



# **Cheswick Green Parish Council**

**SOLIHULL**

**Response to Solihull MBCs  
second consultation on  
Cheswick Green Primary  
(CGP) School  
February 2021**

The Parish Council (PC) believes that the number of objections to this proposal will be severely curtailed, as it has only been able to inform residents about this consultation via the internet. As per the previous consultation this discriminates against those that do not own/use an electronic device, making these consultations not inclusive and this matter needs addressing, as it is unfair.

Members of the Parish Council would have distributed leaflets through doors however due to COVID19 we have been advised by Solihull Council (SC) not to do so.

The (PC) appreciates the second opportunity to respond to the proposed expansion of the school but unfortunately is opposed to this project being undertaken.

The (PC) is disappointed that (SC) has chosen to refer to the decision of the (PC) in 2016 rather than the decision of 2020. Agenda item 3.10 of the report to Cabinet Portfolio Holder for Children of 11<sup>th</sup> January 2021 states 'The Parish Council considers that the expansion of Cheswick Green Primary School offers the best location to accommodate the demand for primary school places associated with existing and future properties in the area'.

The (PC) would inform (SC) that this decision was taken when the Chairman of the (PC) at that time, had what current Parish Council members consider an interest in this matter and should have withdrawn from proceedings. The Chairman influenced the decision of the (PC) through his position and in that several Councillors had not been in post for long. Furthermore, the same person had fraudulently submitted two 'Call for Sites' to (SC) one of which concerned land adjacent to CGP School. The (PC) would be obliged if (SC) did not refer to this tainted decision in future.

As (SC) has chosen to raise the past rather than the present Councillor Hawkins one of our Ward Councillors opposed the proposed extension but subsequently changed his view. Party (toe the line) politics no doubt, not a "Thatcherite" then.

We were not pleased to read the following message from Councillor Hawkins on 2<sup>nd</sup> February 2021 which he posted on Twitter. 'Pleased with the reaffirmation by Cabinet member Ken Meeson this evening for school transport to be provided for school pupils who wish to attend the potentially expanded Cheswick Green Primary School'. The word 'potentially' is understood as is the expected outcome of this consultation process by us and our residents.

We cannot understand why so little progress has been made in establishing a project to deliver this proposal since 2016. We the public are now entering into a second round of consultation where we are being asked to comment on proposals that are not fully developed or thought through. It appears that this proposal is accelerating when consideration should - but has not - been given to the views of parents of pupils and local residents. The only way we are receiving anything other than scant information is by asking questions. We hold the view that at the first stage of consultation we the public should have been furnished with details that provided a clear picture and an understanding of what is being proposed. We are of the opinion that (SC) delayed progress to present parents and residents with a fait accompli.

We understand that should this proposal proceed it is likely that a planning application will be subject to a Full Cabinet meeting this April. We are a consultee but would appreciate sight of the plans and other information at the earliest possible date.

The (PC) would welcome a social media meeting with the Councillors involved with this proposal and we have sent them each a copy of our response to this consultation.

We raised several questions with Ann Pearson during this consultation period. Our questions, her replies are in italics and our views of those replies are below.

1. The Headteacher and Governing Body are supportive of the proposal, in principle, and are clear about the benefits that this expansion can provide to current and future pupils. Can you please explain this as this was not our impression from the draft minutes from the Governor Body meeting?

*During original desk top feasibility work, Cheswick Green Primary School was identified as one of 3 schools that could meet the demand from the proposed Blythe Valley development. The Governing Body expressed an interest in being expanded at that stage of the process. Desktop feasibility work identified that neither Hockley Heath or St Patrick's Church of England Academy could be expanded to meet the demand from Blythe Valley Park, so Cheswick Green Primary became the identified school for a proposed expansion. Since then the Headteacher and Governing Body have worked hard, in partnership with the Council, to develop a building scheme that can deliver the requirements of the school but meets the budgetary constraints of the Council. At the Governing Body meeting in October 2020, the building design and proposal were signed off 'in principle' by the Governing Body, this meant that the proposal could move forward to public consultation.*

