

# **Appendix A**

## **Holt Farm**

### **Summary of objection letters to Statutory Notices and itemised points of objection**

- 1. Letters to initial Statutory Notice posted 21/11/05.**
- 2. Letters to second Statutory Notice posted 07/04/06.**

**1. Initial Statutory Notice – posted 21/11/05.  
Summary of objection letters received.**

Letter No	Objection codes	Status	Signatures	Summary
100	1, 2	Local Resident	2	Moving of children to ensure continuous education. Age of school. Family History. Petition.
101	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	Grandparent	1	Age of school. Family History. Problems at other schools. Council tax. Consultation process. Petition. Effect on people.
151	5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22	MP	1	Consultation process. Inadequate response. Rejections. Information to MPs. Individual support. Affect on students, families and community. Loss of career or job relocation for staff. Affect on citizens. Affect on businesses. Guarantees. Special Needs. Freedom of choice. Quality of teaching. Rationale of choice by DMBC. Political representation. Extended services. Converted buildings. Alternative purposes. Funding. Birth rates. Immigration. Authority responsibilities.
154	6, 20, 21, 23, 24	Unknown	1	Press reports. Responses. Capacity utilisation. Birth rates. Predictions. Migration. Pupil distribution. Area Committee Meeting.
266	1, 5, 6, 17, 25, 26, 27	Parent / Carer	1	Alternative proposals. Viability of school. Birth rates. Status. Effect on other schools. New builds / Expansion. Cost savings. History. Plans for land. Effects on those involved.

267	6, 7, 9, 13, 16, 17, 19, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38	Parent / Carer	1	<p>Questions. Surplus places. Other LEAs. Statutory Notice. Consultation process. Merger. Annex. Jobs. Responses. School uniform. Suggestions / Alternatives. Special Needs facilities. Sure Start. Leadership. Events. Curriculum. Teaching methods. New consultation. Examples.</p>
272	4, 10, 11, 20, 21	Local Resident	1	<p>Annex / Integration. Attitude of other schools. Effect on children. Money saving. New build. Council tax. Birth rate. New development. Transport difficulties.</p>
273	6, 22, 26, 35, 37, 38	Parent / Carer	1	<p>Consultation process. Daily routines. Discipline. Other options. New consultation. Proposals. Cost saving. Uniform. Running of schools.</p>

**Initial Statutory Notice – posted 21/11/05.  
Itemised points of objection.**

Obj Code	Objection point
1	History is an integral part of our lives and important for future generations. Holt Farm is 100 years old. If the school closes, an important part of Halesowen will be lost.
2	A petition against closure of Holt Farm was submitted to the Council that spoke for the majority of people in Halesowen and the surrounding area. Does this not count for anything?
3	Children have moved to Holt Farm because of bad experiences at other schools. You now want to close Holt Farm and send children back to these schools. This is a backwards step for these children.
4	Do local people who pay council tax not matter? Your original comments in the Halesowen News were all about saving taxpayers money, but surely building a new school is a waste of this money as both Holt Farm and Hurst Green have recently had money spent on them.
5	I wish you could appreciate how local people feel about your plans and the stress you have caused. Change creates a delicate time in the lives of many people and it will be very difficult for students and their families, as well as the community as a whole, to adjust. Should these plans be accepted, students will be required to learn while adjusting to new environments and will face anxiety about change; the anxiety will create difficult amounts of stress that will affect learning.
6	No adequate response has been received from the original consultation. Questions, concerns and suggestions were ignored, and alternative proposals that were offered have not been considered at all. We came up with ideas that could have brought in both more pupils and finance, but we are not being given the chance to put any of these into operation. We also did a brilliant plan of action for the next couple of years, and should be given the opportunity to try and improve things. Do you ever intend to reply to all the letters and / or questions sent to you from various people during the consultation process?
7	You stated 11,000 consultation documents were made available yet only received 778 back and almost three quarters of these respondents rejected the Authority's plans. How were the consultation documents made available? Do you think it would have been better to send these to every Council taxpayer?
8	DMBC failed to inform all four Borough MPs of their plans until after informing the local media. This I believe shows total disdain for the office of Member of Parliament and for the constituents we represent.
9	Teachers, administrators, and support staff will all be affected with potential losses of careers or job relocation. If the merger goes ahead do you promise to safeguard every job?
10	Dudley citizens will be affected by the change in traffic flow, especially around Olive Hill Primary School where the difficulties caused by people transporting their children to school by car are obvious, and business owners will be affected by the reduction in customers.
11	I am curious to know if there is a guarantee that students will be able to attend the closest schools to those that are being closed. It is very hard for students to transfer into different schools, and it will presumably be difficult for the students from the closing schools to transfer in. Having a guarantee will provide a smooth transition and the least drastic amounts of change and will cause the least disruption in the communities. Even if Holt Farm is annexed to Olive Hill it will surely be difficult for the children of these two schools to integrate properly and it is very likely that it will become a "them and us" situation, especially as some Hurst Green parents have made it quite clear that they do not want the pupils from Holt Farm at their children's school. Can you imagine how these young children feel? As far as they are concerned they are wanted by no-one, and not knowing what will happen to them or where they will be going is extremely upsetting and unsettling.
12	Keeping the small schools provides a choice, which provides the best option for all students.
13	Teaching methods, and therefore the quality of teaching, can be very different when a teacher teaches a large class versus a small class. Do the two schools operate the

	same Curriculum? Do the two schools operate the same teaching methods?
14	I am curious to know how each of these schools was chosen. Although I have read the relevant documents it is hard to understand the rationale of choice as not all of the schools are losing pupils at a fast rate in fact one can point to other schools in the Borough whose rolls are falling faster.
15	In each case of the five schools earmarked for closure, their political representation at Council level is with an opposition party or in an area of high deprivation, minority ethnic concentration or on land which would release a high resale value. This is an unusual statistical anomaly which merits further investigation.
16	If the Holt Farm building is no longer a school, the role will be inherently different. Any converted buildings have different community roles. The needs of the community must be taken into account if the building is converted. If it turns out that Holt Farm must be converted then it must remain as a community centre and not be used for any other purpose or bulldozed in order to have the land sold. For example, have you decided where the ARC centre will be in the Halesowen Township? You could use Holt Farm for this. I would also like to reiterate and receive assurance that all monies saved through combining the schools should be reinvested into education and should not be used in other pursuits.
17	Has the Borough explored the option to use the available space in the schools for alternative purposes or is this an attempt simply to cut costs demonstrating that the planners understand the costs but not the value of the service that these schools provide? If available space is used in more creative ways, education money can be saved and the changes in the community will be the least drastic. Many other authorities have faced falling rolls and employed creative ways of using premises such as children's centres, Sure Starts and so on. These will offer the school a better status. I would like the Authority to confirm and show evidence that they have investigated this and other options such as federation as suggested by local parents. I believe demonstration of such studies is a requirement of the Ministry's guidelines also.
18	The Authority has not specified exactly where additional funding will come from in order to 'merge' and build new schools. Nor does the Authority specify land available for new schools. Therefore, I ask the SOC to investigate where the funding will come from in order to merge and build the schools as well as to assist in the transition and identify land and timescales for the new schools.
19	The Borough's track record is less than sparkling when considering that its plans to merge two Church of England schools in Halesowen, St John the Baptist and Hasbury have been rejected by the Education Minister twice already. Can the Authority guarantee this will not happen to their plans this time around? Have there been any other annexes that have worked successfully? Can you provide examples?
20	While the annual birth rate in Dudley has gradually fallen from a peak of 4,116 in 1990, this falls in line with the cyclical nature of birth rates. ONS projected population numbers between the present and 2028 suggest that the population decline reaches a low point and then rebounds afterwards; supporting that the rise and decline of birth rates are cyclical. Since the decline will level off, how reliable is the 2010 prediction? How has this forecast been made?
21	Birth rates are not always an adequate predictor of future school numbers. For example, the numbers provided do not take into account a change in population based on people staying in Dudley longer and an increase in immigration which will add to the population should the objectives of the Black Country Study be achieved. There are a number of new estates e.g. Highfields, Drew's Holloway, which will attract more families to the area.
22	I do not believe that the Authority has actually taken on board their responsibilities to the community and that the consultation was merely a paper exercise. It seems that "consultation" was never the aim of the game and that it was a done deal right from the beginning. How otherwise can everybody have ignored all the proposals put forward, particularly when they are in line with all your strategies laid out in the primary review? That really doesn't make any sense at all you have to agree on that!!
23	We also need to know about the distribution of pupils amongst local schools, i.e. how has this been affected by the 'free market' approach? Is this policy leading to an imbalance between schools? The Council's 'solution' of sending pupils from closed schools to neighbouring schools is bound to exacerbate any imbalance already

