



Dear Sirs

Proposed Tain 3-18 Campus

I refer to your proposal document and to your meetings of Monday 15th September and Wednesday 8th October. I would like to note that I fully support development of a 3-18 campus but would like to comment on the following points.

- I do not feel that the current projected figures of a school roll increase are high enough. While the figure seems to take into account a comfortable level of pupil increase, if there were to be further expansion of the town, any potential housing developments would potentially have the ability to make this current provision a squeeze with very little room for expansion. There is also the potential of pupils out with the town perhaps moving catchment and coming into the new campus school. I do not feel that the proposed figure is enough.
- Currently in Tain we have the provision of St Duthus Special School which is a specialist school for young children with various special needs. The proposal document has stated that the primary school will house the "ASN" provision in an enhanced provision area. Some of these children have profound complex needs far greater than the need of being placed somewhere within the primary school building. I feel that more consideration should be made towards a far more suitable and sympathetic accommodation provision. I also feel that when it comes to the special school, you have noted in Appendix 13 that there will be no specialist head teacher for the special school, although there will be a depute which they currently do not have, they will have the same head who will cover the primary and the nursery, which I hope is really given much more consideration closer to the time it comes to making these decisions as I feel strongly that this would not work. The best proposal would be to have someone come in that it more suited to this more specialist school provision.
- A suitable separate area for Gaelic Medium pupils, taking into consideration that the provision housed sensitively as the recommendations are that Gaelic pupils should not be immersed with English speaking pupils until roughly around primary 4 until the appropriate level of Gaelic is achieved.
- External areas for the primary children should be as large as is possible and with ample consideration to ensure that the amount they are exposed to the secondary children is kept to a minimum. There are behaviours and language that they could be exposed to that should be limited to minimum. I believe that Wick 3-18 campus has addressed this issue but as I have no direct way of viewing this I would like my own opinion heard. The primary should have as many outdoor areas as possible, in as much as large grassed and multi surfaced play areas and small areas that can be assessable directly from as many of the classrooms as possible.
- The Community Building could potentially take up a lot of space in the immediate vicinity of the school, could it be feasible to have this building moved to another position within the site, this would possibly allow for more space for the school campus alone but continuing to ensure that the pupils can continue to have easy

access to it. Parking areas surrounding this facility would then mean problems of visitors cars to this facility could then be moved away from the immediate school area.

- Problems occurring with high volumes of traffic around the campus with drop offs and staff at the school could be alleviated by having a one way system around the area. Another solution could be to move the vast bulk of the parking at the school to the Craighill site. This could be of a permit parking system, which would enable staff being issued with a permit and then parking there for free. You would have much fewer cars in and around the school on a daily basis as you would not need as many car parking spaces at the school, freeing up some more suitable playground space. It may perhaps be an idea to charge a fee to the Health Board for their staff to park there also as unfortunately, their parking allowance has not been very well thought through. Therefore utilising an empty site and solving a problem already in the town.
- The biggest advantage would be for a Safer Routes to Schools program implemented and children being encouraged to walk or cycle to school, in the proposal document there has been no note of the road crossing officers in the Appendix 13, hopefully just an oversight but something that is vital to the schools.
- I also feel it is preferable to have the Council's own in-house team design and manage up keep of the school, having the edge on sympathetic and sustainable design choices for their own buildings which should enable it to last through time.

I appreciate that these matters will be addressed thoroughly further into the planning stage but wanted to have my concerns noted from the outset. I look forward to comments and the next stage of the development.

Yours faithfully

██████████

On behalf of St. Duthus Special School, Parents and Parent Council we wish to raise the following points with regards to the proposal document for the Tain 3- 18 School.

Whilst we can see many benefits to the new building we want to highlight a number of areas.

In general:

The document references 'ASN and provision' and St. Duthus School. There is a fundamental difference between ASN and the complex healthcare, medical and sensory requirements for children who currently attend St. Duthus School. There needs to be separate distinction when referencing these requirements as they are distinct needs which will require distinct separate facilities.

e.g 5.6.7 talks about replacement St. Duthus school, however then goes on to talk about ASN often with medical needs. A more detailed understanding of the difference of provision is essential in the development of the proposal.