*However, part of the purpose of the Governing Body meeting in October was to provide further feedback and ask questions about the design and this is reflected in the discussion. At the time of the meeting from which the draft minutes have been referenced, the Governing Body signed off the proposal 'in principle' because the majority of the building design was agreed but still required some further amendments. Work is ongoing and the scheme has move forward again since that meeting. This scheme represents a significant investment in Cheswick Green Primary School of around £3,000,000.*

No matter what we are told concerning how this stage of the proposal has been reached, one cannot escape the fact that you cannot reasonably fit a two-form entry into a one form entry school with the addition of new classrooms and by re-engineering existing space. Surely our children deserve a modern education establishment. This is Solihull one of the most sought-after locations to live in this country not an inner-city area.

There were clearly problems with this proposal at the October meeting of the Governing Body with funding also being an issue (see Appendix 1). An investment of £3,000,000 from Section 106 Agreements, however this amount is only a fraction of what was received in relation to Cheswick Place and Blythe Valley (BV).

Finance is the decision-making factor here. As your report states 'An expansion of an existing school is the most cost-effective way of creating the additional 210 places required'.

2. The Headteacher and Governing Body have been integral to the design proposal and have carefully considered the use of the school building as part of this process. Can you please inform us what the benefits to pupils are?

*The Headteacher, supported by Governors is continuing to work with the Building Design team to ensure that the final design 'enables staff to provide the same*

quality of education for 420 pupils as is currently being provided for 210 pupils'. This work has included adapting and improving the design to include the following:

- Ensuring classroom bases follow the present very successful design (own cloakroom, outdoor access and canopy area directly outside classroom in addition all classrooms will now have their own sink area)
- Creating breakout learning spaces around the school
- Providing additional meeting and office space
- Having enough storage space for curriculum resources
- Ensuring there are adequate toilet facilities for children and adults
- Developing our Early Years provision for Nursery and Reception
- Improving outdoor spaces for play and games
- Providing extended space for the hall when needed

*It is important to note that the benefits to pupils, through this expansion, are not solely from the building expansion. The key benefits for pupils are due to the very fact that the school has more pupils on roll which provides increased revenue funding. This was highlighted in the published frequently asked questions document that was published as part of the consultation process.*

*With increased funding comes greater opportunities to purchase resources to support learning and this includes staffing. This could be through having greater numbers of support staff, through increased training, or by being able to retain experienced staff by offering wider opportunities for career progression whilst staying in the school.*

*More staff means more curriculum expertise. All the curriculum subjects need to be led by a co-ordinator. In a one-form entry school there can be the need for more subject co-ordinators than there are staff; this can be a challenge. In a two-form entry school key subjects such as English and Mathematics could have two teachers leading to maximise impact. Creating staff teams for planning is very effective and whilst this can be done in phases (FKS, KS1 and KS2), in a one-form entry primary school it is far more effective when done in year groups. This is possible in a two-form entry school because each year group has two teachers and other support staff who can work collaboratively and share new ideas. This can not only improve the outcomes of the children but can also enhance the professional development of all staff.*

We agree with the methodology but again as you must be aware there is a lack of space.

Some phrases have been carefully chosen. Creating spaces can only mean within the existing school building. Providing additional office space and storage space, again within the existing space. And improving outdoor space for play and games, is an insult to our intelligence. A significant part of the surface area will make way for classroom construction and the number of pupils using the playground will double.

We are told that the Headteacher and Governing Body have been integral to the process, so why is it our understanding that staff at the school have been forbidden to discuss this matter. And why has the Headteacher refused to discuss this with a parent. We will provide particulars on request.

3. Additional parking provision for staff has been included in the feasibility study. The existing car park will be expanded to provide an additional 14 parking places. Does the 'feasibility study' mean that an additional 14 spaces will be provided?

Do you agree that existing parking is 13+1 disabled space? On the assumption that the total of spaces is 28 how many parking spaces will be required for staff when the school is at full capacity?

*The current formal existing parking provision is 44 and the proposed additional parking is 65 to account for 7 additional teaching staff and up to 7 assistant teachers, noting that some may use sustainable modes of transport.*

Existing parking is 14 spaces not 44. If 44 spaces were in place when the school was constructed, they have not been evident to our knowledge for 30 years or more. We suggest that you reconsider parking as part of your ongoing traffic consultation and review where sufficient parking for staff can be created, provided or developed. We know where the space will be found, on Cheswick Way or a neighbouring road.

