

Appendix 1 – Summary of Responses to Consultation

There were a total of 7 responses to the consultation process. The responses received indicated support for the proposals. A summary of the answers given is provided below.

Question 1 – Do you support the proposal to relocate the Melbourne School PRU provision for Key Stage 3 pupils and collocate it with a permanent base for Key Stage 1 & 2 pupils on the Millbrook site? (Please tick one answer only)

Yes	4
No	3
Unsure	0

Question 2 – If you've answered "no" or "unsure" to the first question, would you prefer for the proposal to be approved with amendments; for an alternative option to be considered; or for things to stay as they are? (Please tick one answer only)

Approve with amendments	0
Alternative option	1
No change	2

Question 3 – We would also like to know a bit about you. This information is optional and will be used in accordance with the Data Protection Act 1998. (Please tick as many boxes as apply)

I am a:

Parent/Carer	2
Member of School Staff	1
Member of the School Management Committee	3
Other	1

Further Comments:

The balance of responses received was in favour of the proposal and this was reflected in the comments. These included:

- "We fully support the move of the Key Stage 4 section of the Southampton PRU from Melbourne Street to the Millbrook site in Green Lane... With the necessary proposed refurbishment, the Millbrook site will provide much better accommodation and facilities for all PRU students. PRU students need and deserve the same resources and opportunities as their fellows in mainstream schools."
- "This is an excellent idea and the rationale for the proposal is clear and sensible and will help us better support the needs of vulnerable young people."
- "I think this is an excellent idea that will serve these students incredibly well in the future."

Two of the responses that objected to the proposal also provided comments.

Objection 1: "I do not feel it is appropriate to have all Key stages on one site. I also feel it will reduce the attendance of Key Stage 4 students, due to it being so far away for many students to travel to."

SCC Response: Key Stage 2 and 3 provision are already co-located without issue and that the design for the facilities will serve to keep all key stages in distinct, separate areas of the building. Whilst it is appreciated that this relocation would involve longer journey times for some pupils, it is felt that the disincentive to attendance that it would pose would be significantly outweighed by the incentive provided by the improved facilities available at the new site (e.g. sports hall, playing pitches etc.). It is also worthwhile noting that management efficiencies (e.g. reduced utilities costs) would be delivered by co-location, enabling greater education resource to go towards the core business of learning and teaching.

Objection 2: the second objection raised a number of points, which are presented, together with the Council's response to each, in the table below.

No.	Objection	SCC Response
1	<p>“Anti-social behaviour is already a serious problem in the area, including in Cowley Close, Kern Close, Romsey Road, Barons Mead and Upper Brownhill Road... Bearing in mind that these pupils have been excluded from other schools, and their age, there could be additional burden on Redbridge ward residents in terms of crime and ASB... Once again, it appears that Redbridge ward is perceived as the “sink” into which problems elsewhere are placed. Local residents are fed up with such attitudes.”</p>	<p>There is no evidence to suggest that there will be an issue with crime/ASB in Redbridge as a consequence of this move. Both the Compass and the Melbourne sites report that there have been no such incidents with neighbours/the surrounding community in the 2011/12 academic year.</p>
2	<p>“There is no indication over whether the Police or Council officers... have been consulted and so we cannot assume that such changes would pass off without problems, or whether indeed the Police feel that this is a change that they would support.”</p>	<p>The scope of the consultation that was carried out is detailed in the main report (§10-11). Taken as a whole, the activities undertaken exceeded the requirements for a proposal of this nature. That said, as has been the case under the existing arrangements, the Headteacher, school management board and senior CSL officers will maintain a close relationship with the Police and other relevant council officers to ensure any possibility for anti-social behaviour is minimised as far as humanly possible. It is felt that this effective working relationship has contributed markedly to the fact that there have been no such ASB incidents with neighbours/the surrounding community in the 2011/12 academic year emanating from pupils attending PRU provision.</p>
3	<p>“We are also extremely disappointed that... ward councillors were not directly consulted about these changes, despite the issue being a</p>	<p>As indicated above, the scope of the consultation that was carried out is detailed in the main report (§10-11). Taken as a whole, the activities</p>

	<p>key ward issue that residents would have views upon... we also do not feel that residents were adequately consulted.”</p>	<p>undertaken exceeded the requirements for a proposal of this nature. However, whilst there is every confidence that the implementation of this proposal will improve significantly the educational outcomes and life-chances of these most vulnerable children and young people, it will be important to agree further steps with Ward Councillors that ensure all are well informed and have as much opportunity as possible to help ensure the new provision’s success in ways that work for pupils, the school’s neighbours and the community at large.</p>
--	--	--