	existing. The Council will obviously save money by reducing Headteacher and other salaries, but if there is an optimum size, is it not likely that the solution will cause this to be exceeded?
24	There has been a forum to discuss Holt Farm Primary School. I would have liked to attend but knew nothing about it. Was any attempt made to publicise this meeting? I saw no advertisement for an Area Committee meeting in the press.
25	I understand it has come as a real shock to the Headteacher at Hurst Green Primary when the news was broken to her by the Halesowen News. Again I understand they intend to object to the plans, likewise the other schools involved. Is it any wonder?
26	The original plan was for the council to save £1 million, well how can this be when you intend to now build new schools / or new buildings on existing schools. When you put these buildings up on current schools, that ensures a loss in playground or playing fields, the children do not have enough as it is. Therefore the money you will now spend on new buildings far outweighs the money you will save losing 5 Headteachers. The £8 million Dudley has secured to rebuild 2 primary schools gives me an estimation of £20 million pounds for 5 schools. Basic maths tells me it does not save money, it will take years to recoup the monies.
27	In one of the committee meetings the question was asked about the plans for the land, it was said that someone had already made an unexpected offer for land at some schools but that could not possibly be looked at now.
28	In the SOP 2003 - 2008 it was identified that schools had surplus places in area 4, the highest being Caslon at 33.6 %, yet you propose to close Holt Farm with 27.5%. Why is this?
29	It appears that you have chosen three schools that border other LEA's. Is it because they have large imports of children from Wolverhampton, Staffs and Sandwell?
30	Why within a few days of being placed at the school did you remove the Statutory Notices?
31	After the first part of the consultation process you still propose to close all five schools. This indicates all five schools presented no arguments / alternatives to allow them to remain. Did you actually look at the information provided to you by the individual schools and treat them on their own individual merit or just take the decision 'on block'?
32	What happens now if Mrs Partridge at Hurst Green or the Governing Body object to the merger?
33	Is this actually a merger or just a filtration system?
34	If the merger goes ahead in what year do you intend to close the annex? Will the Annex eventually turn into a ghost building?
35	What is the actual intention for the school uniform, and will you pay for it? A lot of parents rely on hand me downs through family or friends, and cannot afford to keep swapping and changing.
36	With regards to the Schools Governing Body, if the school does turn into Hurst Green Annex, you state we come under their governing body. Does it not seem wrong that our Governors / parents will not have a say in our children's future?
37	How will you organize events over two sites? For example Sports Days / Xmas productions, year group photos? What will happen about daily matters such as assemblies? How will the discipline of the school be maintained without a Headteacher on site, one who knows the children and staff inside out? How can anyone justify this ludicrous plan of getting rid of a Head, amalgamating schools without first trying out other options. Surely this should be a last resort. Has anyone actually thought the basics through or was this just a last ditch attempt to keep us all quiet?
38	The governing body of Hurst Green asked you if you now think you should offer their parents the right to consultation. Do you? In fact the whole idea of an annex should go out as a new consultation to all involved. The original was for the closure of our school, not the amalgamation with another.

**2. Second Statutory Notice – posted 07/04/06**  
**Summary of objection letters received.**

Letter No	Objection codes	Status	Signatures	Summary
1	1, 2, 3, 4	Parent / Carer	1	Unwilling to send child to an annex. Not chosen school. Belief that Holt Farm is best local school. Broad spectrum of activities at Holt Farm. Excellent staff. Council should close failing schools.
2	5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13	Parent / Carer	1	Situation badly handled by Council. Birth rate predictions disputed. Mishandled Hurst Green merger. Council putting money over education. Unrealistic timescales. Allowed transfer from Holt Farm to meet own ends. Anguish being caused to children. Removing parental choice. Cost of building negates money saved. Lack of places for future children. Staff facing redundancy despite promises.
3	3, 9, 14	Parent / Carer	1	Efficiency / standards of Holt Farm. Effective / dedicated headteacher. Petition from community ignored. No alternatives offered / considered. Uncertainty / anxiety / stress caused.
4	3, 5, 6, 11, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24	Parent / Carer	1	Inadequate length of consultation. No time for meetings to be held. Biased / ambiguous documentation. No choice offered or alternatives considered. Lack of / inadequate response to questions. Failure to consult interested parties. Availability of documentation. Birth rate predictions disputed. No joint working taken place. 'Blackmail' by Council Officers. Mishandled Hurst Green merger. Suggestions for alternative options. Praise for headteacher and staff. Cost of building negates money saved. No space for new build / Children's Centre at Olive Hill. Loss of playground space. Emission of landfill gases.
5	3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, 20, 21, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28	Parent / Carer	1	Inadequate length of consultation. Biased documentation. Failure to consult interested parties. Lack of evidence. Lack of openness / transparency. No choice offered or alternatives considered. No figures given. Availability of documentation. No time for meetings to be held. Principles of Consultation broken. Adjudicator's decision misrepresented. Staff facing redundancy despite promises. Birth data predictions disputed. Mishandled Hurst Green merger.

				<p>No spaces for future nursery children.  Travelling distance too far.  Increase in traffic congestion and pollution.  Risk of accidents.  Suggestions for alternative options.  No places at local schools.  Emission of landfill gases.  Children already transferred.  No space for new build / Children's Centre at Olive Hill.  Loss of playground space.  Bullied to complete preferred school choice.  SOC / Adjudicator decision on Beauty Bank.  Statutory requirements for consultation not met.  Secretary of State investigation.</p>
6	5, 6, 8, 10, 11, 13, 15, 17, 22, 23, 27	Parents / Carers	2	<p>Inadequate length of consultation.  Misleading documentation.  No places at local schools.  Birth rate predictions disputed.  Mishandled Hurst Green merger.  Allowed transfer from Holt Farm to meet own ends.  Adjudicator's decision not to increase capacity.  No space for new build / Children's Centre at Olive Hill.  Staff facing redundancy despite promises.  Bullied to complete preferred school choice.  Unacceptable Council behaviour / comments.</p>
7	14, 29	Great grandparent	1	<p>History / continued quality of school.  Family's personal experience of schools.  Local decision should belong to local taxpayers.  Petition from community ignored.  Cost of building negates money saved.  Stress caused by proposals.</p>
8	5, 9, 18	Parent / Carer	1	<p>Important early friendships destroyed.  Disruption / impact for children.  Situation badly handled by Council.  Birth rate predictions disputed.  No option given for school to stay open.</p>
9	3, 6, 8, 14, 15, 17, 20, 24, 27, 30, 31, 32	H.S.A member	1	<p>Unfair consultation.  Inadequate length of consultation.  Misleading / biased documentation.  Failure to consult interested parties.  Petition from community ignored.  Ignoring school history / age.  Future use of facilities / equipment.  No spare capacity.  Birth trends.  Nursery provision.  Hurst Green merger.  Landfill gas.  Children already transferred.  Head / staff.</p>
10	5, 9, 11, 17, 18, 33	Parent / Carer	1	<p>No understanding of literature provided.  More speculation than facts.  Lack of choice.  Affect on child.  Birth data inconsistent.  Confusion.</p>
11	3, 5, 11, 27, 28, 34	Parent / Carer	1	<p>Lack of places in local schools.  Alternative suggestion.  Birth rates.  Pollution / traffic / accidents.  Staff.</p>



