



**CLAREMONT SCHOOL**  
**REDEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS**  
**PARENT / GUARDIAN SURVEY REPORT**

**NOVEMBER – DECEMBER 2020**

**NOTE\*:**

The purpose of the Parent / Guardian Survey was initial engagement with Parents/ Guardians only, regarding the redevelopment proposals at Claremont School. The survey was not intended or designed for engagement with wider stakeholders within the community.

The comments within the report incorporate comments from some members of the community who participated in the Parent / Guardian survey once they were aware of the survey.

The comments received are ahead of any formal community engagement and shall therefore not be used in whole, or in part, within the Planning Application Community Involvement Statement.

The comments within this report are provided with the purpose of informing the design development only.

EDUCATION CAPITAL TEAM

December 2020

## Claremont School redevelopment proposals

<https://bristol.citizenspace.com/children-families-services/claremont-school-redevelopment-proposals>

This report was created on Monday 07 December 2020 at 12:06

The consultation ran from 13/11/2020 to 06/12/2020

Responses to this survey: **22**

### Proposed ground floor layout

#### Do you agree with the proposed ground floor layout?

There were 22 responses to this part of the question.

Option	Total	Percent
Yes	14	63.64%
Parts of it	4	18.18%
No	4	18.18%
Not Answered	0	0.00%

#### Please provide comments below: Ground floor layout

There were 8 responses to this part of the question.

##### Summary of comments (ref Note\*):

- Urgently needed.
- Looks attractive / fit for purpose / spacious & airy.
- Boundary issue to be resolved to the north & east of the site with circa 2m additional land currently shown.
- Vast increase in building footprint with considerable increase in traffic / parking in small residential streets.
- Huge increase in traffic associated with pupil numbers, little increase in staff parking. Concerns of parking on surrounding streets, causing congestion (also for emergency vehicles etc.).
- Financial model is fundamentally flawed as most of the maintenance costs are associated with Claremont House which will be retained.
- Noisy plant near to residential properties.

- Disagree to demolish the majority of the site which are within their design life (newest 10-years old/ pool 20-years old). Better to spend money on the replacement of pre-fabs at Henleaze Junior School.
- New building footprint much greater than existing. Loss of green space.

### Proposed first and second floor layout

#### Do you agree with the proposed ground floor layout?

There were 21 responses to this part of the question.

Option	Total	Percent
Yes	12	54.55%
Parts of it	3	13.64%
No	6	27.27%
Not Answered	1	4.55%

#### Please provide comments below: First and Second Floor Layout

There were 8 responses to this part of the question.

#### Summary of comments (ref Note\*):

- What is the fire strategy ? Concerns of means of fire escape on from 1<sup>st</sup> floor for Secondary & Post-16.
- Will the therapists area on the GF include a medical room ? There doesn't seem enough space for clinics and therapeutic treatment.
- No mention of dedicated sensory space (a Sensory / Immersion Room).
- Looks attractive / fit for purpose / spacious & airy.
- Additional classrooms will provide much needed SEND space.
- No elevations provided. Concerns of shadowing and overlooking to adjacent residential properties.
- Too much development / overdevelopment. Two storey will be totally out of keeping. Other schools on the Henleaze site are spacious and low-rise. Surrounding houses are chalets and lower buildings. Concerns of overlooking.
- RGS is a perfectly adequate and purpose-built facility, with benefits for both Claremont and RGS pupils to interact.
- New building will remove the visual appearance of Claremont House, the only building currently visible from Henleaze Park.
- Accommodating children older than Primary would be inappropriate. Older children would be better located at RGS.

## Proposed external spaces

### Do you agree with the proposed external spaces?

There were 22 responses to this part of the question.

Option	Total	Percent
Yes	12	54.55%
Parts of it	4	18.18%
No	6	27.27%
Not Answered	0	0.00%

### Please provide comments on proposed external spaces below:

There were 10 responses to this part of the question.

