**Summary of Consultation Responses - Higher Standen**

In total 84 consultation responses were received. 54 responses were in support of the proposal, with 42 (50%) of these strongly agreeing. 21 respondents opposed the proposal, of which 16 (19%) were strongly opposed.

Overall, this equates to 64% in support of the proposal and 25% opposed. 9 respondents (11%) neither agreed nor disagreed with the proposal.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **How strongly do you agree or disagree with the proposal to start the process of commissioning a new primary school in Clitheroe?** *(Drop down list)* | |
|
| Strongly agree | 42 |
| Tend to agree | 12 |
| Neither agree nor disagree | 9 |
| Tend to disagree | 5 |
| Strongly disagree | 16 |

Respondent Information

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| A parent/carer of a pupil currently at: | 20 |
| A parent/carer of a future pupil at: | 8 |
| A member of staff at a local school/ gov organisation | 12 |
| A school governor at a local school | 8 |
| Other…. | 1 |
| an interested member of the local community | 35 |

It may be useful to note that 5 "Strongly Disagree" representations (8%) and 2 "Tend to Disagree" representations were received from St James CE Primary School (6 Governors and 1 member of staff). A further 2 "Strongly Disagree" responses were received from parent/carer of pupils at St James in addition to 1 "Strongly Agree", 1 "Tend to Agree" and also a 1 "Strongly Agree" response from a parent/carer of a future pupil at St James. This means 14% of the total responses were from St James stakeholders, indicating significant interest from this school.

Responses were received from 6 primary schools and 1 independent through school, Moorland Private School. 4 respondents strongly agreed with the proposal, 1 respondent neither agreed nor disagreed and 2 respondents strongly disagreed with the proposal.

8 responses were received from parents whose children would require school places in the future. It would appear that 7 of the responses were from parents who would wish to access a school place at the new school and 1 parent intended to access a school place at St James CE Primary School. 100% of the responses were strongly in support of the proposal.

It may also be useful to note that strong support for the proposal was provided by Mr Marshal Scott, Ribble Valley Chief Executive, and Mr Nigel Evans, MP for Ribble Valley.

Full list of response comments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| A clear need for school places | 57 |
| Agree with school location. | 24 |
| Economic benefits | 2 |
| Concerns of school capacity (not large enough) | 2 |
| Requirement for wider infrastructure provision in Clitheroe | 12 |
| A need for secondary school provision in the area | 8 |
| No comment | 3 |
| School status (Free school/Academy) including standards and accountability. | 10 |
| Demographic of new families | 9 |
| In favour of new school being Church of England Academy/Church of England school | 2 |
| Roman Road | 1 |
| No need for school places | 13 |
| Quality of life (crime/litter/air pollution/wildlife/beautiful views) | 10 |
| Concerns over impact over new school on existing school | 14 |
| Disagree with school location | 3 |
| Traffic volume and noise pollution | 33 |
| Future economic climate issues | 2 |
| Parking | 16 |
| Access through existing estate including sustainable transport route. | 27 |
| Traffic safety issues | 22 |
| Pupil migration from out of the area | 9 |
| Council financial resource concerns | 4 |
| Lack of information/explanation from the School Planning Team | 2 |
| Concern over playing field space | 1 |
| Concern over past/on-going/future housing development impact. Increased population. | 30 |
| Support/expand existing school instead. Spare places/capacity | 20 |
| Potential EOI for secondary school to change age range instead of new provision for a primary school | 1 |