2.4 Project Roll estimate: The current roll is 14, however this would be more if the current accommodation for St. Duthus could accommodate such.

Therefore projected requirements need to be enhanced significantly in order that the space allowed is then not cramped as too many pupils crammed in due to gross underestimations.

New legislation means that vulnerable children aged 2 and upwards will also need to be included in the St. Duthus roll call, which hasn't been included previously.

2.9 Confirmation required that current transport arrangements will remain the same as it is not appropriate the St. Duthus children are on the same buses.

3.6 Separate consultation is required with St. Duthus school and parents/Parent Council as part of this process, to ensure the necessary specialist provisions are in place and understood fully.

4.4 Initial description of campus. We fully understand this is for illustrative purposes. However it shows St. Duthus on the ground floor of a primary school building. It has been previously agreed St. Duthus special school would have it's own building, own entrance, security, dining facilities, playground, parking etc. etc. Therefore this is critical as this impacts the whole proposal and space required for the site. It is wholly inappropriate for the pupils to be in the same building sharing the facilities with Primary School children. And similarly it would be inappropriate for mainstream Primary School children to be sharing facilities with 18 year old children with special needs.

Security – these requirements will have to be clearly defined and distinct from ordinary Primary/Secondary school provisions for very obvious reasons.

4.5.8.0 Staffing Implications - St. Duthus has primary and secondary pupils. There appears to be a lack of understanding of the population of the current role in that the proposed management structure has a Depute reporting to a Primary school, however there could well be more Secondary Pupils in the St. Duthus pupil roll count.

Appendix 11(b)

1 Introduction: no reference to separate St. Duthus school

2 Primary School Provision: again, St. Duthus seems to be subsumed within Primary School arrangements. Facilities need to include separate classrooms, sensory rooms, safe space, toilet/changing facilities, dining room. In addition double wide corridors/doors for provision of 2X wheelchairs and/or gait trainers, specialist cycle tracks (indoor & outdoor provision, similar to Drummond School), life skills kitchen, secure specialist playground equipment and fencing. Parking facilities for the school buses for their specialist trips and parent parking needs to be factored in. Plenty of storage space.

In addition there needs to be consideration for the noise levels that will be taking place outside and inside due to the nature of some of the children's disabilities. Breaktimes and the suggested staggered start times will need to be planned in consultation.

Due to the forthcoming move to the temporary modular units a lot of work has been put in to the development of that building. That needs to be closely considered in the development of this new 3 – 18 campus.

Comments from the Acting Head Teachers which also need to be factored into the design of the school:

Quiet entrance, separate space for eating, ensuring age appropriate for secondary pupils – Specialised provision situated between Primary and Secondary buildings / departments.

Emphasise that specialised provision is very different from ASN provision. Life skills flat / area for pupils to develop independent living skills.

I believe developing leisure skills is extremely important for our pupils. Most of the pupils who are here will not go on to work or supported work therefore they need to have interests and skills. I would request a cycle track so that our pupils can learn to ride trikes / bicycles as a Health and Well-being activity and life skill.

The need for wide corridors indoors so that pupils on the MOVE programme can travel in wheelchairs, use trikes, gait trainers in all weathers.

Storage space for all the large equipment required for pupils with profound needs is essential and can be significant.

I feel St Duthus should be all on one level and sit between the Secondary and Primary blocks it should be linked by a corridor to each school

This would allow inclusion but also give the low sensory safe building for other pupils.

I agree with your comments about the nature of the pupils St Duthus has to accommodate.

Our Numbers are currently 16 including 1 flexi learner. One more pupil is just to begin phased inclusion. The roll for the new school is up to 24.

The school also offer elaborated curriculum activities to a number of primary pupils with ASN.

Two join on a Monday for Library

Two join us for Puffin Pool

Two join us for Horse- riding

Three join us for TRA swimming.