12	5	Not stated.	1	Birth data.
13	5, 9, 11, 17, 20, 27, 35	Parent / Carer	1	Expenses / Monetary savings. Lack of space. Facilities / condition of Holt Farm. Birth rates. Housing developments. Lack of capacity. Community. Inadequate consultation. Confusion. Effect on children. Interested parties.
14	2, 3, 7, 15, 17, 18, 19, 20, 22, 27, 36	Parents / Carers	2	Interested parties. Timescales. Numbers / lack of capacity. Intimidation. Ethos of Holt Farm. Money. Alternatives. Confusion. Unanswered questions. Done deal.
15	1, 2, 5, 8, 14, 15, 17, 18, 20, 22, 24, 32, 36, 37, 38	Parent / Carer	1	Interested parties. Unfair consultation. Lack of time given. Public feeling. Underhandedness. Money. Misleading / confusing documents. Delay in action. Alternative options. Birth rates. Migration / regeneration / building. Lack of capacity. Nursery provision. Landfill gas. Children already transferred. Holt Farm standards.
16	2, 3, 39	Not stated.	1	Standard of school. Changing community needs. School results. Loss to community.
17	5, 15, 17, 27, 28, 38, 40, 41, 42	Parent / Carer	1	Length / speed of consultation. Misleading / confusing documents. Lack of capacity. Adjudicator's decision. Birth rates. Confusion. Safety. Traffic / pollution. Disability facilities.
18	11, 12, 14, 18, 28, 43	Not stated	1	Petition. Alternative suggestions. Council not listening. Monetary savings. New builds. Distance to travel. Environment. No room. Smaller class sizes. Annex arrangements.

19	3, 5, 17, 20, 32, 36, 43, 44	Parent / Carer	1	Confusing documents. Interested parties. Nursery. No capacity. Money over education. Headteacher and teachers. Uniforms. Annex arrangements. Birth data.
20	2, 3, 6, 11, 17, 18, 19, 22, 35, 45	Parent / Carer	1	'Blackmail'. Misleading / confusing documents. Hurst Green. Parking arrangements. Standard of school / staff / facilities. Saving money. Space. Alternative suggestions.
21	6, 15, 17, 18, 19, 22, 27, 45	Parent / Carer	1	Adjudicator's decision. 'Blackmail'. Misleading / confusing documents. Length of consultation. Lack of choice. Hurst Green. Parking arrangements.
22	5, 11, 15, 18, 19, 22, 28, 46	Parent / Carer	1	Exclusion from meetings. Alternatives. Ambiguous answers. Birth data. National process. Council comments. Monetary savings. Environmental impact. Walking distances. Increase in vehicles. PR exercise.
23	5, 6, 11, 17, 18, 19, 20, 22, 45	Parent / Carer	1	Misleading / confusing documents. Lack of choice. Alternative suggestions. Failure to consult interested parties. Birth data. 'Blackmail'. Hurst Green. Monetary savings.
24	5, 11, 15, 18, 19, 22, 28, 46	Parent / Carer	1	Exclusion from meetings. Alternatives. Ambiguous answers. Birth data. National process. Council comments. Monetary savings. Environmental impact. Walking distances. Increase in vehicles. PR exercise.
25	5, 6, 11, 18, 19, 20, 22, 40, 45, 47	Parent / Carer	1	Lack of choice. Failure to consult interested parties. Birth data. Alternative proposals. Hurst Green. Council comments. Money spent on consultation.

				Questions unanswered. 'Done deal'.
26	5, 6, 10, 11, 17, 18, 19, 20, 22, 24, 30, 45, 48	Parent / Carer	1	No other options considered. Alternative suggestions. Money spent on school. Hurst Green. Council comments. Birth rates. Confusing documents. Unanswered questions. Failure to consult interested parties. Space and parking. Monetary savings. Landfill gases.
27	3, 48	Pupil	1	Teachers. Friendships.
28	49, 50	Pupil	1	Length of time at school. Scared of bigger school. School clubs.
29	5, 6, 11, 15, 17, 18, 20, 22, 23, 27, 28, 32, 36, 39, 40, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55	Parent / Carer	1	Nursery issues. Capacity in Halesowen North / other townships. Consultation process. Travel and distance. Proposals. Cohesion and the community. Historical net capacity.
30	5, 17, 18, 22, 45, 56, 57	Parent / Carer	1	Confusing / biased documents. 'Blackmail'. Affect on area. Birth rates. Funding. Effects on children. Ethos of Holt Farm.
31	11, 15, 17, 27, 28, 36, 38, 39, 41, 45, 51, 58, 59, 60	Parent / Carer	1	Biased / confusing documents. Length of consultation. Missing documents. Schools with more surplus capacity. Re-investing money. Community / traffic / busy roads. Evidence. Playing areas. Space. Late reaction to problems. Mobiles at Olive Hill.
32	5, 10, 15, 17, 18, 27, 38	Relatives	2	Birth rates. Alternative options. Length of consultation. Lack of capacity. Lack of choice. 'Done deal'.
33	32, 56, 61	Resident	1	Putting education first. Less funding for Borough. Chase Government. Stability for children.
34	5, 27, 32, 36	Parent / Carer	1	Putting education first. Birth rates. Parental choice. Early year's / childcare. Happy Families Nursery.
35	11, 15, 17, 20, 22, 24,	Uncle	1	No capacity at Olive Hill. Landfill gases.

	27			Failure to consult interested parties. Length of consultation. Confusing documents. LEA staff.
36	5, 18, 19, 22, 47, 57, 62, 63	Parent / Carer	1	Rejection of closure. Bullying by the council. Lack of information. Alternative suggestions. No opportunity for trying other options. Local building land. Birth rates. Extended schools. Money wasted on consultation. 'Done deal'. Council threat. Children important.
37	8, 9, 11, 13, 19, 26, 27, 36, 60	Not stated	1	Putting education first. Hold on admissions. Transfers. Lack of spaces. Suffering and stress caused. Teaching staff. Saving money. Building at Olive Hill. Lack of space.
38	5, 7, 9, 10, 12, 15, 17, 18, 22, 27, 32, 51, 64	Parent / Carer	1	Evidence. Length of consultation. Confusing documents. No capacity. Other options. Birth rates. Nursery facilities. Stress caused. Pressure from Council. Railroading in one year. Other Halesowen mergers.
39	3, 5, 12, 17, 20, 27, 28, 32, 36, 43, 44	Parent / Carer	1	Confusing documents. Failure to consult interested parties. Nursery provision. Lack of capacity. Money over standards. Teachers. Uniforms. Distance. Management of two sites. Birth rates.
40	11, 18, 36, 65, 66	Resident	1	Strategies being ignored. Spending money. One school closure per township. Other options. Money over standards.
41	5, 11, 17, 20, 22, 25, 27, 38, 66, 67	Not stated	1	Parent's right to object. Pressure from Council. Increase in admissions. Consultation meetings. Hurst Green. Timescale to close 5 schools. Saving money. Demonstrate funding. Birth data. Other methods.