#### Summary of comments (ref Note\*):

- Drop off & pick-up are far too small. Existing arrangements (7 drop-off & 2 disabled) are full to crowded / laughable. Will be chaos and won't be enough space with little off-street parking.
- Children in wheelchairs are not easily visible – it's a disaster waiting to happen.
- School Transport should provide transport rather than pushing parents to take their own children.
- Concerns of access on/off site during construction and in use around pick-up/ drop off times.
- Not many accessible or minibus bays. Where is the home-to-school transport going to park ? (taxi's, large mobility vehicles etc.)
- There are already around 30 staff who drive. The surrounding roads are currently at capacity. By adding Secondary staff the situation will be much worse. Can the access roads cope with the additional traffic ?
- Limited space in the courtyard. External finishes will need to be of high quality.
- Concerns of buses/ taxis queuing.
- Doesn't appear to be a pedestrian entrance / exit.
- Will the 28 parking spaces be sufficient for all the staff, plus visitors ?
- Boundary is incorrectly shown for the Primary play space – a corrected boundary will reduce the available land. The area is also steep and not suited to children with PD's.
- South facing area is good but concerns of overheating for the children so may not be usable for the large part of the day.
- Car park not big enough for the 89 members of staff let alone buses, taxis etc.
- No cycle provision for staff & visitors.
- Parking in Henleaze Park is already a problem. Adding more cars will be unwelcome.

Bristol City Council  
External Communications and Consultation Team & Education Capital Team

- External spaces for play/ activity are very small and appear inadequate.
- The lack of consideration of topography is concerning.
- Parking is insufficient. No surveys or info about the traffic has been provided and appears not to have been considered.
- Proposals not aligned with Once City Climate Strategy.

### Do you have any concerns about the arrangements during the proposed site redevelopment?

#### Do you have any concerns about the arrangements during the proposed site redevelopment?

There were 22 responses to this part of the question.

Option	Total	Percent
Yes	12	54.55%
No	10	45.45%
Not Answered	0	0.00%

#### If yes, what are you concerned about?

There were 12 responses to this part of the question.

Option	Total	Percent
Drop-off and pick-up at the temporary school	6	27.27%
Travel distance to the temporary school	5	22.73%
Disruption to child's learning	5	22.73%
Provision of specialist equipment	5	22.73%
Other (please specify)	4	18.18%
Not Answered	10	45.45%

#### If other, please specify:

There were 6 responses to this part of the question.

**If you have any other comments on the redevelopment proposals, please provide them below:**

**If you have any other comments on the redevelopment proposals, please provide them below:**

There were 12 responses to this part of the question.

Summary of comments (ref Note\*):

- Plans seem to have been drawn up by someone who is putting budget over safety.
- School needs the facilities which they deserve.
- Ensure early consultation with SEN specialists.
- Make provision and plans for future developments in teaching methods for SEN pupils. Think longer than short-term for the development.
- Provide a platform for being a beacon SEN school in Bristol.
- How long will the temporary arrangements be required for and what lead-in will the school have ?
- Much needed scheme – design looks good.
- Plans look amazing and would really improve life for students & staff.
- Car parking should remove on-street parking which causes inconvenience to local residents. Parking on narrow streets can be dangerous.
- The considerable expansion is completely disproportionate to the area. Concerns of increased traffic and parking.
- Concerned of the proximity of the school to the boundary of own property and devastating consequences.
- On review of the Cabinet paper, do not believe justification exists for the project on both environmental & financial grounds. The bulks of the costs in the 10-year PPM plan relate to Claremont House which will be retained. The annual cost savings per pupil do not justify the redevelopment.
- It would be more cost effective to maintain existing buildings and build new facilities for Secondary & Post-16 on a more appropriate site.
- To demolish a perfectly serviceable school is not in line with the Council's Policy 'Towards a Zero Waste Bristol'.
- Not properly consulted – found out about the consultation from the Bristol Post. This is not satisfactory given the significant changes that are proposed to the site and the impact in terms of noise and privacy once the newer and taller buildings are in use. Given that residents have not been contacted about this and the lack of accessibility of it online, this cannot be considered a valid consultation. No further progress should be made until all local residents that may be affected by this have been contacted and their views sought after.
- The part of the school nearest to Henleaze Infant School is under developed. The side of the school with most impact on neighbours is over developed.
- The two storey building will be over bearing on the landscape.