Appendix 3, pages 17-21 show vehicles parked outside the school Monday to Friday. Staff at the school park between 12-16 vehicles per day during the same period. Page 22 depict the same area outside the school during last week's half term, quite a marked difference.

4. Would you please provide a copy of the feasibility study that demonstrated that a new school could not be built on Blythe Valley. What was the number of houses projected for Blythe Valley at the time?

*No feasibility study has been undertaken regarding the physical location of a school in Blythe Valley. The issue around the creation of a new school is about the development providing insufficient pupil demand to sustain the viability of a new school. The pupil yield from the Blythe Valley Park development is based on the approved 750 dwellings.*

*A development of this size is expected to generate approximately 30 pupils per year.*

*No school takes 100% of its catchment area cohort, the norm in Solihull is on average 50% of pupils – in more rural areas such as Cheswick Green this rises to around 70%. This would generate around 21 pupils per year. It is the pupil yield from both Blythe Valley Park and Cheswick Place that will support the creation of the additional 1 form of entry.*

We are astounded that (SC) could be so negligent with regard to the future education of children. Not a single report with options has been presented to Councillors concerning the viability of constructing a new school on Blythe Valley or a new two-form entry school in place of the existing Hockley Heath Primary School. Not even a feasibility study just a desk top exercise on the back of a fag packet. Councillors have merely accepted without question what Officers have told them and from what we can glean from the first consultation our objections met with indifference.

5. What is the scope and over what period will the traffic survey be undertaken.

*The Council has appointed a consultant transport and highway engineer to review the proposal and its impact on the local area. Their finding will be developed and scrutinised by the local planning authority ahead of the formal planning submission to ensure that the proposal meets the Council's various development policies relating to developments within urban neighbourhoods.*

*The consultant will be required to undertake a transportation assessment suitable to support a planning submission to include (but not limited to) the following:*

- *Mapping of pedestrian and cycle routes into site from the surrounding areas based on empirical data including details of existing route infrastructure and identification of desire lines across roads.*
- *Surveys of (i) on-site car parking demand and (ii) off -street all day demand to identify any displaced parking associated with staff and residents.*
- *Observation of surrounding highway conditions during set-down/pick-up periods, this will include how displaced parking affects/inhibits safe access to the School by all modes, the impact on existing residents and highway management.*
- *Identification of possible infrastructure improvements to facilitate access into School site from identified walking cycle desire lines including enhanced crossing facilities at principle roads.*
- *Identification of possible improvements to mitigate any increased setdown/pick-up on surrounding residential roads, including offer of vehicle access crossings and driveways to existing residents.*
- *Assessment of personal recorded injury accidents in vicinity of site and identification of mitigation for any identified issues.*
- *Calculation of forecast traffic impact using evidenced based approach for each proposed use e.g. school/nursery facilities based either on first principles or derivation of trip rate according to existing modal splits of staff, visitors, pupil set-down/pick-up from existing school travel plan data and/or parking surveys.*
- *Set out net change in trips against existing use.*
- *Calculation of forecast parking accumulations using evidence based first principles for proposed use, including visitor parking, using existing parking surveys and modal splits contained within existing school travel plans and new facilities, accumulations based on derived trips rates. For any nursery uses, please note modal split of set-down and pick-up will not follow existing school modal splits due to the greater propensity for parents to drive to setdown/pick-up children.*
- *Assessment of forecast parking against existing on-site supply with mitigation proposed to ensure existing displaced parking does not exacerbate existing injudicious displaced parking on surrounding roads. The initial assessments were carried out in December 2020, and the transport statement is being developed under the scrutiny of the local planning authority. The works will be complete prior to the formal submission of the planning application.*

(SC) has commissioned a transport survey during a time when only the pupils of key workers are in school. What possible meaningful data can be derived from such a survey; we look forward to seeing the data prior to the next stage in this process. Irrespective of the outcomes of the traffic survey and current COVID restrictions you cannot mitigate sufficiently to significantly curb the increase in unwarranted cross flow of traffic and the ensuing chaos that will follow. We would appreciate a copy of the commissioned traffic report as soon as possible so that we may compare the results with our own traffic survey.