				Failure to consult interested parties. Inadequacy of consultation documents. Respondents views.
42	5, 10, 15, 17, 19, 22, 43, 51, 58, 68, 69	Parent / Carer	1	No response to questions. Borough MPs. Investigation by Secretary of State. Birth rates. Lack of clarity on annex. Length of consultation. Parents rights. Limited choice. Failure of consultation requirements.
43	5, 11, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 28, 32, 33, 39, 41, 42, 55, 70, 71, 72, 73	Not stated	1	Extracts from DfES and Schools Organisation websites. Raising standards. Respect parents wishes. Children and Young People's plan. Capital funding. Playing fields. Transport. Significant barriers. Early Year's Provision. Nursery. Effect on standards locally. Need for places. Finance. Views of interested parties. Human rights. Class sizes. Community. Space at Olive Hill. Principle's of Consultation. Historical net capacity.
44	2, 3, 17, 20, 22, 27, 28, 29, 32	Parent / Carer	1	Guilt from Council. No nursery places. Distance. No spare capacity. Confusing documentation. Failure to consult interested parties. Education should be priority. Teaching staff.
45	2, 5, 11, 27, 39	Grandparent	1	Standards of Holt Farm. Loss to community. Birth rates. Movement of children to area. No capacity at Hurst Green. Economical to keep Holt Farm. Multicultural society.
46	17, 28, 41, 43, 44	Parent / Carer	1	Distance to travel. Major roads. Cost of uniforms. Confusing documentation. Management of annex. Unfair consultation.
47	14, 20, 24, 28, 41	Parent / Carer	1	Distance to travel. Major roads. Failure to consult interested parties. Petition. Landfill gas emissions.
48	11, 18, 22, 45, 47, 53	Parent / Carer	1	Bullying by Council. No chance to object to closure.

				Misleading documentation. Money spent on consultation process. Building at Olive Hill. Car parking at Olive Hill.
49	5, 9, 11, 17, 18, 19, 20, 22, 45	Parent / Carer	1	Ambiguous / biased documentation. Misleading / confusing answers. Failure to analyse other options. Failure to consult interested parties. Parking at Olive Hill. Birth data. 'Blackmail'. Monetary savings. New build at Olive Hill. Losing playground space.
50	2, 6, 18, 22	Parent / Carer	1	Bullying from Council. Hurst Green. No choice offered. Happy at Holt Farm.
51	3, 5, 13, 15, 18, 22	Parent / Carer	1	Length of consultation. Council comments. Alternative proposals. Teaching staff. Birth data.
52	3, 5, 8, 9, 11, 13, 17, 19, 27, 36, 28, 70, 74	Parent / Carer	1	Freedom of choice. Distance to travel. No capacity. Adjudicator's decision. Wasting money. Building work. Effect on children. Birth rates. Closure of Holt Farm admissions. Attitude of Council. Failure to answer questions. Teacher's jobs. Finding other schools. No open consultation.
53	2, 3, 9, 18, 19, 23, 45, 47	Not stated	1	Teaching staff. Stress caused. Evidence of other options. No real answers. Space at Olive Hill. Parking. Cost of proposals.
54	5, 6, 11, 15, 17, 18, 19, 20, 22, 23, 24, 45	Parent / Carer	1	Failure to consult interested parties. Car parking at Olive Hill. 'Blackmail'. Biased / ambiguous documentation. Confusing wording. Questions not adequately answered. Length of consultation period. Birth data. Lack of choice offered. Hurst Green. Monetary savings. Building at Olive Hill.
55	5, 9, 11, 15, 17, 18, 19, 20, 22, 27, 28, 45, 73	Parent / Carer	1	Length of consultation. Failure to consult interested parties. Parking at Olive Hill. Safety. Travelling distances.

				<p>Alternative options.  Building at Olive Hill.  Money wasting.  Ambiguous and leading documentation.  Unanswered questions.  Confusion at consultation meetings.  Birth data.  Council forcing situation.  Statutory requirements not met.  Adjudicator's decision.</p>
56	2, 5, 6, 8, 11, 18, 22, 45, 57	Parent / Carer	1	<p>Standard of Holt Farm.  'Done deal'.  No other alternatives explored.  No choice given.  Total disregard for parties involved.  Birth data.  Costs of building work.  Hurst Green.  Inadequacies of Olive Hill.  Health and safety.  Scaremongering tactics.  Early transfer of children.</p>
57	3, 9, 28, 37, 48, 57	Pupil	1	<p>Friendships.  Teaching staff.  School centenary.  Adverse effect on people involved.  Distance to school.</p>
58	2, 5, 6, 8, 11, 18, 22, 45, 57	Parent / Carer	1	<p>Standard of Holt Farm.  'Done deal'.  No other alternatives explored.  No choice given.  Total disregard for parties involved.  Birth data.  Hurst Green.  Costs of building work.  Inadequacies of Olive Hill.  Health and safety.  Scaremongering tactics.  Early transfer of children.</p>
59	3, 5, 6, 8, 10, 13, 14, 15, 17, 22, 27	Parent / Carer	1	<p>Misleading documentation.  Parent's views.  Petition.  No spare places.  Unfair consultation.  Length of consultation.  No choice.  Birth data.  Hurst Green.  Scare tactics.  Early movement of children.  Adjudicator's decision.  Head / staff.  Job security.</p>
60	11, 15, 17, 27, 28, 39, 41, 45, 58, 59, 60	Not stated	1	<p>Length of consultation.  Missing / changed presentation documents.  No capacity for Holt Farm pupils.  Money.  Adjudicator's decision.  Reinvestment.  Community.  Traffic / congestion / pollution.</p>

				Major roads. Playing area. Space at Olive Hill. Mobiles.
61	11, 14, 18, 28, 29, 30	Parent / Carer	1	Petition. Other suggestions. Council not listening. Cost of new builds. H.S.A funded items. Travelling distance. Traffic / pollution / health. Space at Olive Hill.
62	2, 5, 13, 15, 17, 18, 22, 27, 37, 39, 54, 69	Not stated	1	No choice. Length of consultation. Multi race school. Council comments. Using school to bring extra revenue. History. Community. Teaching staff losing jobs. Birth figures. Biased / misleading documentation. Adjudicator's decision. Secretary of State enquiry.
63	17, 20, 23, 32, 36, 46, 69, 75	Not stated	2	Misleading documentation. Community. Failure to consult interested parties. Early Year's facilities. Space at Olive Hill. Money. Minister of Education. Use of Holt Farm site.
64	2, 5, 20, 76, 77	Parent / Carer	1	Good school. Birth rates. Lack of understanding / language barrier. Failure to consult Mosque.
65	2, 3, 5, 7, 11, 17, 22, 24, 27, 43, 78, 79	Parent / Carer	1	Teachers. Standards. Special needs provision. Birth rates. Olive Hill - small school / building site. Planning permission. Timescales. Funding. Operation of an annex. Placement of children in Holt Farm. Toxic gases. Ethos. Facilities. Confusing documentation. Intimidation.
66	6, 8, 15, 17, 20, 25, 27, 51, 69, 80	Not stated	1	Hurst Green merger / new school. No space. No capacity. Children transferring early. Insufficient information / analysis. Failure to consult interested parties. No requests for annex. Inadequate time. No evidence for any school. No informed response.



