an already extremely busy road. The disruption to both sets of pupils would be detriment to their education.
33. There are many reasons not to close a community school. JSHS students are best served with their own institution.
34. Total disruption to 2 communities. Unnecessary travel. Amalgamations are disruptive to the community.
35. This option would be disruptive for the communities involved and would add to the traffic congestion in Shotton. I find it hard to see any educational benefits for pupils.
36. This option would disrupt two communities. There would be no educational benefits. Why close an excellent school??
37. Pupils really do not get along. Quite a distance for pupils to travel.
38. This is by far the worst option! Solves nothing and stores up problems for the future.
39. Transport issues - adding to current congestion in Shotton. Not popular in either community. Waste/misuse of current JSHS site.
40. Does not address the issue of surplus places or the condition of the buildings. See few advantages apart from saving the salary of a headteacher. However, set up costs (stationary, signs, reorganisation, transport etc) would far exceed any cost saving.

41. This option would cause disruption to two communities, neither of whom want this, whilst also disrupting the academic lives of two schools for no apparent reason!
42. Loss of school and community services will have a major impact on the locality. Transport issues for example, cost of travel, congestion and environment. Too disruptive for learners/community.
43. Removal of secondary education from the community, 2. Difficult travel conditions along coast road, 3. Ignores future building/housing developments.
44. This seems like an impossible idea. The thought of students and staff being split over 2 sites would have a devastating affect on the learners as well as the staff. There seems to be no logical explanation behind the reasons for Connah's Quay High School being in this process in the first place. The school's surplus places is below the number identified within the criteria as is the number of sixth forms on roll. However, there are other schools within the area who do seem to fit the criteria who don't seem to be involved within the process.
45. Shocking to close one of the most improved schools in Flintshire, which has just under 10% surplus places, one thousand happy learners and a thriving 6th form. Connah's Quay does not meet the criteria to be in this process at all. Ian Budd and Tom Davies were unable to make clear who would be teaching in the 6th form hub, and how it would currently affect the people who teach 6th form within the relevant schools. What is the point of a 6th form hub being erected right next door to Deeside College - makes no sense.
46. CQHS does not meet any of the criteria which triggers this process. This option seems extremely unfair and almost personal against CQHS. It has been the most improving school in Flintshire County in recent years - what on earth is the point in closing this school??? It makes no sense. Why not close John Summers and divide the learners between all the neighbouring schools if John Summers has so few learners - surely this solves the problems. Apparently this idea was previously rejected. I would like to hear how that decision was explained and justified. Ian Budd and Tom Davies were unable to make clear who would be teaching in the 6th form hub, and how it would currently affect the people who teach 6th form within the relevant schools. What's the point of a 6th form hub being erected right next door to Deeside College - makes no sense.
47. CQHS should not be in this process at all. It does not fit the criteria in any way. Also the idea of one school on 2 sites so far apart is ludicrous and will obviously have a detrimental effect on both teaching and learning. Ian Budd and Tom Davies were unable to make clear who would be teaching in the 6th form hub and how it would affect the people who currently teach 6th form within the relevant schools. A 6th form hub on the Deeside College site would take away the opportunity for students in this area to continue their education at their chosen school.
48. Connah's Quay high school SHOULD NOT BE PENALISED BY AMALGAMATION WHICH ENTAILS CLOSURE. IT IS A SUCCESSFUL WELL SUBSCRIBED SCHOOL WITH LESS THAN 10% SURPLUS PLACES AND A SIXTH FORM OF MORE THAN 137 LEARNERS WITH EXCELLENT RESULTS. IAN BUD AND TOM DAVIES WERE UNABLE TO MAKE CLEAR WHO WOULD BE TEACHING IN THE 6TH FORM HUB, AND HOW IT WOULD CURRENTLY AFFECT THE PEOPLE WHO TEACH THE 6TH FORM WITHIN THE RELEVANT SCHOOLS. WHAT IS THE POINT OF A HUB ON THE DEESIDE COLLEGE SITE WHEN IT TAKES AWAY THE CHOICE OF LEARNERS TO BE EDUCATED AT THEIR SCHOOL.
49. For this option I am struggling to understand why such an improving school (Connah's Quay High School) that does not meet any of the criteria given by the Welsh Assembly Government as it has less than 10% surplus space, nearly 1000 learners on roll and a 6th form of over 135 given by the Welsh Assembly Government because it is being considered as a school that could be closed. I understand that Connah's Quay High School have been considered due to the fact that it is an area school review however there are a number of other secondary schools in the area with more surplus spaces, less learners on roll and a much smaller 6th form and for some reason these schools are not mentioned in any of the options given. It just seems to me that this option would create a bigger problem. This option also isn't a long term one as both John Summers and Connah's Quay High School buildings both have a short life span so in the end this process would start over again. A better idea

- is to close the school with the most surplus places, least learners on roll and smallest 6th form and invite those learners to go into the closest school available to them in the area. Invest money into the existing schools to accommodate the new learners.
50. This would be devastating for the local communities, as well as staff at the schools. Connah's Quay high school has a relatively small number of surplus places, whereas John Summers has more, so it seems very unfair to put the local community in Connah's Quay through this system. The logistics of having to run two sites would be extremely difficult. The road between the two schools is frequently blocked with traffic. This does not address the modernisation needs, especially when John Summers site has such a short life span. The modernisation of two sites would be an expensive option.
  51. Connah's Quay should not be in the review at all; with approx. 1000 learners and a 120+ sixth formers and less than 10% surplus places, the option of an amalgamation or any adjustment to CQHS is illogical. The problem is John Summers, not CQHS so why has a thriving school been dragged into such an upheaval? Why would the government go out of their way to seek a school where students and staff are on two sites; far more problems would be raised if this option was used? There are also many other schools who are in a worse position than CQHS and yet they are not in the review. Again, what would happen with the sixth form? This still remains unclear. All 4 of these options seem to leave major pot-holes for the issues and problems that the council are seeking to address.

#### **New responses received since 09/03/12**

52. Connah's Quay High is an excellent school and works exceptionally well for children with ability and children who struggle. It has an excellent pastoral care and additional needs department who really care for the young people. I think the formula they have there really works with an effective leadership team. My children have done/are doing extremely well there educationally and personally. The opportunities to do well are very much at the forefront and this is demonstrated in the results the school attain. I wouldn't want this to change. My son is now at Cambridge University and this is down to the encouragement and opportunities at CQH.
53. This is my preferred option as the pupils would not be disrupted from their current schools and having two schools as one would allow the funding from the Welsh Government. Maybe the council could provide some funding to support this option and it would still be considered the most inexpensive way of providing a good education for all the children. The Headmaster in CQHS has proved to be very able in turning a school's reputation around and whoever was successful in the Head teacher post would need to provide all the opportunities for the children to bring them success.
54. Too many children for one school!!!
55. Does not address the problem at all.
56. Catchment area would be too large. High cost project. Very unhappy if schools merge, as CQ currently very successful and well run, with well behaved pupils. It will not retain this success if schools merge. Any issues at John Summers should remain there and be resolved without involving CQ High.
57. No obvious savings - dilution of learning and organisations. Remodelling of JS would still need to take place. One school would reduce funding/head and this is without change in demographics or pupil numbers even with gateway regeneration.
58. Size of school too big.
59. This has already been tried and did not work. No point in going back in time.
60. Totally against an amalgamation of the 2 schools!! It looks as if CQHS will be used as the post 16 hub meaning that there is a strong likelihood of the learners aged 11-16 of CQHS will have to travel to John Summers for some (or all of their learning). This option is a complete non starter. I was a child who went to the old Rowley's Drive School then moved up to CQHS for my 3rd year of high school.. What an utter shambles that idea was. The traffic situation between Queensferry and Connah's Quay is chronic and I feel that the learners would be spending more time sat in cars/buses etc instead of walking to their local school and enjoying quality time with their friends on the walk.