These pupils do not attend Tain Primary schools but Seaboard Schools. The new school would I presume still need to offer specialist input to locality children not just Tain pupils so space would need to be included to accommodate them.

Tain 3-18 Campus

Comments on the Proposals and Appendices

Section	page	§	Topic	Notes & questions	Cross reference
App.1	1	0	New temporary modular accommodation?	Present temporary modular accommodation at Craighill very in poor condition	§1.1 §2.4
	1	1.1	"statutory consultation"	Did the "statutory consultation...engage meaningfully" with anyone?	
	2	1.1	"certainty" about timescale	Where is this timescale provided?	
	3	2.4	Why "or" in timescale.	Can this be longer than 5 years?	§3.4
	6	4.1	Wick campus	How can the Wick campus on a large open site be relevant to Tain on a small enclosed development site?	App.10 Opt.1A.01
	6	4.4	"accommodation required will fit on the site"	Why not hold the consultation until meaningful plans are available?	App.11a
	6	4.4	"increase the scope of the accommodation"	The site as shown provides no scope for this without reducing the sport/recreational facilities provided.	App.11a
	6	4.4	The campus specification	See App.11b below	App.11b
	7	4.5	The "shared street" includes dining facilities.	How can there be suitable separation of primary & secondary in the "shared street"? If separation is by time how will noise control be managed especially during secondary examination periods?	Opt.1A.01
	7	4.8	Neighbour concerns	Locals understand that the buildings shown in the consultation were purely illustrative, as plans do not yet exist. However due to the shape and restricted size of the site a multi-story building is inevitable and there would be little scope of realigning buildings. The proposed building is shown as 4 storeys tall (making it the tallest building in Tain). The proposal is to put this 50m from houses. The present building at 105m is 1 storey tall where there are windows and two where there are none. The present building is set considerably further down the slope than the proposed structure. The sketch plans show a 4-storey building which is stated to be the same height as the present 2-storey building (11m)!	Opt.1A.01
	8	4.10	Disruption during construction	The three comparison sites given all had a considerably larger land area for the construction.	Opt.1A.01
	8-15	5	Educational Benefits	Lots of high ideals! As a retired teacher I would hope that these would apply to any modern school building in any situation. As such they are irrelevant to the development of this specific set of buildings and can only be properly addressed when detailed plans are available	

App.1	15-16	6	Community facilities	The community facilities as shown seem to put a lot of spatial pressure on the site. I would suggest that this building would be better placed on the present Hartfield Road car park site. This would not lead to any loss of facilities from the site, and would enhance the "physical separation from the school buildings" (§4.5). On the very inadequate plans shown the new community building would appear to fit well in this site.	§4.4 §4.5 App.11a App.11b
	17	9	School transport implications	What is the relevance of including obsolete travel plans in App.9 from 2002 (TRA) and 2003 (Knockbreck) when the new arrangements will require a completely new access and drop off system for both cars and busses? Why are the new plans not outlined as the plan clearly shows a one-way system at the new complex which will have major implications for transport and traffic in the whole surrounding area especially Scotsburn Road and Hartfield Road?	App.6 App.9 App.11a
	17-18	10	Safer routes to school	Why are outline plans not included? It is not possible to assess the site if we don't have vital information and the safety of pupils must be one of the most vital, if not <u>the</u> most vital, consideration in any development.	
App.11b	1	1	'detailed accommodation brief'	How can we comment on proposals when details are not available?!	
	1	3	Secondary school numbers: expected roll rising to 634, provision 650.	Is an excess of 16 pupils (2.5%) adequate?	
	2	3	Secondary school provision	There is no mention of a library in the secondary provision. This is absolutely essential.	

Omissions from the document

- No detailed transport plan for the new campus despite it appearing that some decisions have been taken. See App.11a one-way arrows.
- No details of safer routes to school other than vague statement of intent.
- No details of accommodation, especially for the secondary provision.
 - In particular there is no mention of a library in the secondary accommodation. This is an essential even in these days where much is available in an electronic form.
- No statement of environmental policy relating to the buildings
 - Why are the roofs flat?
 - Are there to be solar panels on the considerable roof area. This would have little additional outlay and produce long-term savings, not to mention educational opportunities.
 - What will happen to the existing biomass boiler. There is no provision shown on the very inadequate plans with the document (App.11a).
 - Will there be a wind turbine on the site?