It would appear that a decision has been taken to provide transport to and from school which would ease congestion if the take up is high. Staggering school attendance hours will not help, nor will before and after school club attendance and the need of parents to go to work.

6. In view of the significant resident concern, it is noted that an independent assessment of traffic and parking had been commissioned. As families dropping off/collecting young children from BV would be most likely to use their own transport, would you please confirm that the assessment will take account of the additional harmful gases that the expansion would produce. Importantly, would you also please confirm that your recommendation will reflect the Council's carbon reduction targets.

*The transport mitigation options will consider the Council's carbon reduction targets. In response to reduced carbon emissions the school has refreshed and implemented a school travel plan to promote sustainable modes of transport.*

We suggest that you give serious consideration to the needless crossflow of traffic between Cheswick Green and Blythe Valley. If the revised Local Plan is approved the same can be said of a new two form entry school within Site 12 serving pupils who will mainly not reside in Cheswick Green. Is Cheswick Green to become a primary school hub. We will be interested to see how carbon reduction targets can be met with not only an increase in traffic flow but also a needless increase in cross traffic flow.

7. It is stated that the traffic/parking study will investigate mitigating options which may include an alternative access to the school site. It is assumed that the key use of a second access would be to drop off/collect children from the school. With car engines running in the access road and the inherent traffic congestion in approaching roads, would you please confirm that this will all be taken into account.

*The proposed transport mitigation options are currently considering several opportunities that are subject to further investigation, detailed consideration and agreement with the Local Planning Authority. Carbon reduction and congestion will naturally be considered by the consultant transport and highway engineer to adhere to the local planning authorities policy requirements.*

Public Health England is promoting the need for pollution to be reduced in the vicinity of schools and yet the implications of the (SC) proposal will be to increase pollution levels.

8. Your feasibility study may have demonstrated that Hockley Heath Primary School and St Patrick's Academy were unsuitable to accommodate an expansion of this size. However, as a key suggestion was to accommodate children across all three primary schools, we see no evidence that the proposal was taken seriously and investigated. Paragraph 4.4 of the Cabinet Member report on 11<sup>th</sup> January did specifically address the feedback in the consultation regarding the option to accommodate the children across all three primary schools and identified that this was not a credible option, for the reasons identified in the report.

*To meet demand from Blythe Valley Park and Cheswick Place developments the Council needs to add additional school places, to ensure it meets its sufficiency duty. Cheswick Green Primary School is the closest school to both developments.*

As you will see later in our response (SC) has given no meaningful consideration to credible alternative options.

9. It is noted that the Cabinet Holder for Education is also a Councillor for Hockley Heath. This does suggest a conflict of interests and with this in mind, a reappraisal of allocating children across all three local primary schools is requested.

*As indicated in the Cabinet Member report 11<sup>th</sup> January and the answer to question 8 above, it is Officer's view that this is not a deliverable option to provide sufficient school places in response to the housing development at Blythe Valley Park and Cheswick Place. This view has been endorsed by the Cabinet Member.*

We believe that some Councillors involved in this proposal have a conflict of interest.

Below are our detailed objections to this proposal which generally are no different than the previous consultation. However, if this proposal is approved, we do have a recommendation to make with regard to Blythe Valley children travelling to CGP School.

#### Proposed extension

The proposed extension is only adequate rather than looking to the future. In our opinion while probably meeting the needs to accommodate twice as many children and staff, the facilities do not compare to what was provided in the North of the Borough under 'The Building Schools for The Future' programme. Surely this is an oversight of SC. Is there not sufficient funding from the Section 106 Agreements to provide such facilities?

Members of CGPC have read SC documents in relation to building schools for the future and the 'Primary Schools Strategic Framework' version 1.2 published in 2006. We are concerned that provisions of the 'vision for primary school education in Solihull' do not reflect what is proposed here. The strategic plans (North Solihull) published in 2012/13/14 have good outcomes but will the same be said of our school some years following this proposed expansion?