61. This I feel is taking a step backwards- two sites has been done before it did not work well then and with the added congested traffic through Shotton feel it would be worse now. This option should not even be considered I do however agree that a new 6th form hub would be a great advantage/opportunity for life long learning in the environment, providing the financial support is agreed.
62. Where would this new site be? Travel for pupils? Would transport be required?
63. This is a ridiculous idea as us and Connah's Quay don't get on as it is
64. Mixing the two schools would not work. Transport would be a problem.
65. This is not a good idea as it would cause too many problems between pupils and also for parents choosing where their child goes to high school.
66. This option is outrageous. Split site schools are proven to be unsuccessful, also the cost to run two sites would not be cost effective. The only saving would be a headteacher salary but would leave staff and or pupils with a ridiculous commute down a road that is always very busy, wasting valuable learning and teaching time. Not too mention unhappy parents and pupils in both areas.
67. Expensive, waste of money, increase in transport needed, not all people would be able to walk to school, it would cause a rise in obesity.
68. I believe neither of these schools want to merge as there has always been conflicts and rivalry between the schools.
69. There is a rivalry between both schools and communities and so there would be conflict. Plus the loss of John Summers would be losing the heart of the community. Plus everyone will lose jobs.
70. This is the option that would affect my children. I most definitely do not want thus option to go ahead. I went to CQHS and that is where I wish my children to go to. It seems crazy for them to have to relocate to the other side of the area when we have a perfectly good school not far from where we live.
71. The loss of the school will have a big effect to the community. Also there will be loads of traffic to go through to travel to and back to both schools.
72. Don't want to be associated with Connah's Quay. Loss of school will hugely impact community.
73. I don't want to have anything to do with Connah's Quay. Transport will be a issue and the loss of JSHS will be a big loss to the community.
74. Area is large enough to sustain 2 high schools. In both areas the housing estates are growing and developments are planned.
75. Just don't think it would work on any level. Was tried many many years ago and proved itself to be unworkable.
76. There would be far too many pupils for the one school and I do not want my three children to travel that far to school.
77. A large area that could support two schools.
78. In my view not an option if it happened, I would move my children elsewhere. The rivalry is too great and the traffic would be a nightmare. How can you councillors imagine joining these two schools when John Summers came out with a one in the inspection and CQHS didn't? If I wanted my children to go to CQHS I would of sent them there. Its a big fat NO from me on this.
79. Children don't want to move school, also increased traffic would have an impact on an already struggling high street, also not all would be able to get busses, therefore personal safety is endangered as they have to walk.
80. Pupils can get forgotten about when they attend a 'super school' classes wouldn't be as personal. I could go on and on and on. Also both areas C Quay and Shotton would loose their identity.
81. Unable to except that Shotton will have no secondary education facility.
82. I chose JSH because it has less pupils and excellent teaching staff. I don't want this to change.
83. The loss of the school will have a huge impact on the community. The transport will be costly for parents sending children to the school. Loss of many jobs.
84. I chose JSH because it has less pupils, and excellent teaching staff I don't want this to change.
85. Placing the school over two sites in unworkable due to the travelling involved from one to the other both by the learners and the staff. It didn't work last time !!!

86. This is how CQHS used to be run many years ago. Didn't work then, no point going back to something.
87. Does not meet criteria of saving money. Connah's Quay High school gives excellent opportunities for its learners. Why change this? Everyone knows split site schools have issues. Why create a problem
88. Don't agree with this option, need more details, than what described above, at this moment it's a no no. Also seems people would lose their jobs in this option also.
89. This is a ridiculous idea that solves nothing. All this does is save one wage. You cannot expect one head to run two sites when the access through Shotton is so awful. It does not solve any of the issues that triggered to renewish the first place.
90. 2 site school would not work. Total waste of money and resources. CQHS shouldn't even be in this process.
91. Connah's Quay High school works - look at exam results! The issue seems to be due to numbers falling at John Summers so give their parents the option of moving to another schools. Do not jeopardise the futures of our children.
92. Why is CQ in the review (nor = 1000) sixth form >120 surplus spaces 10%ish! other schools e.g. Flint, St David's would trigger a review based on numbers. Also where is the saving with this option? = Salary of 1 head!! Not that much!! What happens with job security?
93. THIS WOULD CAUSE TOO MUCH DISRUPTION TO THE CHILDREN AND TEACHERS IN EACH SCHOOL
94. CQHS does not need to change as it has adequate pupils to sustain it.
95. The loss of John Summers would make a huge negative impact on the community. There would also be a huge problem with the transport of the pupils to and from school.

#### **New responses since 26/03/12.**

96. Connah's' Quay own form Alternative:- The best option we think would be to keep CQHS separate from John Summers High School but a good ides making one school by i.e. CQHS college for sixth form school students, only to include other schools as well.
97. Totally unacceptable to even contemplate bringing about the closure of such a highly maintained secondary school which has had a lot of money spent on keeping it that way in the past 15 years including first class science facilities.
98. Connah's Quay own form Alternative: - New school on the gateway development for John Summers Pupils and Hawarden High. Amalgamate Connah's Quay and Deeside College.
99. Connah's Quay own form Alternative: - Use money earmarked for schools anyway. They are always in need of upgrades, text books, gym equipment etc It's the children going to schools that matter.
100. Connah's Quay own form Alternative: - None of the options reduces the surplus place issue they are designed to address. Consideration should be made to either relocating learners from JSHS and closure of site, alternatively amalgamation of JSHS with a closer school such as Hawarden High school or St David's Saltney.
101. If this were to happen I would move house if necessary to ensure my daughter did not have to go to such a large school. Flintshire county council would have to provide transport and places in other schools ,I am sure I will not be the only parent who feels this strongly about it
102. I am unable to see why Connah's Quay High school is part of this review at all. None of these 4 options appear remotely suitable for our school.
103. I strongly disagree with this proposal due to traffic congestion between the two schools.
104. I strongly disagree with this proposal due to traffic congestion between the two schools.
105. Does not address surplus places and cost. A backwards step in terms of transport problems. Connah's Quay High School does not meet any of the criteria for inclusion in the review.
106. Does not address cost and surplus places. Connah's Quay High School does not meet any of the criteria areas in the review process.

107. Connah's Quay High School should not be included in this plan as it does not meet the criteria to be considered for closure, as it is over the threshold for both 11-16 and sixth form sizes. We also provide above the required number of courses without considering the extended range we can include through the consortium & core learning centre. Also we make excellent use of the funding we receive per pupil compared with other schools. Connah's Quay High School is a successful school with good exam results and a positive Estyn report with sector leading features; it would therefore not be good for the learners in the Connah's Quay area to close the school and would definitely have a negative impact. If this option is considered, both schools will become unsettled and parents may move older children and/or seeks alternatives places for future Yr 7s; teachers in both schools will begin to look for other jobs immediately leading to lack of continuity and stability for all learners. Any closure of a school with excess surplus places should consider the location of ALL the nearest schools for the learners, as for some John Summers' pupils, other school sites are nearer. A far better solution would be a gradual winding down of one school by not accepting Yr 7s. Funding of extensions and new buildings will still be required and discussion of sixth form provision.
108. Total waste of money to close two schools then open one school on the EXACT same two sites.... Makes no sense.
109. It would be cheaper and safer for me to send my children to the Elfed High School in Buckley than send them to Connah's Quay High as I would not qualify for free transport living within the 3 mile radius of the School. My children would have to walk for over 2 miles to their school, be exhausted and unable to perform to their best ability if this plan were to be implemented. To go to the Elfed my children would be able to walk to Shotton Station, catch the train and then the bus to school and be in a better state of mind to carry out a days work. As for the children of Garden City to ship them by bus over the New Bridge to Connah's Quay high campus is a 6.8 mile trip (one way), when it is just 5.2 miles to go to the Elfed, again I wonder about the exhaustion of the children having to make this journey on a daily basis and the effect it will have on their standard of education.
110. Due to surplus numbers then this looks like the obvious option. However I do think there is another option: Make John Summers campus into the post 16 hub. Benefits: - Queensferry is very central for all schools across Flintshire. It also has good transport links. Takes away the stigma of John Summers School as a secondary school and creates a whole new area for the school as a post 16 hub including investment. I will personally move area before sending my child to John Summers school due to reputation.
111. I cannot see how a split site school could possibly work, especially with the traffic issues between the two sites. Staff would be late for lessons and learners would only find one of the sites convenient to access. Also, I do not understand why a successful school like Connah's Quay is included in such a review at all.
112. No, No, No. Leave the highly successful Connah's Quay school alone. Excellent Leadership team, staff and well motivated pupils, giving greatly improved why touch it. If you do the Education Department will take sole responsibility for failing standards. Split sites has been tried previously it does not work, the department knows that. I wonder how de-motivated the staff are now, waiting to see if they have a job at the end of this. Hands off, like Argoed we will fight to protect our school. As mentioned previously look at other schools if you have to, Post Hub at Connah's Quay a definite. Should I even mention problems transporting pupils the infrastructure will not take this option.
113. Connah's Quay High is an extremely popular school, with good Estyn and examination results. It has a strong Leadership team and dedicated teaching staff. Pupils are happy and well motivated which is why exam results are good. This option has done nothing but de-motivate pupils and staff, how can the school keep their staff with the threat of amalgamation on the cards. SHAME ON YOU. Traffic problems transporting pupils to Connah's Quay where do I start? The answer leave Connah's Quay as it is with the exception of building a POST 16 HUB nearby. What a perfect opportunity the authority has to build an outstanding further education centre with close links to Deeside College. Leave 11-16 alone.