See "Working together for the Highlands" – "economy" 16 & "better infrastructure" 13

- No mention of recycling facilities
See "Working together for the Highlands" – "better infrastructure" 15
- No plans which are usable to assess the building structure in relation to the statements in the document.

It is impossible to make any adequate assessment without meaningful plans.

The illustrative diagrams shown in App.11a are totally inadequate to allow for assessment of many of the stated objectives in the document.



Dear Sirs

Proposed Tain 3-18 Campus

I refer to your proposal document and to your meeting of Monday 15th September and Wednesday 8th October. I *support* the idea of a 3-18 campus especially after attending the meeting on Wednesday 8th October and hearing the educational benefits, having said that and read through your proposal document I would like to make it known that I do have some concerns over the building itself ie

- The size of the proposed building – is it big enough?
- Car Parking
- Teacher numbers

Although I realize that this is for a later stage in the development process, I would like it recorded now.

I look forward to comments and the next stage of the development.

Yours faithfully

A black rectangular redaction mark covering the signature of the sender.

[Redacted]

27 October 2014

The Highland Council

By email only to ecsadmin@highland.gov.uk

Dear Sirs

3-18 Campus Tain, Consultation

I refer to the current consultation regarding proposals for a 3-18 teaching campus for Tain and to recent public consultation meetings in Tain.

I wish to record my personal support for this proposal.

This is a very exciting prospect for Tain and the wider community with the potential to take education to the next level. The new development and the accompanying boost to morale for staff and pupils should also assist in the recruitment of staff which has recently been an issue for Tain schools.

Please do not hesitate to contact me should you require any further information or clarification.

Yours faithfully

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

27 October 2014

The Highland Council

By email only to ecsadmin@highland.gov.uk

Dear Sirs

**3-18 Campus Tain, Consultation
Craighill Primary Parent Council**

I refer to the current consultation regarding proposals for a 3-18 teaching campus for Tain and to recent public consultation meetings in Tain.

At a recent meeting of the Parent Council for Craighill Primary School we discussed the current consultation. At the end of our discussion there was unanimous support for the proposals and we wish to ensure that this overwhelming support is considered within the consultation process.

This is a very exciting prospect for Tain and the wider community with the potential to take education to the next level. The new development and the accompanying boost to morale for staff and pupils should also assist in the recruitment of staff which has recently been an issue for Tain schools.

The enthusiasm for the proposal is also accompanied by a similar enthusiasm to engage in and support the detailed design which is obviously key to the long term success. In this respect we would welcome the opportunity to input at the earliest stage once the outline proposal has been considered and approved.

Please do not hesitate to contact me should you require any further information or clarification.

Yours faithfully

[Redacted signature]

[Redacted contact information]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 23 September 2014 18:22
To: ECSAdmin
Subject: Tain Campus

Dear Highland Council

Further to your meeting on Monday 15th September 2014 in Tain, I would like to make the following comments.

It was suggested at the meeting that a more suitable option would be a separate campus for early years, primary and ASN children and then a campus for Secondary and ASN children. As a parent I think that this is a much better option for all concerned. Has the practicalities of the effects on younger children mixing with secondary age children been evaluated?

There are plenty options for sites in Tain. The Secondary Campus could be built on the existing playing fields as proposed and the Early Years/Primary campus could be built on Craighill for instance.

I don't think these decisions should be made on budget alone, GIRFEC should be considered and are we really Getting It Right For Every Child if we rush through these plans in order to spend the money allocated without looking at what is the best option for generations to come.

I look forward to hearing your comments on the concerns raised.