67	1, 5, 7, 17, 22, 27, 45, 57, 70, 81	Parent / Carer	1	Holt Farm – school of choice. No capacity at Hurst Green. Every child matters. Birth rates. Loss of Cllr Vickers. Timescales. Importance of children. Lack of space at Olive Hill. Extra traffic. Confusing documentation. Council behaviour.
68	2, 3, 6, 9, 18, 28, 36, 41, 49, 79, 82, 83	Aunt	1	Standards of education. Class sizes. Stability for children. Staff. Other options. 'Done deal'. Travelling distance. Major barriers. Increased traffic / congestion / illness. Education should be above money. Stress caused. Children's happiness.
69	5, 9, 11, 14, 19, 22, 27, 36, 51	Not stated	2	Lack of response / answers. Lack of evidence. Birth predictions. No places for children. Petition. Money over education. Pressure and stress caused. Bullying by Council. Money. Lack of communication.
70	5, 17, 18, 19, 20, 22, 28, 36, 45, 69	Parents / Carers	2	Biased / misleading documentation. Failure to consult interested parties. Secretary of State investigation. No options. Birth data. 'Blackmail'. Unprofessional / uncaring.
71	5, 6, 11, 18, 34, 36, 44, 51	Parent / Carer	1	Birth rates. Township capacity. Reduce capacity at Holt Farm. Money being wasted. Closure last resort. Hurst Green.
72	2, 3, 5, 6, 11, 13, 15, 17, 18, 19, 20, 22, 85	Parents / Carers	2	No choice. Other uses. Hurst Green merger. Teaching standards. Special needs provision. Jobs for teaching staff. Biased / confusing documentation. Birth data. 'Blackmail'. Failure to consult interested parties. Lack of answers provided. Monetary savings.
73	2, 4, 6, 11, 15, 17, 27, 28, 44, 54	Parents / Carers	2	Hurst Green merger. Influenced documentation. Consultation too short.

				<p>Not enough information available.  Other schools need replacing.  Standard of Holt Farm.  Statutory Notice advice.  Travelling distances.  Uniforms.  Monetary savings.  Size of Olive Hill site.  Lack of spare capacity.  Multicultural school.</p>
74	5, 6, 17, 18, 19, 20, 22	Governor	1	<p>No choice.  Alternative solutions.  Biased / ambiguous documentation.  Hurst Green merger.  Birth data.  'Blackmail'.  Failure to consult interested parties.  Monetary savings.  Loss of Olive Hill play area.</p>
75	2, 9, 15, 20, 28, 69	Parent / Carer	1	<p>Secretary of State investigation.  Consultation not long enough.  Consultation not wide enough.  Travelling distance.  Congestion / pollution / health.  Standard of Holt Farm education.  Distress and upset for children.</p>
76	9, 11, 15, 18, 20, 23, 28, 32, 49, 69	Grandparent	1	<p>Unnecessary disruption for children.  Travelling distance.  Congestion / pollution / obstruction.  Size of Olive Hill.  Nursery provision.  Alternative options.  Consultation not wide / long enough.  Smaller schools / smaller classes.  No choice.</p>
77	2, 11, 20, 36, 76, 79	Not stated	1	<p>Putting education over money.  Teaching staff.  Special needs.  Ofsted results.  Language barriers.  Different styles.  Failure to consult interested parties.  Spending money on Olive Hill.</p>
78	5, 6, 11, 17, 18, 19, 20, 28, 45	Parents / Carers	2	<p>Confusing documentation.  Elusive answers.  No choice.  No other alternatives explored.  Traffic congestion.  Failure to consult interested parties.  Parking.  Birth data.  Hurst Green merger.  Waste of money at Olive Hill.  Losing playground space.</p>
79	3, 13, 30	Pupil	1	<p>Teachers.  Jobs for staff.  New investments.</p>
80	2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, 20, 22,	Parent / Carer	1	<p>Length of consultation period.  Parents providing ideas.  Birth rates.  Travelling distance.</p>

	23, 28, 32, 36, 51, 61, 63, 70, 74, 84, 85			<p>Pollution / accidents.  Hurst Green merger.  Failure to consult interested parties.  No option for Holt Farm to remain open.  'Bullying' by Council.  Stress being caused.  Biased / misleading documentation.  Children transferring out of Holt Farm.  Stopped admissions.  Lack of communication.  Special needs.  Alternative proposals.  Nursery provision.  Ofsted report.  Staff futures.  Head and staff.  Close schools in special measures.  Putting money before education.  Insufficient detail.  Other schools with more surplus capacity.  Government funding.  Parental choice.</p>
81	3, 4, 5, 11, 13, 14, 17, 18, 24, 36, 49, 66, 86	Parent / Carer	1	<p>Birth data.  Alternatives.  Closing good schools.  Size of Olive Hill.  Landfill gases.  Jobs for teachers.  Difficulties for children.  School visits.  Consultation documents.  Closing too much in one year.  Putting money over education.  Head and staff.  Petition.</p>
82	18, 22, 24, 28, 32	Not stated	1	<p>Travelling distance.  Nursery.  Landfill gases.  Council frightening parents.  Alternatives not listened to.  Done deal.</p>
83	5, 6, 11, 13, 14, 15, 17, 18, 19, 20, 25, 27, 36, 43, 44, 49, 50, 51, 66, 73, 83	Parent / Carer	1	<p>Speed of consultation.  Difficult to understand / complete documents.  Proposals constantly changing.  New consultation.  Moving to Olive Hill.  Bullying at schools.  Running of annex.  Teachers' jobs.  Uniforms.  Poor communication.  Hefty task in short time.  Not enough places.  Adjudicator's decision.  External groups.  Petition.  Birth rates.  Failure to consult widely.  In-depth analysis.  Background work.  Maidensbridge.</p>

				Rules of consultation broken.
84	1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 11, 27, 36, 66	Parent / Carer	1	Unrealistic timescales. Standards at Holt Farm. Other school in special measures. Hurst Green merger. Chose Holt Farm. Birth rates. No capacity at Olive Hill. Monetary savings.
85	2, 6, 11, 20, 27, 28, 36, 41, 51, 70	Parent / Carer	1	Travelling distance. Major barriers. Freedom of choice. Standards. Traffic / pollution / health. Not a wide consultation. Hurst Green merger. Space at Olive Hill. Money. Caslon. Evidence.
86	4, 15, 17, 28, 32, 36	Carer	1	Consultation document too difficult to understand. Nursery. Travelling distance. Money over standards. Timescale. Closing good schools.
87	2, 28, 32, 50, 65	Parent / Carer	1	Travelling distance. Nursery. Local schools. Community language class. Surroundings / environment.
88	6, 17, 18, 22, 26, 27, 28	Parent / Carer	1	Pollution / congestion. Biased / ambiguous documentation. Reallocation of funds. Adjudicator's decision. Hurst Green merger. No options. 'Blackmail'.
89	11, 17, 19, 20, 37, 39, 45, 50, 65, 75	Resident	1	Biased / misleading documents. No information / replies. History / achievements. Building at Olive Hill. Failure to consult interested parties. Use of Holt Farm site. Community. Local groups run from Holt Farm. Pollution / health risks from increased traffic. Space at Olive Hill.
90	69	MP	1	Investigation.
91	6, 11, 15, 17, 32, 36, 70, 87	Not stated.	1	Hurst Green merger. Failure of consultation documentation. Length of consultation. Quality of school. Deprived area. Building / space at Olive Hill. Parental choice.
92	2, 20, 27, 28, 36, 37, 49, 51, 65, 73	Parent / Carer	1	History / quality of school. Education over money. Smaller class sizes. Failure to consult interested parties.