114. This option is again an attempt to keep a school open on the Queensferry site. The option as presented would lead to a highly inefficient organisation, indeed the sort of organisation that LA's across the UK have worked very hard to get rid of for decades! CQHS is a viable school by any measure the LA wishes to make. It does not have significant numbers of surplus places, and it has sufficient numbers of learners to be able to provide a curriculum that meets the needs of learners and the WG Learning and Skills Measure. Unfortunately JSBS does not meet those measures. It is already high reliant on CQHS and other schools in terms of it being able to offer the appropriate number of learning opportunities to meet the Learning and Skills measure, and there are also a large number of surplus places.

**Q12 If you support Option 4 what do you think would be needed to make it work? What local issues would need to be considered?**

1. I would imagine that the amalgamation would mainly be made up from those at CQ High as it is the better school and Greg Dixon would be the obvious choice as head as he has done a great job turning that school around, but would he be happy about losing CQ High's identity as part of the process ?
2. The biggest issue in any merger is that staff within the schools feel threatened and in danger of losing jobs. This is likely to be impacting on teaching already and my own children have both reported that staffs in their school (CQH) do not want to merge. My guess is that if they knew their jobs were secure and that this is purely about providing improved learning opportunities they may feel differently. One this is established a merger between 2 good organisations will be carried out relatively smoothly. People assume that this is about saving money, aka jobs, again if the public were aware that actually it is more about learners then the public would show greater support too. It is important to point out that the staff savings will happen but over a greater time span in terms of people leaving their posts through choice.
3. This would be my ideal choice as I don't think that it would cause as much disruption to the pupils. By the time a decision has been made, my daughter who is in year 8 at present, will be at a critical point of her education. She is settled, has a good group of friends, her confidence has grown immensely since she has attended Connah's Quay High and she is doing really well in her subjects. The school are, by far, one of the most caring schools I have ever had the pleasure of dealing with and I feel proud that both my children attend Connah's Quay High (my son is currently in 6th form). There are many more family homes being built in Connah's Quay, John Summers is not local to the community, Connah's Quay High is. Whilst the traffic leading to the school at peak times is busy, this is nothing in comparison to the traffic in Shotton, which will only become worse if one of the other 3 options is successful. I cannot express strongly enough how much I wish for Connah's Quay High to remain.

**New responses received since 05/03/12.**

4. Additional: Taking into account the northern gateway project and other long term criteria, pupil numbers will increase. With money made available from this project plus other contributing finance interests. My support for a brand new purpose built high school replacing John Summers High with this new facility three to sixteen and post-16 hub at Connah's Quay; again this new high school would be one governing body and one management structure. Call it Option 5.
5. This option has little merit and should be removed from the available choices
6. It wouldn't work. Bad idea!
7. It is a wailing time bomb which would only work on paper and in an office in County Hall.
8. Nothing would make it work as there are too many differences between the social backgrounds, aims and aspirations of the pupils and their families.
9. The transport issue is a huge problem. The road between Shotton and Connah's Quay is congested and would be time consuming getting from site to site. Surely Hawarden is nearer so needs to be in the review. Also St David's in Saltney is quicker

to get to from John Summer's and also has many surplus places. It would make more sense to send the learners from JS's to Saltney.

10. Traffic congestion through Shotton and transport arrangements. Ensuring the buildings fit for purpose.

#### **New responses received since 09/03/12**

11. Connah's Quay own form alternative:- Set up catchment area so people living near the high schools have to go there unless require a specialist school due to language or religion i.e. Maes Garmon, Richard Gwyn. I moved to my house before I had children because I wanted my children to go to Golftyn C.P. and the CQHS and the near college. Other people should do the same. Leave CQHS alone. WE are open to a 16+ centre near CQHS.
12. Connah's Quay own form alternative: They don't need to be interfacing with anything. Connah's Quay High school is working well so leave it alone! If they amalgamate the schools there are traffic issues, fighting issues, only one headmaster won't work, my child's education will seriously be affect and I am totally against it.
13. Connah's Quay own form alternative:- Yes - Give the headmaster at Hawarden High school a telephone call, see how he/she likes the idea of sharing!! Absolutely ridiculous suggestion and a shear waste of money. We do agree to building a post hub 16+ at CQHS.
14. Connah's Quay own form alternative:- Try contacting Hawarden High school and let John Summers share a facility with them. CQHS has an excellent academic record and should remain so far the future. As for suggesting the pupils could travel over the Flintshire bridge is ridiculous. Get in the real world!!
15. Connah's Quay own form alternative:- John Summers has a significant surplus of places, yet Hawarden High is unable to accommodate the pupils requesting to attend, ergo move pupils from Hawarden to John Summers via amalgamation. As there is no space on the Hawarden site to extend utilise the John Summers site, by some updating/remodelling of current buildings. Traffic congestion is also a major problem between Queensferry and Connah's Quay, so again it would be logical to transport pupils between Queensferry and Hawarden, to avoid adding to an already difficult situation. Why is Hawarden High being 'politically protected'?
16. Connah's Quay own form Alternatives:- Connah's Quay High School is fine as it is as the children are doing well at their work and are happy and do not want any changes doing.
17. Connah's Quay own form Alternatives: - Leave the two schools as they are as there is always friction between the two schools. The teachers struggle managing the amount of children they already have.
18. n/a
19. Connah's Quay own form Alternative: - What about Hawarden High School? Their site is old fashioned and small. Could they merge with John Summers? Connah's Quay High school is big enough. I live on the road where CQ High is located. The traffic is bad enough as is the rubbish left by the children at break time. Invest in John Summers School. The site is more than big enough. Imagine being a parent and having to travel through Shotton twice a day to go to CQ High School.
20. Connah's Quay own designed form Alternative Option: - Leave CQHS out of the mix as this is currently an excellent school, only has 10% surplus places and with an additional 140 houses being built at Wepre, these will more than likely be taken up then. Build a post 16 hub at either CQHS or Deeside College as this will definitely enhance the learners. Partially close some of John Summers school classrooms to either utilise as additional council office space/meeting rooms/councillors use. Look at over crowding at Hawarden High and possibly amalgamate those 2 schools as logisitically they are closer.
21. TRAFFIC!!!!!!!!!!
22. Connah's Quay own form Alternative:- I cannot see how amalgamating the two schools and running two existing sites will ensure either is fit for 21st century education, especially when there has been no identified funding to do this. CQHS and JSHS were many years ago run over split sites, and given the traffic management situation in Shotton & Queensferry this would be even worse hour than it was then! I

do however agree that the post 16 hub should be situated on the site adjacent to CQHS.

23. Connah's Quay own form Alternative:- The possibilities of linking Hawarden and John Summers; using space within the grounds at Hawarden, it is not ground locked it has fields. John Summers also has scope to extend. Splitting 11-16 learners between the three other secondary education establishments within the area. Looking at some serious possibilities as to the effect on the learners, communities etc of any changes; is it box ticking? As I cannot see any monetary savings in providing education in any changes that might be suggested. A stand alone post 16 hub, with their own controls i.e. Governing body; it might be good for links to have the Governing Body made up from other Governing bodies i.e. representation from all secondary schools and the colleges. This surely has potential to release spaces in other schools and also save on buses during the day; it would require buses from various areas at the start and end of the day. Executing a fair and equal evaluation, with all pros and cons laid out in layman's terms. Stop Councillor Steele-Mortimer from telling us that things are ok in the press and that he is following what a committee has suggested is right! If he stayed awake at meeting he might get the whole picture!
24. Amalgamate John Summers with Hawarden High. Modernise Connah's Quay so it can continue to thrive.
25. Connah's Quay own form Alternative: - As a parent Connah's Quay High school is doing really well and I am very pleased with there success rate. I feel if there is to be an option, I also would agree on exploring the possibility of a new sixth form building which would give a wider range in subjects for the learners.
26. Connah's Quay own form Alternative: - a) Option: Amalgamate John Summers High School with Hawarden High School. Surplus numbers from Hawarden can overspill to John Summers. Technical closure of the 2 schools and creation of 1. There are good transport options walking to school for children living in Gladstone Way Mancot to reach John Summers. b) Build post 16 hub at Connah's Quay and refurbish Connah's Quay High School to improve existing facilities.
27. Connah's Quay own form Alternative:- To re-model John Summers High School but only for the amount of children that they have there and not to make anymore room.
28. Connah's Quay own form Alternative:- I do not think that this would be a good idea, there have been many disagreements between the school for many years and it will just disturb all pupils at Connah's Quay High School.
29. Connah's Quay own form Alternative: - If John Summers School is low on numbers, why can't it join with Hawarden High? Would make more sense! Leave an excellent school like Connah's Quay High alone!!!
30. Connah's Quay own form Alternative: - Leave schools where they are and as they are. Why waste money and time on this matter. It will only disrupt pupils lives. Just spend money on improvements where and when required.
31. Connah's Quay own form Alternative:- There must be other options to explore for the benefit of the students involved.
32. Connah's Quay own form Alternative: - Leave CQHS as is and develop a 16 hub on site. With regards to John Summers pupils relocate students to CQHS and/or Hawarden High School. Relocate students to CQHS and remodel CQHS site to accommodate all students or relocate John Summers students to Hawarden and remodel school, this maybe a problem as there is not as much scope to enlarge Hawarden High School.
33. Connah's Quay own form Alternatives:- If CQHS was rebuilt and was made as one hub then I think that would make sense, but has anyone thought about the traffic and how the children from the other side of Shotton. It would be good to have 11-13 as one with head and 14-16 as another with head too. The bullying situation would be much better. The teachers would show more respect to the children. I also think that more teachers would go off sick if this did happen.
34. I am a sixth form student please take my view seriously. There should be a 5th Option of just refurbishing the schools to an appropriate standard and leaving them how they are.
35. Make a 5th option allowing us not to agree with any of the suggested options.
36. Connah's Quay own form Alternative: - Flintshire CC should look at other schools that have the same problems as John Summers (surplus places) - possibly Hawarden