Regards
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 08 October 2014 17:07
To: Maurice McIntyre
Subject: Public meeting 3-18 campus

Hello there

I just wanted to advise that I am unable to attend tonight's meeting which I'm disappointed about as I attended the last one and found it disappointingly negative from the townfolks' point of view. I am a parent of children currently in p4 and p6 at Craighill and I enthusiastically support the proposal. My only concern is the health and safety issues surrounding the construction of the new building in such close proximity to the existing TRA site but I'm sure that will be addressed.

I hope the meeting goes well.

Kind regards
[REDACTED]

From: [redacted]
Sent: 27 October 2014 07:48
To: Business Support C & L - HQ & South
Subject: tain 3-18 campus

good morning

the following are my thoughts/ concerns -

1 - why was it decided that a 3-18 campus is the best thing for Tain; is there evidence for this? also are there long term effects of this?

2 - will there be rationalisation of the teaching staffing?

3 - will children be exposed to a wider range of subjects? TRA doesn't currently offer computer science which seems ridiculous in the 21st century!

4 - child safety is massive concern - will there be segregated play areas?

- how to reduce traffic in and around the school? once

the health centre is closed this could make an excellent car park for the campus; please try to secure this from NHS Highland

- TRACC - I don't like that the public currently are within

the school during the day - this is not a good thing at all and this MUST be avoided in the new design

5 - craighill primary school's head teacher is retiring in November and we can already see that there has not been a great response to the advert for a replacement presumably because an incoming head wouldn't have job security because of the 3-18 campus - what are the council's proposals for this situation.

6 - is there asbestos in the TRA building? - if so how can the council remove this when there will be children on site

7 - craighill primary school - there is already a massive issue with parking and will get worse when the medical practices move into the new health centre in the next few weeks; how are the council going to help sort this out; also adding in the nursery to this site will make situation worse

although these emails sound negative these are my concerns. I'm glad that the school situation in Tain is being resolved and look forward to more information about this project. I have concerns about the financial side of things as the build cost is given at £44 with a total build/ running cost over 25 years of £84 million - where is this coming from and what is the difference to the current running costs?.

I look forward to hearing from you

[redacted]
[redacted]
[redacted]
[redacted]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 29 October 2014 09:34
To: Brian Porter
Subject: Tain 3-18 Campus consultation

Brian

The 29th October has crept up in me but I may still have time to make comment on the above, I hope.

"I am totally in favour of the 3-18 campus model as it can help ameliorate many of the problems of transition for pupils at the beginning and end of the Primary stage, though every effort should be made to co-ordinate feeder Primaries into the central hub. I have seen it working particularly well over the last few years on the Dornoch 3-18 Campus and my experience of this has consolidated my very favourable appreciation of this educational structure. Such a model should also provide efficiencies arising from a flatter and more versatile school management system.

This model should not, however, be used as a pretext for the closure/mothballing of rural Primary Schools which are highly valued in their home communities and are in many cases an integral foundation for the community as a whole."

I hope you find my comments timeous and in order,

Kindest regards

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 06 November 2014 15:02
To: Brian Porter
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Re: Tain 3-18 Campus Request for additional information

Dear Mr Porter

Thank you for your email of 31 October 2014.

Your information I attended the 8 October session isn't correct. I had no knowledge of that meeting and only heard about it at our Community Council meeting on 27 October. It appears to have been yet another of the Council's poorly advertised public engagement sessions on the subject. There was a Community Councillor amongst the small number of members of the public who attended but had only heard of it late in the day through a neighbour. None of us therefore are really are much wiser on the benefits of the 3-18 concept.

As your email arrived after our Community Council meeting and there wasn't enough time to arrange a special meeting to discuss its content, I circulated it around members for comment. As insufficient additional detail was provided, despite my request in terms of the Statutory Guidance, the resolution has been to abide by our consideration of the item on 27 October, namely to express the following concerns,

Consultation

- Not enough information. The public must be offered meaningful plans in order to provide meaningful comment.
- The 'alright on the night' approach from officials is not providing sufficient assurances
- Not a large enough spread of stakeholders getting involved
- This has been a 'waste of time' box-ticking exercise.
- HC appear to be making decisions and conducting public engagement retrospectively
- Will staff and pupils be consulted over the proposed interior layout, design & sustainability ?