				<p>Failure to meet statutory requirements.  Disruption to children.  No places to move to in other schools.  Bigger problems in other areas.  Lack of evidence.  Travelling distance.</p>
93	11, 15, 17, 27, 28, 32, 41, 43	Parent / Carer	1	<p>Unfair consultation.  Consultation too short.  Influenced / ambiguous documentation.  Suitability of annex.  No capacity for children.  Danger of parked cars.  Nursery.  Long term strategy.</p>
94	5, 15, 17, 19, 20, 28, 45, 54	Not stated	1	<p>Failure to consult interested parties.  Dangers of traffic congestion.  Birth data.  Length of consultation.  Biased / misleading documentation.  Questions not clearly answered.  Multi-race school.  Ethnic community.</p>
95	5, 6, 20, 22, 27, 28, 41, 54, 63, 76, 88, 89	Parent / Carer	1	<p>Failure to consult interested parties.  Multicultural population.  Consultation only in English.  Hurst Green merger.  Lack of capacity in other schools.  Not conducive to Central Government initiatives.  School given federation status.  Removes all schools in Northern part of ward.  Travelling distance.  Major barriers.  Threatening behaviour.  Birth data.</p>
96	2, 11, 17, 27, 28, 36	Parent / Carer	1	<p>Close failing schools instead.  Travelling distance.  Accidents / pollution.  Building and grounds.  No space at Olive Hill.  Consultation form not easy to understand.  Education before money.  Cost of new builds.</p>
97	2, 11, 28, 36, 37, 41, 90	Not stated	1	<p>Failings in education.  Holt Farm qualities.  Lack of space at Holt Farm.  No monetary savings.  Teachers.  Travelling distance.  Major barriers.  Put education over money.</p>
98	28, 32, 44	Parent / Carer	1	<p>Uniforms.  Distance.  Nursery.</p>
99	5, 6, 18, 22, 27, 32, 69	Parent / Carer	1	<p>Lack of choice.  No alternatives offered.  Birth data.  'Blackmail'.  Secretary of State investigation.  Adjudicator's decision.  Hurst Green merger.  Early Year's provision.</p>

100	18, 19, 20, 22, 36, 38, 41, 61, 66	Parent / Carer	1	Failure to consult interested parties. Bullying by Council. Leaving solutions too late. Other ways to save money. Government funding. Distance. Major barriers. Unanswered questions. Lack of communication. Putting money over education.
101	8, 15, 17, 27, 32, 74	Not stated	1	No capacity at Olive Hill for children. Adjudicator's decision. Nursery provision. Stopped admissions. Interschool transfers. Leading / confusing documentation. Consultation too short.
102	2, 4, 5, 6, 8, 13, 15, 17, 19, 20, 28, 32, 45, 51	Grandparent	1	Consultation too short. Biased documentation. Other schools with higher surplus. Lack of evidence. Failure to consult interested parties. Unanswered / inadequately answered questions. Staff losing jobs. Birth data. Travelling distance. Traffic / parking at Olive Hill. Nursery. Transfers.
103	4, 5, 15, 17, 18, 51	Not stated	1	Consultation too short. Biased / leading documentation. Lack of evidence. Other schools with higher surplus. Other options not considered. Disputed birth data used.
104	4, 8, 14, 15, 17, 51, 70, 74	Not stated	1	Consultation too short. Leading documentations. Lack of evidence. Other schools with higher surplus. Petition from community ignored. Stopped admissions. Allowed interschool transfers. Removing freedom of choice.
105	1, 6, 11, 18, 27, 70, 80	Parents / Carers	2	No options given other than closure. Badly handled Hurst Green merger. Closure disguised as merger. Cost of building at Olive Hill means no money saved by proposals. Loss of playground space. Waste of money invested in Holt Farm. Removing parental choice. Holt Farm first choice school. No capacity in other schools for number of children displaced.

## Second Consultation 2 February – 17 March 2006

### Itemised Points of Objection.

Obj Code	Objection point
1	Holt Farm was the school of choice for my children. Not an annex or any other school.
2	Holt Farm offers a broad spectrum of extra curricular activities, excellent learning support, teaches to high standards, provides brilliant special needs provision and has a fantastic educational track record. It is set in pleasant surroundings where children can learn about the outdoors. How can you ensure the children at Holt Farm will receive the same standards of education elsewhere?
3	The head and staff at Holt Farm do a brilliant job and are held in high regard. They have shown their commitment to our children by staying at the school even though it means they may not have jobs. These are the people we want to look after our children.
4	There must be worse schools in the area that are in need of closure. Other schools have been documented as having a higher level of surplus places than Holt Farm.
5	Birth rates do not seem to be falling as dramatically as Dudley Council make out and verified figures collected by parents have shown that they are in fact increasing. Is your birth data verified in an unbiased manner? Have you taken into account migration, new housing developments and the effects of the Black Country Study? Why is your birth data inconsistent with the birth data provided by parents during the consultation period? Will new schools need to be built in the future to accommodate all the children that are coming in to the area? If your plans go ahead there will be absolutely NO spare capacity in Halesowen North. This does not meet paragraph 35 of DfES guidelines.
6	The merger with Hurst Green was a good idea and parents may have been behind this proposal as children had a better chance of coping with the transition if all children moved to the joint school at the same time. However this fell through because the Council did not consult with Hurst Green first. Why was this not done before the proposal was told to parents?
7	The timescales for the new proposal are unrealistic. Can you be sure that all changes to Olive Hill can be implemented in time?
8	Many children are already leaving Holt Farm in order to secure a place at another school before any changes are made because their parents have been scared by the Council. Does this affect the situation and the proposals? Why did you allow parents to do this, was it because you knew it would make your argument more viable and give you a stronger case even though your proposal was still only in consultation and not definite?
9	The proposals are causing a lot of anguish for our children and parents.
10	We feel we are being railroaded into sending our children to Olive Hill and not being given a choice.
11	Are the new buildings and changes that will be needed at Olive Hill going to be more expensive than keeping Holt Farm open? Will there be any cost saving benefits to this? The Olive Hill site is very small, is there enough room or will it mean that the playground space is lost? Do you have planning permission to build? Is the capital funding actually agreed for all this work? The DfES website (paragraphs 38–43) states 'the Decision Maker must be satisfied that any capital required to implement the proposals will be available. Normally this will be in the form of written confirmation from the source of funding on which the promoters rely. In the case of a local authority, this may be from an authorised officer within the Authority'. Do you have written confirmation? Can you prove it as we have yet to see it? It also states 'There can be no assumption that the approval of proposals will trigger the release of capital funds from the Department unless the Department has previously confirmed in writing that such resources will be available; nor that any allocation "in principle" can be increased. In such circumstances the proposals should be rejected, or consideration of them deferred until it is clear that the capital necessary to implement the proposals will be approved'. Paragraph 63 also talks about 'minimum areas of team game playing fields to which schools must have access'.
12	Where will pre-school children go when it comes for them to start primary school?