High School? Connah's Quay High School is a well run high achieving school that would not benefit from amalgamation with John Summers.

37. TRAFFIC !!
38. TRAFFIC!!
39. None of the above options are suitable.
40. Can't really comment, don't know, what's really involved i.e. pupil movement from school to school etc.
41. Please note that I do not consider any of the options to be the best fit. There are other schools that should be considered in this process and Connah's Quay should not be one of the schools affected.
42. CQ used to run a split site with Rowley's Drive and it proved to be a nightmare - not efficient time & money wasted travelling/covering colleagues.

#### **New responses received since 26/03/12**

43. Connah's Quay own form Alternative: - I would like to say I hope you leave Connah's Quay High School as it is with a Post 16 hub within the grounds as there is enough room within the grounds. Also the amalgamation of John Summers and Hawarden would be easier on traffic and schools are at the same situation of pupils. Also why change Connah's Quay when there isn't a problem there.
44. Connah's Quay own form Alternative: - Amalgamate John Summers High School with Hawarden High School. Connah's Quay High School now has an excellent reputation. I feel that amalgamating with John Summers that standards would suffer.
45. It can not feasibly work in the best interests of educating students at the far end of Deeside.

**Q12c Postcode**

1. CH1 6AQ	53. CH5 3AY	106. CH5 4UN
2. CH1 6BB	54. CH5 3HE	107. CH5 4UT
3. CH1 6HF	55. CH5 3HJ (2)	108. CH5 4WG
4. CH2 2RH	56. CH5 3HR (2)	109. CH5 4WP
5. CH2 4BS	57. CH5 3SB	110. CH5 4WZ
6. CH2 4NY	58. CH5 4AB (2)	111. CH5 4XD
7. CH3 5LU	59. CH5 4AG	112. CH5 4XJ
8. CH41 4HB	60. CH5 4AQ	113. CH5 4XW (2)
9. CH47 0LQ	61. CH5 4BH (4)	114. CH5 4YL
10. CH5 1AH	62. CH5 4BQ	115. CH6 5NE
11. CH5 1AU	63. CH5 4BT	116. CH6 5RB
12. CH5 1AX	64. CH5 4BW	117. CH64 9SG
13. CH5 1AY	65. CH5 4BY	118. CH65 9EP
14. CH5 1BX	66. CH5 4EM	119. CH65 9LJ
15. CH5 1DH (2)	67. CH5 4EP	120. CH65 9LQ
16. CH5 1DJ	68. CH5 4FD	121. CH66 2HT
17. CH5 1DT	69. CH5 4FW	122. CH7 1UE
18. CH5 1EA (2)	70. CH5 4FX (2)	123. CH7 2NH
19. CH5 1HE (3)	71. CH5 4GB	124. CH7 2QR
20. CH5 1HQ	72. CH5 4GF	125. CH7 3PP
21. CH5 1HS	73. CH5 4GH	126. CH7 5NH
22. CH5 1HT (2)	74. CH5 4GN (4)	127. CH7 5QB
23. CH5 1HW	75. CH5 4GP	128. CH7 6AS
24. CH5 1HZ	76. CH5 4GQ	129. CH7 6XE
25. CH5 1JA (3)	77. CH5 4GR (2)	130. CH7 6YW
26. CH5 1JR	78. CH5 4GZ	131. CH8 7BE
27. CH5 1JX (2)	79. CH5 4HD	132. CH8 9DH (2)
28. CH5 1LB (2)	80. CH5 4HQ (2)	133. CH8 9DX
29. CH5 1LE (2)	81. CH5 4HX (2)	134. CW8 3BY
30. CH5 1LF	82. CH5 4JF	135. L26 1YQ
31. CH5 1PE	83. CH5 4JJ	136. LL11 3SL
32. CH5 1PJ	84. CH5 4JN	137. LL11 5SG
33. CH5 1QD	85. CH5 4JU	138. LL12 2TF
34. CH5 1QN	86. CH5 4LJ	139. LL12 7RE
35. CH5 1QR (2)	87. CH5 4LQ	140. LL12 8NR
36. CH5 1QS	88. CH5 4NA (2)	141. LL12 9DW
37. CH5 1QW	89. CH5 4NB (2)	142. LL12 9EF
38. CH5 1QY	90. CH5 4ND	143. LL14 2SS
39. CH5 1SA	91. CH5 4NG	144. LL15 1DS
40. CH5 1SE (2)	92. CH5 4NJ (2)	145. LL15 1RG
41. CH5 1UP	93. CH5 4NR	146. LL17 0SG
42. CH5 1XS	94. CH5 4PW (3)	147. LL170AD
43. CH5 2AA	95. CH5 4QB	148. LL18 4AH
44. CH5 2JB	96. CH5 4QL	149. LL18 5WR
45. CH5 2JG	97. CH5 4QU	150. LL19 8pa
46. CH5 2JN	98. CH5 4RA	151. LL19 9EL
47. CH5 2JQ	99. CH5 4RU	152. LL19 9NR
48. CH5 2PA	100. CH5 4RX	153. LL29 7AP
49. CH5 2RW	101. CH5 4SH (2)	154. LL30 3HS
50. CH5 2SA	102. CH5 4SN	155. LL31 9AS
51. CH5 2SR	103. CH5 4SQ	156. LL32 8LT
52. CH5 3AU	104. CH5 4TH	157. LL65 4TN
	105. CH5 4UD (2)	



**Q13 Is your response most relevant to....? please tick all that apply**

John Summers High School	97	49.2%
Ysgol Bryn Deva	0	0.0%
Custom House Lane School	4	2.0%
Golftyn Primary School	5	2.5%
Wepre Primary School	2	1.0%
Dee Road Infants School	1	0.5%
Connah's Quay High School	103	52.3%
Queensferry Primary School	14	7.1%
Sealand primary School	5	2.5%
St Ethelwold's Primary School	5	2.5%
Taliesin Junior School	9	4.6%
Shotton Infants School	6	3.0%

**Q14 Are you....? Please tick all that apply**

Parent or carer of High School pupil	85	43.1%
High School Teacher	47	23.9%
High School Staff	25	12.7%
School Governor High School	13	6.6%
Parent or carer of Primary School pupil	39	19.8%
Primary School Teacher	0	0.0%
Primary School Staff	10	5.1%
School Governor Primary School	8	4.1%

**Other please specify**

1. Member of SMT at Yale College (merging with Deeside College in Aug 2013)
2. Sixth Form Student (14)
3. Parent of three ex-pupils, previous High School Governor, grand-parent of prospective pupils.
4. Supervise Tiddlers Playgroup.
5. Concerned grandparents and tax payers.
6. 5X60 Officer FCC
7. Supervisor Cleaner
8. Position not specified. (4)
9. Flintshire Youth/Community Employee
10. Trainee Teacher
11. School Nurse Team Leader and Nurse Practice Teacher
12. Student Governor, John Summers High School
13. Cleaner at John Summers Campus and Queensferry CP
14. Grandparent (6)
15. Cleaner (campus) & Connah's Quay High School
16. I have friends and family that attend both schools.
17. Undergraduate applying for High School Teacher Training.
18. parent of nursery pupil