Principle of 3-18

- No case has been made for a 3-18 Campus (maybe in time a 2-18 Campus)
- Parental concern expressed over the mix of ages
- Danger of institutionalising kids...on same site from age 2-18.
- Reckless to house an entire generation on the one site, in event of act of terrorism or disaster.
- If driven by savings, is this paving the way for closure of the rural primary schools within the catchment area ?

Building Layout

- Concerned about the appearance and size of the proposed buildings and potential relationship with the neighbouring houses.
- The top playing field doesn't appear large enough to accommodate parking access and buildings without at least moving the tech buildings.
- The plans on display showed a landscape setting dependant upon trees on neighbouring land eg Mansefield Hotel and private gardens...nothing of significance within the TRA site itself, lending to the misrepresentation this is an open landscaped development befitting the generally held expectations of a 'campus'. Are existing trees along south edge to be retained ?
- The Campus concept demands an open landscaped feel in line with HC and Scottish Government planning policies on the principles of Place Making.
- Flat roofreally ?....in this day and age. Have lessons not been learnt from the existing TRA and Craighill problems ?
- Nursery and Primary children will need secure, separate play spaces. How will this be achieved without resembling prison exercise yards ?
- How will drainage issues on top field be resolved ?
- Where are the waste management plans ? Where are the bin areas and what are the collection arrangements ?
- Access for emergency vehicles, especially Fire ?

Accommodation issues

- Sufficient scope required for 60 years expansion. Existing TRA has doubled in size over 40 years.
- Local Plan show allowance for 725 new houses for Tain and Seaboard only. There are no figures for Portmahomack, Fearn, Nigg, Arabella, Kildary, Scotsburn, Edderton, Ardgay and all the individual rural developments inbetween.
- How realistic are projected pupil numbers ?
- What happens if the Cromarty Firth develops as widely predicted ?
- If Invergordon and Alness combine there will be pressure from the KALECC area, even some area Invergordon children to attend Tain.
- Where will the proposed library be located and will it be a Community Library, necessitating the closure of the existing Library (the 2nd busiest in Ross-shire) in the town centre ?

Pupil Amenity

- Will Nursery and Primary playspaces be away from Academy classrooms to avoid noise, especially at exam time ?
- Will access time be staggered to avoid a pupil mix entering or leaving the Campus at the same time and how will noise be contained ? How will parents be expected to deal with this ?
- How will pupil segregation be managed in a 'shared street'?
- Concern over shared canteen. Unfair to staff and pupils.
- Where are the 'safe routes to school' provision ?
- Is multi-storey really desirable for special needs, pre-school, nursery and primary school pupils ?
- How can pupil attainment levels be improved and protected during the construction phase ?

Traffic

- What was the point of drawing from 2002 Travel Plans ?
- The increased volume of traffic introduced into what is essentially a residential area, especially at peak times, is a huge concern. How will School Buses, Parental drop-off and pick-up, Staff parking, TRACC parking work? Parents of Nursery and Primary pupils will demand access right to the front door !
- The habit of parental drop-off and pick-up requires to be recognised and catered for. The school-run is a national problem and cannot be ignored. This load currently is spread around the town.
- Will junctions either end of Scotsburn or Hartfield Roads cope with additional peak time pressures.
- 218 car parking spaces only ? 230 approx. provided at the present two Primary Schools and TRA/TRACC.

Residential Amenity

- There will be significant loss of view, privacy and possibly natural light to some of the surrounding properties, especially to the south of the site. The buildings proposed may be 2, 3 or 4 storeys high and in close proximity to the properties to the south. This will give rise to issues of overlooking. The existing tech buildings are single storey, further down the slope and further away from the houses to the south.
- A potentially noisy site, with heavy use in both daytime as well as evenings. Concerts, dances and other public events will clearly be heard. This is the case now, when the buildings are situated 125m from surrounding property.