The proposed classrooms with breakout areas appear to be satisfactory however many other areas of the school are not.

The hall for 200 children is the same size for 400 children?

The after-school club for 200 children is the same size for 400 children?

The library for 200 children is the same size for 400 children?

The music room for 200 children is the same size for 400 children?

The number of toilets has been increased which probably meets the minimum requirements, but could not more modern considerations have been included as part of this project?

The staffroom is too small now yet presumably the number of staff will double.

Will staff in an overcrowded room for lunch and meetings be in the right frame of mind to teach?

Is the reception of sufficient size to deal with parents' queries?

Will all school staff be able to park within the school grounds? It is imperative that sufficient car parking spaces are provided for all staff. It is not appropriate that they should have to park outside residents' houses as many do at present.

Will the proposal if approved take into consideration the environment, green credentials and be more eco-friendly? Indeed, would the school environment be a good place for children and staff?

Will current technology be utilised to aid learning? The school was rated as 'Good' following the last two Ofsted Inspections and we are concerned that the



standard may slip in the confined spaces of the school should this proposal be approved. The classrooms are adequate; however, it is the other spaces where we have concerns.

We understand the Governing Body have agreed in principle to this proposal which comprises of professional and informed lay persons whereas we as uninformed lay persons foresee insurmountable issues.

#### Surrounding area and infrastructure

Below is a satellite photograph of CGP School showing the nearby road network. If you are unfamiliar with this location, you will see that there is only one road access to the school. Bear that in mind in conjunction with our objections to this proposal.



Officers of the Borough Council have commissioned a traffic and highways appraisal to assess the impact of this project.

Should this appraisal be undertaken when the school is operating a temporary staggered access and egress whilst the pandemic is in operation. We would expect that the commission should not only include the impact of 200 plus children travelling to and from Blythe Valley, but also the impact of hundreds of children travelling to and from Shirley to attend the new school proposed as part of the 1000 plus homes to be constructed along part of the length of Dog Kennel Lane and the Stratford Road.

We are aware that a travel survey has been undertaken involving staff and parents of children attending the school. We are concerned that the survey does not include all residents of Cheswick Green in particular residents who live near the school. Perhaps residents and/or other surveys will follow, will they?

Parking outside of the school entrance is and has been a problem for decades. At present at least 1/3 of the children walk to Cheswick Green school but this proposal will also be to accommodate the children living too far away to walk to school. Footpaths from Blythe Valley do not exist. So, with 400 children and the

accompanying staff, both classroom support and others, and the increase in HGV delivering to the school the present infrastructure will not cope at all.

We would not object to a 4-metre-wide path with lighting being laid to connect Blythe Valley with Cheswick Green. A possible route for your consideration is depicted in (Appendix 2) which would also provide a link between the two communities and be of benefit to walkers.

Doubling the size of the school exacerbates traffic hazards that cannot be resolved now so how could this be resolved in future? Please be aware that one bus service will no longer travel past the school because of the congestion and therefore elderly residents must alight on Creynolds Lane and walk to their homes. We would point out that a large percentage of residents are elderly and/or infirm.

Appendix 3 contains comments from a resident who lives opposite the school together with some photographs that he has taken.

We would oppose parking restrictions within 100 metres either side of the school gates with a 20-mph speed limit outside the school. The Parish Council has considered this, but it would merely create parking hazards elsewhere. If the road was clearer outside the school, then children would be more at risk from motorists travelling faster.

We would also oppose designated parking areas such as the car parks of The Saxon Pub and the Village Hall. We would expect the management of these premises to continue to allocate their parking bays to the users of their buildings and for users of the nearby Recreation Ground.

Perhaps restrictive parking could be imposed between 8-9am and 3-4pm, but would such a measure be regularly enforced, we think not. In that event a 20-mph speed limit would be irrelevant as traffic would be severely hampered in passing the school. We understand that the pilot of 20-mph zones in close proximity to schools have not generally been successful.

Neighbours nearby the school are being inconvenienced on a twice daily basis, which periodically has escalated into arguments and threats of violence between householders and motorists. These confrontations are generally the result of blocked drives, a situation which will only worsen if these proposals are approved.