	Will there be enough capacity to cope with the new influx?
13	Are the staff now facing redundancy or will they be redeployed and found jobs elsewhere as promised?
14	A petition of over 5000 signatures was submitted in objection to the closure of Holt Farm. Did this make any difference?
15	The 39 day consultation process was inadequate and more time was needed for this. Even your 6 week period is way too short for a consultation of this magnitude.
16	Due to the rapid timeframe of the consultation, no area council and public meetings could be held in the consultation period.
17	The consultation document and questions were biased, misleading and ambiguous. Wording in documents was not clear and questions were phrased to give the answer required, not honest answers. The whole consultation was designed to confuse and intimidate parents. Insufficient information was provided in the documents.
18	The consultation never offered a choice, only closure of Holt Farm and how to move the children – there was no option for keeping Holt Farm open. Why were no alternatives (many of which were provided to DMBC throughout the consultation) considered or offered? Can you prove other options were explored? Because of these factors parents now believe this is already a done deal and consultation was pointless. What happened to ‘working together’?
19	Proper answers were never given to direct questions asked. Just long winded answers or references to websites which completely avoided the point of the questions. They even contradicted themselves. Some of the answers we did receive were pure lies e.g. guaranteed jobs for staff, no redundancies, guaranteed places at local schools etc. This left parents without the necessary information to make valuable contributions to the process. Why has communication as a whole been so poor?
20	The Council failed to consult all interested parties i.e. all local schools and the parents of these, local residents, local community as a whole, local businesses, local churches, local Muslim and ethnic minority groups etc. You did not meet DfES guidance (paragraph 45).
21	How were the 11,000 consultation documents made available to people? How were the 1,000 documents from the second consultation made available? Who were they sent to?
22	Parents and members of the public were told that should they not choose to go along with the council’s proposals of amalgamation then the school would simply close. This seemed like blackmail and was said to make us feel guilty. We were also told that if we objected we would be making life more difficult for our children even though we have a right to object. Mr Freeman has also been heard to say it is his mission to close these schools. Where is the fairness for parents?
23	Where will the Children’s Centre fit at Olive Hill? How long will it take to build? Will they have enough capacity for the whole of Halesowen North? Has the funding been secured?
24	What will be done about the landfill gas emissions at Olive Hill School? Are there any dangers associated with this? How will the health and safety of our children be ensured if this is the case? Have you put bore holes in place?
25	There has been a complete lack of openness and honesty. Where is the promised in-depth analysis?
26	In the consultation we have been asked to agree to relocation of funds yet haven’t been told how much money will go where. Why have figures never been quoted?
27	The Adjudicator has rejected plans to increase admissions at Olive Hill and Hurst Green and they are already oversubscribed so there has never been enough space. Can your proposals still go ahead as there will not be enough places for the children? Why was the Adjudicator’s decision misrepresented on the DMBC website as ‘Adjudicator backs the plans’ when they clearly don’t? You state you can get a temporary increase in these schools, how temporary will this be? The other schools cannot take the number of children currently at Holt Farm (187pupils into 62 places does not go).
28	Your proposals will double the distance many children have to travel to get to school and will force many more parents into cars. Isn’t this against government policy? What about parents who do not have cars to transport their children? What about the



	traffic and pollution increases this will cause on our roads and the effect it will have on the environment and children's health? The DfES guidance (paragraphs 57 – 58) states 'Difficulties with transport can prevent people participating in learning or restrict their choice of the quality, subject matter or type of learning they attend. In considering proposals for the reorganisation of school, Decision Makers should satisfy themselves accessibility planning has been properly taken into account that e.g. in cases such as school closures and the location of new schools, facilities are to be accessible by those concerned and disadvantaged groups not disadvantaged further, particularly by the cost or availability of transport to places of learning.' Also, 'Proposals should also be considered against Government objectives to reduce traffic congestion and promote alternatives to the car through the School Travel Planning Process'.
29	Education is paid for through local taxation. Surely it should then be up to the taxpayers to decide on the schools future.
30	The H.S.A have raised lots of money to buy equipment and facilities for the school. What will happen to these now? Many improvements were made to the school with this money, do these proposals now mean that this money has all been completely wasted? It was not the Council's money, it was the parents and the community's.
31	The birth rate trend can be argued by that fact that many women started having children later in life which caused a dip. However this trend has now been established so the dip cannot happen again.
32	What will happen to the local nursery / early year's provision? The Olive Hill nursery is already full so where will children go until the new Children's Centre is built (if it is)? Do your proposals to close the early year's provision at Holt Farm contravene paragraph 59 of the DfES Decision Makers Guidance? Happy Families tried to open Nursery provision but you wouldn't allow them to take any admissions therefore adding to the surplus places at the school. Because of this Happy Families had to pull out. This seemed a really contrived way of making sure the school had surplus places and probably would have solved the issue as the extra childcare would have attracted many more parents to the school.
33	Olive Hill does not yet have the proper facilities to deal with so many children and building work will be ongoing. Won't these factors disrupt my child's education even more? How can my child's education improve by moving to this school (DfES guidance, paragraphs 1–4, 6–16 & 23–26)?
34	Wouldn't it be a better and more cost effective idea to reduce numbers at Olive Hill and Hurst Green then reduce Holt Farm to one form entry? It would cost less and cause much less disruption.
35	Holt Farm may be an older school than Olive Hill but it is in a better condition and has better facilities.
36	This is all about money and not about education, standards or the children. Another school in Dudley was in special measures; why not close them and save money there? You could even have closed Caslon School as the children could have easily fitted into Colley Lane and there wouldn't have been an issue with the distance to travel. Why did you pick Holt Farm over these other schools? Halesowen North has less surplus places than Belle Vale and Cradley. Why not target schools in those wards instead?
37	Holt Farm only celebrated its Centenary last year but now you wish to wipe out all this history. The school has served this area well for all these years and is loved by everyone.
38	If you knew about this problem six years ago at the beginning of year 2000 why wait until now to do something about it? You then could have tried other cost saving ideas instead of being in a big rush to close schools unnecessarily which should have been the very last option tried.
39	It would be a huge loss to the surrounding community if Holt Farm were to close. Primary schools are valuable resources which are needed to maintain the quality of a neighbourhood and when such resources are lost communities are often sent into a downward spiral which takes millions of pounds and many years to address. Does this go against paragraph 60 of DfES guidelines?
40	You have changed your plans so often many parents are now unsure what the current state of play is. If you had done more preparation and planning this process would not be in the mess it is in now.