Sustainable renewable energy

- Will there be a bio mass unit and if so where?
- Will Solar PV and thermal panels be an option ?
- Insulation standards should be high.
- Eco- design should be a priority.

TRACC

- A new swimming pool will be much more popular than the present one therefore attractive to many more users.
- School security is already a problem with the public having ease of access to TRACC. How can this be resolved ?
- Realistically, can TRACC be accommodated on the site? Should it not best be located on the current Craighill Primary site, giving it and the school complex the space they need ?

Whilst the Community Council welcomes the proposed investment in the town's schools provision, your latest communication doesn't answer convincingly the questions raised nor contribute meaningfully to the very limited knowledge already in the public domain. We think a more sensible approach would have been to have determined the ability of the site to accommodate the proposed development prior to consultation on the principle of establishing the Campus there. In the event the site is not found to be sufficient in size, we would ask the Council holds on meantime to the Craighill site as a potential alternative location for the new swimming pool and the community complex, thus giving the TRA site the chance of a comfortable layout short term and the opportunity to stretch out a bit in years to come. The requirement for TRACC to be located near the town centre is not so high as the school and it would be close enough to facilitate easy pupil access.

We would hope the above concerns raised by members of the Community Council are considered at the next design stage and we shall expect to be consulted in due course, hopefully more effectively than to date.

Yours sincerely

[Redacted signature]

[Redacted name]

[Redacted address line 1]

[Redacted address line 2]

On Fri, Oct 31, 2014 at 4:54 PM, Brian Porter <Brian.Porter@highland.gov.uk> wrote:

██████████ apologies again for the delay in responding.

In relation to the statutory consultation process, any comments received by the Council during the statutory consultation, are passed to Education Scotland for their consideration in preparing their own report on the Council's proposal. As required by the legislation, the Council's final proposal for decision, which would go to a future Committee likely to be in early 2015, must take account of comments made during the consultation, and respond to those points. Therefore any comments made by the community council will be considered and responded to through that process.

As advised in my earlier email to you, consultation comments will be accepted from the Community Council by an extended deadline of Friday 7th November.

I have sought to answer your points raised as fully as possible at this time.

In relation to the 3-18 Campus concept, since receipt of your email below a follow up session was held on Wednesday 8th October to allow the Council to provide further explanation on the educational benefits arising from the proposed 3-18 Campus. I understand you were present at that session and I trust it proved useful to you in understanding the Council's proposal.

In relation to layout and design, as you note below, the Council is not currently at a stage where a detailed design or layout has been developed. What is being consulted on at this time is the principle of establishing a 3-18 Campus on that site, with detailed work on layout and design only moving forward once a decision on the campus proposal is reached by the Council. There would of course be further stakeholder engagement at the detailed design and layout stage.

The statutory consultation report, and the display boards at the public meeting, set out an illustrative layout, developed purely as a means of illustrating how a 3-18 Campus could fit onto the site. The illustrative layout should not be taken to represent a detailed layout or design.

In relation to your question on floorspace, what I can advise is that based on the illustrative layout, the relevant floor areas would be as shown below.

1. Floor space (all m²) – Secondary 8242, Primary 3746, Additional Support 800, Community 2000, Total 14788.
2. Information on segregated playground space – this matter would be considered as part of the detailed layout and design process.
3. The illustrative layout is based upon 218 parking spaces. A final proposal in relation to car parking and access would be considered as part of the detailed layout and design, following a final decision by the Council on the proposal. In relation to traffic network impact and parking, these factors were also considered as part of the decision on preferred site for the Campus.
4. The proposal report takes account of school roll projections through to 2027, which reflect a projected increase overall from the current 2014 position. The proposal is based upon a Campus which will provide for pupil numbers in excess of the roll forecast at 2027. The approach taken in arriving at those school roll projections takes account of estimated housing developments and economic activity, with the rationale in relation to development scenarios described in the document available from the link below. This document was developed in the context of the Alness/Invergordon school reviews but incorporates Tain also. http://www.highland.gov.uk/download/downloads/id/127/east_ross_sustainable_school_estate_review_-_development_scenarios

In relation to engagement, the Council has undertaken a comprehensive approach to engagement across all key stakeholders. In relation to young people, each household with children attending a school within the ASG has been provided with details of the proposal document, hard copies of the proposal have also been made available within the schools, and display boards setting out the illustrative campus layout have been made available. Subject to the decision reached by the Council on the proposal, the Council would also ensure that appropriate feedback was provided to young people and they were engaged as part of any future discussion around layout, design, etc.