## ADOLYGIAD YSGOLION 2012

### Ardal Queensferry, Shotton a Chei Connah

#### Ysgol Uwchradd Cei Connah a John Summers - Ffurflen Ymateb

*1 received by 30/04/12*

#### **DEWIS 1 - Codi adeilad newydd ar gyfer Ysgol Uwchradd John Summers (ysgol 11-16 a chanolfan Ôl-16 yn Ysgol Uwchradd Cei Connah)**

##### **Q1 I ba raddau ydych chi'n cytuno â Dewis 1? (Ticiwch un blwch yn unig)**

Cytuno'n gryf	=	0	0.0%
Tueddu i gytuno	=	0	0.0%
Nid wyf yn cytuno na'n anghytuno	=	1	100.0%
Tueddu i anghytuno	=	0	0.0%
Anghytuno'n gryf	=	0	0.0%

##### **Q2 I'n helpu ni i ddeall pam mae pobl yn cytuno neu'n anghytuno â Dewis 1, rhowch grynodedb byr o'ch rhesymau**

No responses

##### **Q3 Os ydych chi o blaid Dewis 1, beth ydych chi'n credu y byddai angen ei wneud i sicrhau y bydd yn llwyddo? Pa broblemau lleol fyddai angen eu hystyried?**

No responses

#### **DEWIS 2 - Ailwampio adeilad presennol Ysgol Uwchradd John Summers (ysgol 11-16 a chanolfan Ôl-16 yn Ysgol Uwchradd Cei Connah).**

##### **Q4 I ba raddau ydych chi'n cytuno â Dewis 2? (Ticiwch un blwch yn unig)**

Cytuno'n gryf	=	0	0.0%
Tueddu i gytuno	=	0	0.0%
Nid wyf yn cytuno na'n anghytuno	=	1	100.0%
Tueddu i anghytuno	=	0	0.0%
Anghytuno'n gryf	=	0	0.0%

##### **Q5 I'n helpu ni i ddeall pam mae pobl yn cytuno neu'n anghytuno â Dewis 2, rhowch grynodedb byr o'ch rhesymau.**

No responses

##### **Q6 Os ydych chi o blaid Dewis 2, beth ydych chi'n credu y byddai angen ei wneud i sicrhau y bydd yn llwyddo? Pa broblemau lleol fyddai angen eu hystyried?**

No responses

#### **DEWIS 3 - Datblygu cyfleusterau 3-16 yn Ysgol Uwchradd John Summers a chanolfan Ôl-16 yn Ysgol Uwchradd Cei Connah**

##### **Q7 I ba raddau ydych chi'n cytuno â Dewis 3? (Ticiwch un blwch yn unig)**

Cytuno'n gryf	=	1	100.0%
Tueddu i gytuno	=	0	0.0%
Nid wyf yn cytuno na'n anghytuno	=	0	0.0%
Tueddu i anghytuno	=	0	0.0%
Anghytuno'n gryf	=	0	0.0%

**Q8 I'n helpu ni i ddeall pam mae pobl yn cytuno neu'n anghytuno â Dewis 3, rhowch grynodedb byr o'ch rhesymau.**

1. Dwi'n credu bod yr opsiwn yma'n Cynrychioli dull arloesiol o drosglwyddo addysg sy'n ffit i'r unfed ganrif ar hugain. Mae'r opsiwn yn cefnogi dilyniant myfyrwyr, Cynlluniadau Cwricwlwm, rheolaeth effeithiol a gwerth mewn arian. Mewn rhinflas, mae'n dileu'r holl anhawsterau sy'n gysylltiedig â'r broses o drawsnewidiadau. Wrth gwrs, bydd yr uchad on yn bosib gyda un corff llywodraethu ac un strwythr rheoli.

**Q9 Os ydych chi o blaid Dewis 3, beth ydych chi'n credu y byddai angen ei wneud i sicrhau y bydd yn llwyddo? Pa broblemau lleol fyddai angen eu hystyried?**

2. Bysai adeilad Newydd gyda cyfleusterau i bobl a anhawsterau yn beth da i'n weld!

**DEWIS 4 - Uno Ysgol Uwchradd John Summers ac Ysgol Uwchradd Cei Connah gan ddefnyddio'r safleoedd presennol. (Un pennaeth ac un corff llywodraethu a fyddai'n golygu cau'r ddwy ysgol yn dechnegol ac agor un ysgol newydd ar y safleoedd presennol).**

**Q10 I ba raddau ydych chi'n cytuno â Dewis 4? (Ticiwch un blwch yn unig)**

Cytuno'n gryf	=	0	0.0%
Tueddu i gytuno	=	0	0.0%
Nid wyf yn cytuno na'n anghytuno	=	0	0.0%
Tueddu i anghytuno	=	0	0.0%
Anghytuno'n gryf	=	1	100.0%

**Q11 I'n helpu ni i ddeall pam mae pobl yn cytuno neu'n anghytuno â Dewis 4, rhowch grynodedb byr o'ch rhesymau.**

No responses

**Q12 Os ydych chi o blaid Dewis 4, beth ydych chi'n credu y byddai angen ei wneud i sicrhau y bydd yn llwyddo? Pa broblemau lleol fyddai angen eu hystyried?**

No responses

**Q12c Enw:**

1. LL65 4SN

**Q13 I ba ysgol mae'ch ymateb yn ymwneud yn bennaf â hi? Ticiwch yr ysgolion perthnasol**

Ysgol Uwchradd John Summers	1	100.0%
Ysgol Bryn Deva	0	0.0%
Custom House Lane	0	0.0%
Ysgol Gynradd Golftyn	0	0.0%
Ysgol Gynradd Gwepira	0	0.0%

Babanod Dee Road	0	0.0%
Ysgol Uwchradd Cei Connah	0	0.0%
Ysgol Gynradd Queensferry	0	0.0%
Ysgol Gynradd Sealand	0	0.0%
Ysgol Gynradd Sant Ethelwold	0	0.0%
Ysgol Iau Taliesin	0	0.0%
Babanod Shotton	0	0.0%

**Q14 Ticiwch isod y disgrifiad sy'n berthnasol i chi**

Rhiant neu ofalwr disgybl ysgol uwchradd	0	0.0%
Athro/Athrawes (uwchradd)	1	100.0%
Staff ysgol (uwchradd)	0	0.0%
Llywodraethwr ysgol uwchradd	0	0.0%
Rhiant neu ofalwr disgybl ysgol gynradd	0	0.0%
Athro/Athrawes (cynradd)	0	0.0%
Staff ysgol (cynradd)	0	0.0%
Llywodraethwr ysgol gynradd	0	0.0%

**Arall Nodwch**

No responses.

**Flintshire County Council**

# **Lifelong Learning**

**Area Schools Review 2012**

**Holywell High School**

**Responses received by 30/04/12 = English 19 / Welsh 0**

## **Final Report**

## Area Schools Review 2012

### Holywell High School Consultation Form Responses.

19 received by 30/04/12

#### OPTION 1 – Reduce the size of Holywell High School.

##### Q1 How strongly do you agree or disagree with OPTION 1 (please tick ONE box only)

Strongly Agree	=	0	0.0%
Tend to Agree	=	0	0.0%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	=	3	15.8%
Tend to Disagree	=	3	15.8%
Strongly Disagree	=	11	57.9%

##### Q2 To help us understand why people agree or disagree with OPTION 1 please provide a short summary of your reasoning (250 words maximum)

1. Think it's inappropriate to support renting parts of the school which would be unused by pupils - to private tenants, also money saved on reduced utility costs would be far out weighed by the initial £13m the council would have to spend.
2. I would like to know whose idea it was to change the catchment area for schools. When my eldest son moved from Ysgol Bro Carmel Primary School to high school he was only entitled to attend the local high school which was Holywell. Now that my youngest son is in high school the numbers have dramatically reduced (approx 60 pupils for Sept 2011) due to the change in freedom of choice. I think that all high schools should be to the same standards, and if this where the case then the local children would not have to move to the schools outside of where they live. Personally I cannot see private tenants wanting to rent offices within the school. You only have to look at Holywell high street to see all the empty shops and buildings.
3. I cannot see private tenants wanting to rent room within the high school.
4. This not an option for Holywell as a Town. It requires much support socially and economically to regenerate. Employment is often low skilled and there is a need to encourage employers that require higher skills levels to establish their businesses in the locality. A new school shows that both the WG and LA are serious and sincere about tackling poverty and social disadvantage.
5. Don't like the idea of part of the school being used for office accommodation for private tenants.
6. This will not help the students of Holywell. What the students needs is new facilities.
7. Existing problems within the building would still need to be dealt with. Reducing the size of the building would not help to address the issue of the falling roll in the high school.