Cheswick Way and nearby roads become heavily congested or gridlocked by inconsiderate motorists and the air pollution is hazardous to residents and children.

What may mitigate traffic congestion to some extent is a free bus service from Blythe Valley. Unless the rules have changed a free bus service is not possible, is a subsidised service possible? We assume from Councillor Hawkins recent Twitter comment that approval for this option is certain. Which could mean the expansion is already a done deal and this consultation is merely a tick box exercise?

Presently traffic congestion along Cheswick Way and other roads local to the school is appalling, it would of course be significantly worse if this proposal goes through. It is estimated that at least 150 children will be taken to school by car and the extensive congestion would inevitably flow over into Creynolds Lane.

We understand that consideration is being given to a secondary access/egress to the school, off Creynolds Lane to ease congestion on Cheswick Way. Such a proposal, if approved, will not ease the existing level of congestion on Cheswick

Way. Indeed, congestion would increase on Creynolds Lane and create 2 'bottle necks' where 1 'bottle neck' currently exists. The Parish Council is opposed to creating a secondary access to the school.

A path between Blythe Valley has been considered and we are uncertain whether that remains a possibility considering there would be a need for a bridge over the River Blythe. A path runs around Blythe Valley which could be extended to Cheswick Green but what safe route would it follow? Great for walkers but is it likely that a path would be used by children to walk the 2.2 miles to and from school? We have provided a route for a path for your consideration. We believe that not enough pupils would use a path to make this option viable (Appendix 2).

In a wider context consideration should have been given to the increase in traffic from feeder roads on to and through the Stratford Road corridor as part of this consultation. The cross flow of traffic between Blythe Valley and Cheswick Green Primary School would not be necessary if a new school or extension had been constructed on Blythe Valley or Hockley Heath.

#### School Board of Governors meeting

We have been provided with a copy of the draft minutes of the Board of Governors held on Tuesday 13th October 2020. The debate relating to this matter are shown in Appendix 1.

Having read the content we are adamant that the Board of Governors should not have agreed in principle to the plan.

The following points made during that meeting give great cause for concern;

An old version of a picture of 3D modelling was shared but will be updated and shared with the school?

An Ecologist will do a habitat and biodiversity study?

The design is agreeable at present?

Assumptions are being made about services and exceptions?

White boards are not included but there used to be a fund?

As the ICT suite is being remodelled, the school would have to ask AW about funding for this?

If new computers are needed because of the new building, this is another discussion to be had?

Traffic was identified as a key issue.

#### Further considerations

This issue will be exacerbated by the children coming from Blythe Valley for which there is currently little or no alternative other than to drive.

Detailed and workable solutions will be required to this issue in order to recommend the expansions and to obtain planning permission.

The continuation of the current staggered starts and finishing times in the school may be required. Unlikely to be favoured by parents once COVID19 abates.

New pupils are likely to come from Blythe Valley who would probably require car trips.

A path from Blythe Valley is being looked at, but there are complications.

Because a new school did not form part of the plans for Blythe Valley, plans need to be made for children to get to school. This may mean that some money would be available for transport.

A bus service from Blythe Valley might be a possibility, but these services are expensive and not always popular with parents.

Part of the planning process would be consultation with local residents and parents.

Transport and highways would be part of this consultation.

---

The above extracts from the draft minutes do not give confidence that this is no more than an exercise of how can the extension of the school be shoehorned in.

We are of the opinion that the Governing Body accepted what they were being told and did not have any questions or queries which in our experience is unusual particularly when the proposal is double the number of pupils.

We were told that we will have the opportunity to comment on any transport and highways mitigation offered as part of the planning application. Residents do not need a commissioned traffic and highways appraisal to know that whatever mitigation is recommended congestion will be far worse than at present.

This is just another example of no proper thought being given to a large project by the Council.

#### Alternative Proposal

Under a 'presumption route' the Council is able to make a business case for a new school. We understand that under this arrangement the Council is responsible for the capital cost and revenue set up costs. We agree that creating over-provision of school places has the potential to destabilise the viability of neighbouring schools, but the Councils preferred model is a 2FE (420) place school.