41	This proposal will see small children having to cross very busy roads like Long Lane and Springfield Road. What measures will be put in place to ensure children can get to school safely? The DfES and SOC websites state 'In deciding statutory proposals, the Decision Maker should bear in mind that proposals should not have the effect of unreasonably extending journey times or increasing transport costs, or result in children having to negotiate significant barriers such as railway lines or major roads.'
42	What will happen to children who are disabled? Will special measures be put in for them? Will there be special parking places to drop off these children (paragraph 53 of DfES guidance)?
43	If Holt Farm is to become an annex can you please state how that will work, who will run it and provide evidence that these types of arrangement have actually worked in the past? How will the annex and the parent school interact e.g. sports days, awards, school photos, plays etc? If you have children at both schools will you have to decide to attend one child's activities over another?
44	What will happen about uniforms? You won't save money if you have to pay for all new uniforms for everybody and many parents cannot afford to buy new ones.
45	There is much concern about parking at Olive Hill. There will be many extra cars but no extra parking spaces. It is already very dangerous outside the school and is on a blind bend. Any talk of building a new car park is on a site emitting poisonous gases and further away from the school. Residents around the school already complain about the parking without adding even more cars. The consultation has not covered these areas in enough detail and should have gone out to the residents who live around the school to give them a chance to respond as to how your proposals will affect them.
46	Why were parents with young children due to start at Holt Farm's local nursery not allowed to attend the consultation meetings? I wanted my child to attend Holt Farm but was not even allowed to give an opinion. This seems to be at odds with the general policy of Dudley MBC in encouraging schools to be part of the local community and consulting all interested parties.
47	This whole process was intended to save £1 million. More than that must already have been spent on the consultations alone to pay for the staff and paperwork it must take to keep changing proposals as you change your minds. This money could have gone into the schools and then there would not have been any need to close them.
48	Early friendships are important in a child's life but you are now affecting these by making children move schools therefore causing more upset for our children. This could also leave children open to bullying if they have no friends with them.
49	Many children are scared of attending a large school as they have been used to small, intimate schools and classes. They will also be the 'new children' entering strange, already established territory and other pupils at the school will already have formed friendships groups so they will be seen as outsiders? Won't this have a big effect on them?
50	What will happen to the Church group, the dance group, the Brownie pack, the language classes and other clubs who utilise Holt Farm if it closes?
51	Where is the evidence to support your need to close Holt Farm? And indeed the other 4 schools you are trying to close? Where is the evidence to say it is these 5 schools that need to close and no others? Where is the evidence to support other schools staying open?
52	You state you have consulted with the children of Holt Farm. How and when did this happen?
53	Why did your second proposal never go through its own consultation?
54	Holt Farm serves a diverse range of children from various backgrounds. This has previously been commended by Ofsted and has also gained the school an award. Could your proposals mean that minor ethnic groups become isolated?
55	Your surplus capacity figures could be interpreted in many ways but have given no basis for comparison. Could you supply the net capacity of Dudley Schools in 1997 to allow us to see the fuller picture?
56	Are our children just statistics? Has there been any research into the effects this merger may have on them?
57	Holt Farm is traditionally a close knit community school where all children are known by name and where pupils feel happy and cherished. Why can't a bit of extra money

	be spent to ensure the best for these children and for following generations who will need a good education?
58	Why were the presentation documents for certain schools (i.e. Maidensbridge and Highfields) missing from your website? When they did finally appear they had been changed. Is that legal?
59	Can you guarantee that any money saved will be re-invested into education and will not be used in other pursuits?
60	Why did you replace the mobiles at Olive Hill? If you knew the possibility of them taking extra children was there you could have built it all in one go instead of Olive Hill being a constant building site causing more disruption to children.
61	It is understood that Dudley does not receive as much money as other boroughs. Shouldn't you be working on trying to get more money from the government instead of closing much needed and perfectly good schools?
62	The original consultation was for closure. For whatever reasons the Council didn't follow through with these plans and opted for amalgamation at the last minute. From this decision it is obvious that closure isn't in the best interests of anybody concerned and that the consultation on closure did not allow anybody enough time to work towards a suitable plan and wasn't offered widely enough to the outside community, other schools and their parents to make their comments.
63	Why not allow Holt Farm to offer Extended Schools facilities or become the ARC centre for Halesowen therefore making them more viable?
64	You have already got it wrong with Halesowen school mergers, they have been rejected twice. Are you sure you've got it right at Holt Farm? Have you considered you could be wrong again?
65	Your proposals completely go against the government's policies. All we hear from the government is Education, Education, Education along with smaller class sizes, more choice for parents and local schools for local children. You are totally ignoring all these strategies so therefore how can you justify your actions?
66	Why have you chosen to close one school in every township, even where it is not needed? Is it even feasible to close five schools in one year?
67	With regards to the Church of the Ascension and Maidensbridge consultation, why at the meetings did you put groups of people in separate rooms? Why wouldn't you answer the questions there and then instead of writing them down and answering them at a later date? Why wouldn't you allow parents of both schools to have a meeting together? What were the legal reasons preventing this?
68	Why did Dudley Council fail to inform all four borough MPs of their plans to close schools before the consultation started?
69	According to newspaper reports, you have made such a mess of this consultation that many complaints have been sent to the Ombudsman and as a result you are now being investigated by the Secretary of State for Education. Is this true and, if so, can this stop you making any changes? Have you failed the statutory requirements of consultation?
70	A statement on the DfES and SOC websites states 'LA's should take action to remove empty places at schools that are unpopular with parents and which do little to raise standards. The removal of surplus places must always support the core agenda of raising standards and respect parent's wishes by seeking to match school places with parental choices'. This is not what is happening with any of the 5 schools you want to close. What happened to parental choice?
71	The DfES and SOC websites state that 'the decision maker may wish to consider whether the proposals are consistent with the Children and Young People's Plan for the area'. Is there such a plan for Dudley and if so are your proposals consistent?
72	Won't your proposals have an adverse effect on other schools in the area i.e. overcrowding, lack of any future capacity etc? How does this comply with DfES guidelines?
73	If you read your own principle's of consultation you will see that you have broken many of them. How then can this be considered a fair and unbiased consultation?
74	Why at the beginning of this process did you close admissions at Holt Farm? The school could have filled its numbers but you chose not to let this happen so you could reach your own ends. This leads us to believe that you never intended to let Holt Farm continue even you told us it was a 'consultation'.

75	What do you intend to do with the Holt Farm site once the school has gone? Surely the entire local area should be consulted on that as it will affect everyone.
76	Why was the consultation document only printed in English when you know you have people at the schools who don't speak English very well? They could not understand your documents.
77	Why are you closing all the things that people need i.e. schools, hospitals, swimming pools? Soon there won't be anything left and people will move out of Dudley to another Borough that still has all its facilities.
78	It has been suggested that the pupils left at Holt Farm will be shoved into the younger end of the school so that only half the school needs to be run. This is terrible. Year 5 children using reception toilets? Or are you going to waste even more money building new toilets for them?
79	Does Olive Hill have the same ethos, same styles, reading books, curriculum etc? Does it have the brilliant computer suite Holt Farm has? Will even more disruption be caused by children having to learn new basic things because of different teaching guidelines etc? Where is the stability?
80	An annex is another word for closure with no commitment to any timescale. Some parents have indicated a possible option being exploration of federation or amalgamation but these are not requests for a temporary annex.
81	Mr Vickers said he would listen to our arguments and take our suggestions on board. He didn't do this before he left but what happens now he is no longer at the Council?
82	Are you planning on making class sizes bigger? This will have a detrimental effect on our children's education at Holt Farm, Olive Hill and possibly Hurst Green.
83	It's hard enough for young children to make the transition to High School, how do you think they feel being moved about at a much younger age?
84	As parents we were asked to make suggestions. It should not be up to parents to do this. We do not have the facts and figures that the Council have. We are not in a position to argue the information put to us. We pay our taxes for you to come up with suggestions.
85	Holt Farm offers excellent Specials Needs teaching and facilities. What will happen to this? Will we be guaranteed it at any other school?
86	You promised to take the Holt Farm children to visit Olive Hill Primary to get to know the school, teachers and layout before any changes were made. This has not been done.
87	Holt Farm serves an area of deprivation and gives less advantaged children a great start in life. Is it now your intention to deprive these children even more and make it even harder for them to get anywhere?
88	The closure of Holt Farm will leave the Northern part of the ward without a school as all others are in the Southern part. How do you justify this?
89	John Freeman clearly states in his report that the Primary Schools Review is one component of a raft of other related initiatives that will directly impact on children that include: Extended Schools agenda / Children's Centre / Integrated Schools services / Community use including leisure, libraries and lifelong learning agenda to name a few. So how come the proposed closure appears to have been planned in isolation from the raft of these and other Central Government initiatives that all local authorities have to implement by law?
90	Primary education is already failing in some areas with so many young people leaving schools with no qualifications and some without even knowing the basics. Why add to these failures by disrupting education and making less school places available to children?