##### New responses received since 26/03/12.

8. School modernisation should be about precisely that this is a costly option essentially aimed at reducing capacity by removing surplus places simply to save money. This option would be an abject failure of the LEA>
9. Reducing the size of the school will have little impact on the opportunities of young people in Holywell; it will remain an old building with high maintenance costs. There is not prospects of improving resources, aspirations and no opportunities for the local community to utilise a community based school.
10. As an employee at Holywell High school I am obviously concerned that a reduction in size of the school could result in significant job losses. I do not think that this is the best option for the pupils at our school which is becoming increasingly run down and

will ultimately be very expensive to maintain to an acceptable standard. I also think that this option will encourage parents to move their children to other schools where they perceive better facilities may be on offer.

11. This option does not offer any change or potential transformation. Holywell's children, young people and community, in general, need to be valued with new learning provision.
12. No investment in High school. No change for Primary schools
13. Holywell High school is an important part of the community in Holywell. Reducing it will be seen as a way of making the school seem unimportant and making education seem irrelevant. Parents will decide not to send their children to Holywell as reducing the capacity will be seen as a precursor to closing the school completely.
14. The school should not be reduced in size as the size of the school indicates the amount of pupils that can be allocated and every pupil living in the catchment area needs to have the chance to attend their nearest school. If the school was reduced in size it would never be able to grow due to size.
15. The current building at Holywell High School is insufficient. The building layout is inappropriate and not designed for a modern, 21st century school. Fear of staff redundancies evident with this option.

**Q3 If you support Option 1 what do you think would be needed to make it work? What local issues would need to be considered?**

No Responses received.

**OPTION 2 - Build a new High School for pupils aged 11-18, together with a new primary school to replace Ysgol Perth y Terfyn and Ysgol y Fron**

**Q4 How strongly do you agree or disagree with OPTION 2 (please tick ONE box only)**

Strongly Agree	=	14	73.7%
Tend to Agree	=	3	15.8%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	=	1	5.3%
Tend to Disagree	=	1	5.3%
Strongly Disagree	=	0	0.0%

**Q5 To help us understand why people agree or disagree with OPTION 2 please provide a short summary of your reasoning (250 words maximum)**

1. Don't particularly like the idea of primary and secondary schools on existing HHS site - the poor people who live on Strand Est. already have nightmare of traffic from school buses, cars, taxis and delivery vans also £34m cost to council will no doubt come from council taxes which is already high.
2. I sent my son to Holywell High because they had a sixth form. I strongly agree that there should be a sixth form for continuity. The teachers already know the pupils.
3. I decided to send my 11 year old son to Holywell High School because it was his the local high school and due to the fact that they had a sixth form. I don't see why these children should have to move school just to attend another sixth form.
4. If the LA and WG are serious about reducing poverty etc then having local Post 16 provision is crucial in such a socially disadvantaged area. Also, Post 16 facilities often exceed what is simply a classroom and for adult education to take place the facilities need to be available. Also, the Primary Schools would benefit from becoming one School not Infants and junior and also having access to playing field will be fantastic. Finally, purpose built parking, drop off and access will benefit both Schools, not just the Primary Schools.
5. I agree with this option mainly because pupils can continue their education in the sixth form without disruption.

6. All schools in the area would be at the same location. I also believe that school age should be compulsory to 18yrs.
7. This will greatly aid all children/young adults in the area. It is not right that many people will have to pay for a bus and travel a great distance to attend their education. I think keeping the sixth form will encourage students to stay on and not be deterred by the prospect of costs and transport issues.
8. A new learning campus would benefit the community and there should be sixth form provision in the area. A new school building would hopefully address the falling roll issue. Shared facilities between the primary and secondary schools would save money.

**New responses received since 26/03/12.**

9. AS THIS IS THE ONLY OPTION FOR CHILDREN TO CONTINUE THEIR EDUCATION IN 6TH FORM AT THE SCHOOL, I FEEL CHILDREN AND PARENTS WILL BE PUT OFF COMING TO HOLYWELL KNOWING THE CHILD WILL HAVE TO LEAVE AT 16 AND MOVE TO ANOTHER AREA TO CONTINUE THEIR STUDIES WITH OTHER TEACHERS AND STAFF, THEY SHOULD HAVE TO OPTION OF CONTINUING WHERE THEY ARE AS THEY DO NOW. I WOULD NOT HAVE SENT MY CHILDREN TO HOLYWELL HIGH IF THE DID NOT HAVE A 6TH FORM.
10. WG. Documents refer to aspirational policies. The need to improve long term educational uptake and tackle social deprivation. This option would go a long way in that direction. It would have enormous social amelioration impact. Not just for the intended learning community but for the whole image and self worth of Holywell and surrounds. If WG and Flintshire are serious about dealing with the long term Multiple Deprivation Index rankings of Holywell and surrounds through self betterment their commitment must be wholehearted. People in this area must be shown the powers that be have faith in them. That wholeheartedness resides in post-16 provision. A councillor for 12 years deprived part of Holywell I know only too well how low aspirations and feelings of self worth can be. I am certain far more pupils will consider post-16 education if that provision is local and locality is acknowledged by WG as a real need. Option 2 is the full blood option where by Flintshire and WG can demonstrate forcefully to the people of Holywell and surrounds their long term commitment to a fundamental uplift in learning, achievement and employability in the knowledge based economy. Excessive travel to education should be avoided. This represents wasted time for pupils, wasted finances over the long term and fuel inefficiency. Any financial analysis of the cost differential between a school to 16 only or topost-16 should included travel costing and carbon footprint analysis. What would be the per pupil fuel/carbon saving over a 50 year period (it is unlikely a new school would follow on in that time frame)? The once in a lifetime opportunity is there for Flintshire as this school would be part of a twin towers approach to Deeside post -16 provision where cooperation and mutual complementary could provide massive educational muscle power for generations to come. There needs to be some boldness in this development.
11. A new school would benefit the learners at Holywell High School and the Holywell primary schools, enabling young people to access education fit for the 21st Century. A new school/campus could potentially support the local community and involve adult learning, especially if it has a sixth form provision. 6th Form provision will also help raise the aspirations of young people in a community first area, supporting young people who wish to access higher learning but would be unable to afford transport to a sixth form centre elsewhere; another factor to consider is the length of a day if a sixth form pupil has to travel. To close the poverty gap (a welsh government priority) young people in deprived areas should be encouraged to improve their prospects through education; making it more difficult to study by taking away sixth for provision will make this very difficult.
12. This constitutes a once in a lifetime opportunity to transform learning in Holywell for the children, young people and wider community. With a blank piece of paper it affords the opportunity to 'get things right' and, as far as is practically possible, to have 'future proofed' schools. Schools built in an entirely inclusive and sustainable



way with all likely to use the schools being involved in their design. Retention of a post-16 presence in Holywell is highly desirable in order to tackle the poverty attainment gap and to ensure that all have the opportunity to aspire to post-16 learning and to undertake it locally. A community learning facility with built-in design flexibility and abundant and easily accessible new technologies will provide a learning hub of truly 21st century proportions.

13. New and improved facilities for all children in Holywell. Keeping the sixth form option at Holywell important to retain students in higher education. Many students will not travel to study at other schools
14. A new building providing a modern accessible school for students aged 3-18 will raise the aspirations of the learners involved and the local community. Holywell is an area of low aspirations due to low incomes and lack of jobs, a new build will bring Holywell back into people's minds as an important part of Flintshire. Everyone I have spoken to has expressed a wish for the High School to offer education up to 18 as local transport links are so poor that it is easy for learners to 'give up' on continuing education post 16. The sixth form currently offers an excellent extension to the provision offered at Key Stage 4. From personal experience my children have all attended this school, my son left sixth form and went to Oxford Uni where he obtained a First class degree and is now studying for his PHD. My daughter is now in employment in Kent after completing her 2:1 degree and my twin girls are going to uni in September after enjoying an amazing time supported by teachers who know them and have been available to them every step of the way.
15. I like the idea of a new school. It will be sad to see the old school gone but everyone has to move with the times, so as not to get left behind with new trends and modern ideas. The pupils of Holywell deserve a new school with all the new facilities that would come with it. With good management the high school and the two primary schools all on one campus could be an interesting opportunity for Holywell and the local community. It could bring much needed jobs into the area. We are very lucky that Holywell High School has beautiful views that are taken for granted, and is ideally situated for a wind turbine to be put in place at the same time. I feel we should have the high school 11-18 as we need to keep the older pupils with us rather than loose them to others schools. I feel pupils will want to come to a new school and will not want to miss out on the option of remaining in that school through to age 18 and therefore should not have to leave to go to another school to complete their education.
16. A brand new school would be a fantastic opportunity for the children of Holywell and for the image of Holywell in general. It would allow teachers to use up to date teaching strategies and techniques which would improve the level of teaching. It would also provide an environment for pupils to be proud of. Sixth form is vital in this area of deprivation to help develop their skills and prospects. I fear poor choices and lack of support for pupils if the sixth form is moved.
17. The continuous support and education of our pupils, who have confidence with their teachers as they will have built up a good report, by teaching them from the beginning of high school.