Bristol City Council  
External Communications and Consultation Team & Education Capital Team

- The EqIA fails to consider the impact on the wider community (no consideration to the sizeable increase in traffic).
- 89 staff yet only 24 parking spaces. The proposals will add to the existing parking problem, preventing residents being able to park near to their homes.
- Transport links to the school are inadequate.
- Children from both Henleaze Infant and Juniors schools having to walk across the road to the only pavement.
- Rebuilding a school for just 8 pupils seems a huge amount of money to waste especially when the Council does not seem too sure of the projected number of pupils in need of SEND education.
- There are no details of other potentially more cost effective and more appropriate options for increasing the number of secondary pupils in need of SEND education as expanding or creating facilities at secondary schools within Bristol.
- Would benefit from plans showing elevations of the buildings.
- Adding the secondary school is inappropriate. The site is too small. Educating SEND children alongside/with able-bodied children is very beneficial and this advantage will be lost if children move from the Redland Green site.
- Very concerned about the environmental impact. From the PPM Report for Claremont School from 2017 the majority of maintenance money needs to be spent on repairs to Claremont House. Other buildings just need minor maintenance work, such as painting. It makes no economic nor environmental sense to knock down perfectly sound buildings and rebuild them. Bristol prides itself on being a green Council, but this is not an environmentally friendly option. Claremont House will still take a lot of money to continually maintain.
- It looks as though the Council does not want to spend money to repair buildings and prefers to obtain cash for capital building from a central government pot of money. As a tax payer, this is scandalous.
- If there is a need for a larger school, then another site such as Orchard School might be a better option, being able to build from scratch, rather than being constrained by the high maintenance of Claremont House.
- When the hydrotherapy pool was built 20 or so years ago, local residents were promised access. This has not happened, so the argument that rebuilding the pool closer to the entrance for ease of community use is not necessarily a valid one.
- No convincing arguments have been provided as to why the redevelopment is necessary at all. Even if such an argument were to be made, good governance requires that several alternatives be identified and that all alternatives are made available for public consultation.
- Given that the facility at RGS was only commissioned around 13 years ago, it would be a scandalous waste of public finance for this to be closed down and the same facilities rebuilt at Henleaze.
- The Council need to go 'back to basics'. In particular, they need to consider the requirements both now and projected into the future (using a number of alternative

- projection scenarios) and in the light of these requirements then develop and cost a number of alternative solutions and put all of these out for public consultation.
- Lack of consideration towards the environmental impact. No mention of the environmental impact has been mentioned in the consultation, in particular the increase in carbon emissions in demolishing and replacing existing buildings compared with refurbishing them. This is particularly disappointing given that Bristol City Council declared a climate emergency in November 2018. In the Mayors Climate Action Plan in 2019, he promised to quantify the Councils indirect carbon emissions. This has not been considered in this consultation.
  - In the One City Climate Strategy, Part 2 focusses on buildings and states "retrofitting and building them to become carbon neutral and resilient to a changing climate, calling on central government to develop a supportive planning framework to deliver this". Demolishing buildings that are well within their design life and replacing them with ones that serve the same purpose is not consistent with this strategy.
  - It would be better use of public money to refurbish the existing buildings to improve the education of the students at the school and reduce the carbon impact of operating it.
  - It is also important that the school is not expanded to accommodate children of secondary school age and above as this would not fit in with the two Henleaze Primary Schools and Henleaze Park cannot accommodate the additional traffic.