The Parish Council recommends a new one (210) or two form entry (420) place school.

The Council has said 'That no site has been identified for a school at Blythe Valley'. We request that Officers are asked to re-examine Blythe Valley and examine Hockley Heath for a site suited to a one form entry school. Officers will conclude there is sufficient demand for places for a new school to be feasible at both sites. Indeed, should the construction of 90 plus dwellings earmarked for Hockley Heath in the current draft LDP be approved, that development could be commenced in the first stage (5 years) of the plan and further school places for children would be available.

An alternative is to build a new two form entry school at Hockley Heath to replace the existing school which was built following the closure of the original school in 1913.

Either of these two proposals could be financed from Section 106 Agreements arising from the developments at Cheswick Place and Blythe Valley to pay for a new school. Further finance would be available from the sale of land if a new school is built in Hockley Heath.

A new school constructed within Blythe Valley or Hockley Heath would make journeys to and from Cheswick Green school easier and safer for children with

the benefit of easing congestion locally. Blythe Valley has a mix of uses including housing and has been effectively removed from the green belt. Hockley Heath has a settlement boundary around it and we would reiterate that there are proposals to remove more land from the green belt. Both areas are also sustainable with good connectivity and transport links. We understand that the Council owns/has an interest in parcels of land within the area.

Solihull Council should be looking to the future education of our children by constructing a new school incorporating up to date environmental, bio-diverse, energy saving and technological advancements.

#### Summary

This consultation lacks proper detail and expanding Cheswick Green Primary School is an easy option without any recourse to the implications for the local area. It seems that no other options have been given any detailed consideration.

The primary concern of the Parish Council is the expansion of the school with exception to other criteria. Will the school be 'fit for purpose' appears to be a secondary consideration and the impact on residents not a consideration at all.

Residents do not need a commissioned traffic and highways appraisal to know that whatever mitigation is recommended congestion will be far worse than at present.

The Parish Council continues to urge the Borough Councillors to reject the expansion of Cheswick Green Primary School when so many questions posed require answers and seek an alternative location to accommodate the children within Blythe Valley or Hockley Heath.

## Appendix 1

### CHESWICK GREEN PRIMARY SCHOOL

Minutes of the Meeting of the Full Board of Governors

Held at 6.30pm on Tuesday 13th October 2020 by Teams

Persons present: L Choonpicharn (LC), A Kinsey (AK), J Laishley (JL), C Mason (CM), S Proudfoot (SP), D Smith (DS), C Thompson (CT)

In attendance: Brett Goody (BG), A Vining (Clerk)

All reports referred to in the minutes are available on request from the Clerk and had been circulated to governors in advance via GovernorHub.

1 Welcome and apologies AK welcomed everyone to the meeting.

Apologies were received from: S Aldred (SA), A Cresswell (AC), A Ward (AW) and Sandeep Magar.

2 Purpose of Meeting The meeting was called to show governors the design as it stands at present.

The purpose of the meeting is to agree in principle to the plan.

This will allow statutory consultation to go ahead and BG and his colleagues to move ahead with more detailed plans.

3 Plans The plans presented are the ones produced in response to the last meeting with the school when CM requested a few amendments.

The proposed plans for the new school were shared on screen, explained and discussed in detail.

A picture showing 3d modelling was shared – this was an old version but will be updated and shared with the school.

An ecologist will do a habitat and bio-diversity survey. This may lead to the chance to upgrade the biodiversity on the site.

Challenge: has the design been costed? It has. It is expensive but has been discussed with Anthony Watson who is in charge of budget. BG has spoken to Peter Carroll and the design is agreeable at present.

Challenge: what assumptions do you make with regard to heating, lighting etc.?

This is based on BCIS

indices by floor area. Recent tender exercises are also used. There would be assumptions about additional services and also exceptions which would be subject to survey.

ICT and infrastructure:

ICT is provided. Whiteboards are not included, but BG advised there used to be a fund for money per

classroom, administered by Steve Fenton. The build, finishes and anything fixed to the wall is covered. If the base plan is accepted in principle, the ICT work forms part of this.