**Q6 If you support Option 2 what do you think would be needed to make it work? What local issues would need to be considered?**

1. Access to the school would need to be looked at. I drop my son off at school each morning and the volume of traffic is pretty bad. If you have two school on that site the volume of traffic would double making access in the mornings and evenings even more of a problem.
2. You would have to consider the volume of traffic. I drop my son off at school each morning and the traffic is pretty bad. Access to the school would need to be considered if there was to be a high school and a primary school.
3. The funding would have to be solely LA - loan would be needed. Proper facilities to encourage community use of post 16 facilities would help. A Sports Hall would be needed to reduce the need to visit the Leisure centre and possibly increase leisure capacity and facilities.

4. To make sure that the younger pupils were separate from the older pupils.
5. Ensure all children have access to the latest technology.
6. Providing transport and reducing the impact of disruption to the students education but also not impact other schools by crowding them with our students.
7. The building should cater for other needs within the community such as adult education. It could be used as an opportunity to promote a specialism within the school.

**New responses received since 26/03/12.**

8. Adequate funding which must be vigorously pursued. Infrastructure adjustments fully funded. Development of centre of excellence status for the school. 1. Ensure the funding is established to cover the shortfall between what appears so far the LEA preferred option of a multilevel school ending at 16 year old provision and our community's preferred option of provision up to post 16. Tough funding negotiation with WG which must be reminded of its stated wish to make real and lasting social improvement through enhanced learning skills. Other funding avenues to support this paradigm shift in education in Holywell must be identified and pursued with vigour. What Euro-funding is available, what industry and commerce funding sources are available? The community of Holywell looks to Flintshire to go the extra mile to ensure long term top notch educational provision for the next two generations and beyond at this end of the county. 2. The LEA must adopt and forcefully portray a whole hearted enthusiasm and commitment to this project i.e. Option 2. 3. The school needs to develop a strong specialism base to become a centre of excellence. IT potentially and that in new directions. Much was made recently of the computer code writer shortfall. We should be able to bridge that gap and go beyond in time. Forward thinking and guidance needs to come from the LEA in curriculum development. 4. Ensure full and active community involvement in extended learning by creating appropriate packages for day one of the new school. 5. Ensure full community participation in the widest sense including social activities based at the school, encouraging use by groups and organisations especially with a learning bias. Such groups need to be involved too in the actual planning phase. 6. Look at the provision of top-up courses for aspirational life long learners, which will require research of the needs of groups individuals, businesses etc. The new school needs to become a power house for improvement though educational opportunity. The facilities should be used to their fullest potential to maximise return on the outlay.
9. Consult with the local community/businesses, what would they like to see from an adult learning centre? What skills does Holywell need? Approach the Welsh Assembly government to look at this option in relation to funding, if there is evidence that a sixth form centre and adult learning centre on a shared campus will help reduce the poverty gap then the government would be stupid to not agree to fund this. Lots of collaboration between the teaching community and the building contractors/architect, if a cheap building is created it will be a wasted opportunity. Ellesmere Port Academy comes to mind as instead of a forward looking modern campus they have built an office block for children - this would be a disaster, working with the current schools to develop a modern learning environment is very important.
10. In order to make this option work I think that the schools would have to be carefully segregated. This option would be an excellent opportunity to have a learning centre which could offer access for learning to the wider community of Holywell which geographically is furthest away from the main centres in the county such as Deeside College. local issues would be site access which currently is not ideal, the strand being narrow and regularly double parked.
11. Initially some exploration of what the post-16 hub will look like and how it will link to the post-16 hub located in Connah's Quay is needed. This will enable the 'teasing out' of how this new form of educational provision will be. Dialogue with the Welsh Government [WG] can then ensue in order to explore if the funding agreed in principle for Option 3 can be agreed for Option 2. Dialogue as well with other potential partners will need to be explored: partners such as Deeside College or local, or indeed distant, universities or organisations like the Royal Society for the encouragement of Arts, Manufactures and Commerce [RSA]. It is also crucial to

explore how new technologies can be utilised to enable transformational learning to take place so that learning is dynamic, mobile, connected, inclusive, inter-generational and community enhancing and regenerative. The points in Question 9 are also relevant here.

12. Funding is an important issue as the Welsh Government have only mentioned funding for Option 3. Ensuring the school can be used as a community facility all year round is important, offering adult education classes, drop ins, a community theatre working with the local leisure centre to offer alternative sport provision. Also offering the after school/holiday club that runs successfully at Perth y Terfyn a base within the new school to ensure that all needs are met. It is important that all of the community is involved in the creation of the new school to develop a real sense of ownership which again helps raise the mood of an area that has previously been neglected as we are in the north western part of Flintshire which is often forgotten.
13. Holywell would need support from parents and the local and surrounding areas. There would need to be Community involvement with all aspects of plans. Working closely with Holywell town. Everyone needs to be behind the idea, feeling that their views are listened to and support each other. Issues that would need to be considered are how the local residents will be affected by the school being moved closer to their properties and whether the entrance to the school was being moved. The noise of the pupils during break time. The bus route into school.
14. A positive attitude towards a new school by all stakeholders is required to help improve the image of the school. Staff input is required to discover the requirements wanted to help produce a successful new school.
15. Better facilities. Communication and publication about the school to the community.

### **OPTION 3 - Build a new High School for pupils aged 11-16, together with a new primary school to replace Ysgol Perth y Terfyn and Ysgol y Fron**

#### **Q7 How strongly do you agree or disagree with OPTION 3 (please tick ONE box only)**

Strongly Agree	=	1	5.3%
Tend to Agree	=	6	31.6%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	=	1	5.3%
Tend to Disagree	=	5	26.3%
Strongly Disagree	=	3	15.8%

#### **Q8 To help us understand why people agree or disagree with OPTION 3 please provide a short summary of your reasoning (250 words maximum)**

1. Lesser of 3 evils!! Like the option of additional resources for community.
2. I would agree to this option if it included the sixth form for pupils.
3. A sixth form is very important for the local area. If the sixth form went students would have to get/find transport and costs to attend elsewhere. I think this is a big deterrent for students looking into further educations.
4. A new high school is needed but losing the sixth form would not benefit local pupils who would have to travel to continue their education.

#### **New responses received since 26/03/12.**

5. Having support option 2 in the strongest terms the only logical position is to strongly disagree here. This represents a poor second best illustrating a half hearted commitment to the people of Holywell. I sincerely trust that every effort will be made to find the funding necessary for option 2 as I fear option 3 will not achieve the improvements in self worth, aspiration, achievement and employability so clear in the WG's own aspirational documents. The economic and social benefits will then be less

than might be realised by option 2. In the event that option 3 is adopted, there will need to be a serious improvement in infrastructure both physical elements and services, which holds true too for option 2. This must be done through sensitive consultation with residents in the school vicinity to ensure planned improvements come about with the least possible difficulty. Comments made in response to question 6 are valid here too.\*

6. I think the joining of both Ysgol Perth y Terfyn and Ysgol y Fron and building a new primary school on the site of a new build high school for 11-16 year olds would benefit the local community greatly. Also I think Flintshire would benefit from a new Post -16 facility, although not sure about it being in Connah's Quay. This would be too close to the college.
7. A new school would benefit the learners at Holywell High School and the Holywell primary schools, enabling young people to access education fit for the 21st Century. If done correctly and involving the professional knowledge and opinions of the teachers at Ysgol y Fron and Perth y Terfyn then a new campus with the latest in teaching and technology will enable the future of the Holywell area to have young people who are skilled and educated enough to build the local economy and drive improvements across the region.
8. Clearly with £15.5 million of funding agreed in principle by WG this affords a once in a lifetime opportunity for Holywell. With developments that will ensure a post-16 hub, linked to the one located in Connah's Quay, this is a very strong option and there is some crossover with Option 2. Once again starting with a blank page and getting the best intelligence and knowledge on how learning should look in the 21st century means that there is the chance to 'get things right': ensuring sustainability, future proofing & including community wide access and benefit from the new schools. Holywell will have the potential of becoming a learning town equipping everyone with skills in lifelong learning and fulfilling people's passions and ambitions.
9. The school will not work if it does not have a sixth form, parents will choose not to send their children to the school from an early age because of the lack of sixth form they will instead look at other local primary schools who can guarantee admission to other high schools with post 16 provision. This will not help address the problems of low numbers that the new school is looking at tackling.
10. A brand new school would be a fantastic opportunity for the children of Holywell and for the image of Holywell in general. It would allow teachers to use up to date teaching strategies and techniques which would improve the level of teaching. It would also provide an environment for pupils to be proud of. Sixth form is vital in this area of deprivation to help develop their skills and prospects. I fear poor choices and lack of support for pupils if the sixth form is moved.
11. To keep the children in the same education stream, knowing the teachers will have the support and continuous knowledge about the children. It's important to keep them until they are 18 in the same school.