As the ICT suite is being remodelled, the school would have to ask Anthony Watson about funding for this.

Links and conduit would be provided, but usually a different company is used for the cabling. If new computers are needed because of the new building, this is another discussion to be had.

Cheswick Green Primary School. Full Governing Body Minutes. 13.10.20.

Prepared by Alison Vining 2

Programme:

The aim would be to start in September 2021.

Traffic:

BG identified traffic and accessibility to the school as the key issue moving forward. This issue will be

exacerbated by the children coming from Blythe Valley for which there is currently little or no alternative other than to drive. Detailed and workable solutions will be

required to this issue in order to recommend the expansions and to obtain planning permission.

BG explained that procurement of surveys and a transport engineer have already been started – parking at pick up and drop off is known to be a problem. A parking area would be needed for parents; the transport engineer would need to assess how many spaces would be needed, including extra spaces for extra staff. The continuation of the current staggered starts and finishing times in the school may be required.

Before and after-school club provision helps.

New pupils are likely to come from Blythe Valley who would probably require car trips. A path from Blythe Valley is being looked at, but there are complications. Because a new school did not form part of the plans for Blythe Valley, plans need to be made for children to get to school. This may mean that some money would be available for transport.

There may be an opportunity to bring a new access route.

A bus service from Blythe Valley might be a possibility, but these services are expensive and not always popular with parents.

The school travel plan would be revised and walking buses might be an option. But this does not solve the problem of parents who drop their children by car on the way to work.

A meeting has already been held with transport engineers as they need to look at traffic flow and predictions. They are usually very demanding.

Consultation:

Part of the planning process would be consultation with local residents and parents. Transport and highways would be part of this consultation.

Conclusion:

More work is needed from the design team, structural and mechanical engineers etc.

Brett was thanked for the support he and his team have given to Carol so far.

Governors agreed in principle to the expansion of Cheswick Green based on the layout plan submitted

(Proposed Option 1E rev P05) and discussed at the meeting. Governors accepted that further work

is needed to get the plan ready for planning.

4 Governors' Actions BG left the meeting at this point

AK will speak to Ann Pearson to ask what she needs from the governors to proceed. It also needs to be understood who from SMBC will co-ordinate the various issues and practicalities involved with this.

The mitigation events would afford a compound area to access the site away from the present school. An enabling drawing would be drawn up to show how the build would be arranged.

AK to speak to Ann Pearson

Cheswick Green Primary School. Full Governing Body Minutes. 13.10.20.

Prepared by Alison Vining 3

Plans will be brought back to the FGB at appropriate times. Governors agreed that the Buildings Committee

should oversee some of the decisions in the meantime.

Governors agreed that the plans can be shared more widely with staff after the meeting with cabinet next week. AK to confirm with CM when this can be done.

The Buildings Meeting on 21st October 2020 is no longer needed.



Appendix 2



Google Earth

31/01/2021

<https://earth.google.com/web/@52.3768945,-1.8022018,133.87793542a,2755.30387538d,357,0,11625425h,01,0r>



1/1



### Appendix 3

As you know we live opposite the current school entrance and have for around 2 years. During our we have experienced several issues with traffic and parking associated with the school run as it stands. I've even stood in the road and directed traffic when a Mexican standoff has occurred!

The biggest issue for us is parents parking across our drive restricting access to our property or guests from leaving. We are not the only people on Cheswick Way in the vicinity of the school who experience this issue. Most properties between the School and Creynolds Lane experience this regularly.

I have looked to address the situation directly with people but having been called racist amongst other things, when all I asked was them to move their vehicle and experienced further repercussions of this I have stopped doing so due to concerns it may impact on my kids.

There are 2 further points regularly that are shown in the photos.

The 1<sup>st</sup> is parking on the Zig Zag and blocking the safe access for others to enter/leave the school.

The 2<sup>nd</sup> being people parking on the double yellow lines opposite the entrance. It has been indicated that the school suggested to a few who are disabled that this was acceptable, but it is not just them who park there.

When you have a combination of all 3 which is pretty often it totally restricts the flow of traffic on Cheswick Way. Adding yet more vehicles to the school runs is only going to make the situation worse.















Appendix 4