**Q9 If you support Option 3 what do you think would be needed to make it work? What local issues would need to be considered?**

1. Still don't like the idea of primary on same site as mentioned for option 2. Although if there is going to be additional resources for additional learning why not keep the 6th form? Seems stupid to move it to Connah's Quay which is some distance from Holywell!!!

**New responses received since 26/03/12.**

2. Good links with local community groups would benefit this option. Local issues would be the need for the after school club/holiday club which is already at Perth y terfyn to be moved to the new school site. This is a great asset and would enable parents/carers to continue to work and so help local economy. Also the breakfast club at Ysgol y Fron would need to be incorporated into the new primary school, as this is

also a great benefit for parents and ensure children have a good, healthy breakfast to start the day.

3. Lots of collaboration between the teaching community and the building contractors/architect, if a cheap building is created it will be a wasted opportunity. Ellesmere Port Academy comes to mind as instead of a forward looking modern campus they have built an office block for children - this would be a disaster, working with the current schools to develop a modern learning environment is very important.
4. In my view this is the second most desirable option for similar reasons outlined above, however I do think that we will be in danger of significant job losses and parents may opt to move their children to a secondary school where they can see their entire education from ages 11 -18 through on one site.
5. Those who will be using the new schools must be involved in discussions about the design ideally through interactive and participative workshops in order to harness their feelings, thoughts and ideas. Experience of other new build schools in the UK and throughout the world should also be sought as well as inputs from those well versed in school design and also those au fait with effective pedagogies for the 21st century. It is obvious that serious consideration must be taken of the infrastructure around the site of the new schools to ensure safe access for all. Provision needs to be put in place for possible extension to the schools' buildings should the demographic increase.

#### Q9c Postcode

1. CH4 0HY	8. CH8 7BR
2. CH5 3HR	9. CH8 7DG
3. CH6 5SE	10. CH8 7EQ
4. CH6 6JZ	11. CH8 7LG
5. CH65 3BY	12. CH8 7QA
6. CH8 7AW (2)	13. CH8 7TZ
7. CH8 7BH	14. CH8 7UU
	15. CH8 7UV.

#### Q10 Is your response most relevant to....? please tick all that apply

Holywell High	19	100.0%
Ysgol Yr Esgob	0	0.0%
Ysgol Trelogan	0	0.0%
Trelawnyd School	0	0.0%
Ysgol y Llan	0	0.0%
Ysgol Bro Carmel	0	0.0%
Ysgol Bryn Pennant	0	0.0%
Ysgol Glan Aber	0	0.0%
Ysgol Brynffordd	0	0.0%
St Ethelwold's Primary School	0	0.0%
Lixwm School	0	0.0%
Ysgol Bryn Garth	0	0.0%
Ysgol Maes Glas	0	0.0%
Ysgol Gronant	0	0.0%

#### Q11 Are you....? Please tick all that apply

Parent or carer of High School pupil	9	47.4%
High School Teacher	7	36.8%
High School Staff	2	10.5%
School Governor High School	3	15.8%
Parent or carer of Primary School pupil	2	10.5%

Primary School Teacher	0	0.0%
Primary School Staff	0	0.0%
School Governor Primary School	0	0.0%

**Other please specify**

1. Local resident also
2. Town Councillor. Former Mayor.

**Flintshire County Council**

# **Lifelong Learning**

**Area Schools Review 2012**

## **Ysgol Perth y Terfyn and Ysgol y Fron**

**Responses received by 30/04/12 = English 3 / Welsh 0**

# **Final Report**

## Area Schools Review 2012

### Ysgol Perth y Terfyn and Ysgol y Fron Consultation Form Responses.

*3 received by 30/04/12*

#### **OPTION 1 – Reduce the size of Holywell High School**

**Q1 How strongly do you agree or disagree with OPTION 1 (please tick ONE box only)**

Strongly Agree	=	1	33.3%
Tend to Agree	=	0	0.0%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	=	1	33.3%
Tend to Disagree	=	0	0.0%
Strongly Disagree	=	0	0.0%

**Q2 To help us understand why people agree or disagree with OPTION 1 please provide a short summary of your reasoning (250 words maximum)**

No responses received.

**Q3 If you support Option 1 what do you think would be needed to make it work? What local issues would need to be considered?**

No responses received.

#### **OPTION 2 – Build a new High School for pupils aged 11-18, together with a new primary school to replace Ysgol Perth y Terfyn and Ysgol y Fron**

**Q4 How strongly do you agree or disagree with OPTION 2 (please tick ONE box only)**

Strongly Agree	=	0	0.0%
Tend to Agree	=	0	0.0%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	=	0	0.0%
Tend to Disagree	=	0	0.0%
Strongly Disagree	=	0	0.0%

**Q5 To help us understand why people agree or disagree with OPTION 2 please provide a short summary of your reasoning (250 words maximum)**

1. Why is there no option to modernise and extend Ysgol Perth Y Terfyn - there is land next to the school and the building itself is in a good state of repair needing some external and internal modernisation and extending only to accommodate the junior school. It would give continuity of the school being on that site as there would likely to be strong opposition by residents in the area to any other development. Behind the school is woodland which is currently being made great use of and is safe and easily accessed providing a great resource for primary aged children. Access onto the school site is already established. The location of the high school is off putting and the distance from the Holway area of Holywell will mean families having to attend other schools when there has been a long tradition of children from long standing families from the Holway attending PYT. Extending and modernising PYT has to be a much cheaper option

**Q6 If you support Option 2 what do you think would be needed to make it work? What local issues would need to be considered?**



No responses received.

**OPTION 3 - Build a new High School for pupils aged 11-16, together with a new primary school to replace Ysgol Perth y Terfyn and Ysgol y Fron**

**Q7 How strongly do you agree or disagree with OPTION 3 (please tick ONE box only)**

Strongly Agree	=	1	100.0%
Tend to Agree	=	0	0.0%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	=	0	0.0%
Tend to Disagree	=	0	0.0%
Strongly Disagree	=	0	0.0%

**Q8 To help us understand why people agree or disagree with OPTION 3 please provide a short summary of your reasoning (250 words maximum)**

1. The facilities would be offered on a larger site such as this would benefit all age groups. The combined infant and junior school benefits more able Yr 2's and less able Yr 3's in a 2/3 split class. It also makes KS2-3 transition easier as shared facilities makes transition less daunting.

**New responses received since 26/03/12.**

2. I think the joining of both Ysgol Perth y Terfyn and Ysgol y Fron and building a new primary school on the site of a new build high school for 11-16 year olds would benefit the local community greatly. Also I think Flintshire would benefit from a new Post 16 facility, although not sure about it being in Connah's Quay. This would not be too close to the college.
3. Seems an expensive option when is there doesn't really appear to be a need for a primary school to share a high school site

**Q9 If you support Option 3 what do you think would be needed to make it work? What local issues would need to be considered?**

1. The provision of breakfast club and after school club would be essential for working parents. This would ensure further patronage of the school as otherwise pupils would have to attend different schools with after school provision.

**New responses received since 26/03/12.**

2. Good links with local community groups would benefit this option. Local issues would be the need for the after school club/holiday club which is already at Perth y Terfyn to be moved to the new school site. This is a great asset and would enable parents/carers to continue to work and so help local economy. Also the breakfast club at Ysgol y Fron would need to be incorporated into the new primary school, a this is also a great benefit for parents and ensures children have a good, healthy breakfast to start he day.

**Q9c Postcode**

1. CH8 7BH
2. CH8 7BL
3. LL57 4RB

**Q10 Is your response most relevant to....? please tick all that apply**

Ysgol Perth y Terfyn	1	100.0%
Ysgol y Fron	1	100.0%

**Q11 Are you....? Please tick all that apply**

Parent or carer of Infant School pupil	1	100.0%
Infant School Teacher	0	0.0%
Infant School Staff	0	0.0%
Infant School Governor	0	0.0%
Parent or carer of Junior School pupil	0	0.0%
Junior School Teacher	0	0.0%
Junior School Staff	0	0.0%
Junior School Governor	0	0.0%

**Other please specify**

1. High School Parent