I look forward to receiving comments from the Community Council, which will be considered by the Council as it develops a final report to be considered by Committee, likely in early 2015.

Brian Porter

Head of Resources

Care and Learning Service

The Highland Council



[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 08 October 2014 18:34
To: Brian Porter
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Tain 3-18 Campus Request for additional information

Dear Mr Porter

Thank you for your letter of 29 August 2014 in relation to the above.

I and several other Community Council members attended the public meeting at Tain Royal Academy on 15 September 2014 whereupon we drew up a Draft list of issues and concerns which we considered required addressing before the Community Council considered it could lend its support to the proposal. This was discussed in some detail at our subsequent Community Council meeting on 29 September 2014. Arising out of both meetings was a desire to hear more of the 3-18 Campus concept to try and help allay the fears of some parents who voiced concerns at the public meeting. When the Community Council first heard of the Campus we were of the understanding it already had broad support from parents and schools alike. If the public meeting is anything to go by, this does not appear to be the case. You advised the public meeting the Community Council had been part of "extensive engagement". Whilst not actually correct, now might be an opportune moment to activate that process. In light of the deadline for submissions being 29 October 2014, we still have time to consider our response at our forthcoming 27 October 2014 meeting, where it has been resolved to invite the Headteacher of Craighill to give us his professional opinion on the 3-18 concept. We understand he is in favour, therefore who better maybe to lay our minds at ease on that matter?

However, a primary concern which the Headteacher can not help us with, relates to the size of the site available for development and the scale of the proposal, its impact upon local traffic and residential amenity, and the readily anticipated requirement for expansion over the next 50-60 year period. Naturally, we wish to secure the best facility for our community but also we need to bear in mind this is Tain's most significant and prestigious development in its history and it needs to be done right at first time of asking.

I appreciate you are not yet at the Layout Design stage but, if we are to make an informed judgement on the principle of this site being used to accommodate the 3-18 Campus, then I consider we must be given adequate information in which to do so. I have consulted the relevant Schools (Consultation) (Scotland) Act Statutory Guidance and *Para 12 -Attention to Detail* highlights the importance of high standards in published consultation documents in order to inspire confidence in a proposal amongst parents and the community in general. *Para 98 -Requests for additional information* confirms, as a matter of good practice and courtesy, the authority attempts to answer relevant questions and requests for additional information before the end of the consultation period, where raised by a relevant consultee, ie a Community Council.

The information provided to date, whether the collection of papers entitled Appendix 1 or the information boards on display at the public meeting, do not provide sufficient information upon which to base a responsible and effective consultation response. The areas which I consider require clarification include,

1. A reasonable guesstimate of floorspace accommodation requirements for the first intake of pupils, split into :

Special School

Nursery School

Primary School

Secondary School

Community Facilities

2. Segregated playground space, split into,

Special School

Nursery School

Primary School

Secondary School

3. Access, parking, parent and bus drop-off/pick-up provision, taking account of the fact the existing Primary, Secondary Schools and TRACC use approximately 230 spaces currently. Bear in mind also the anticipated attraction of many new users to a new and much improved swimming pool facility, and potentially an influx of pupils from the Kilmuir and Logie Easter Community Council area in the event of Alness being the chosen site for a combined Alness/Invergordon 3-18 campus.

4. Scope for future expansion needs taking into account the 725 new house allocation in the current IMF Local Development Plan (Tain and Seaboard only). Allowance too for employment growth at Nigg. Bear in mind the existing TRA has more than doubled in size, physically, in 40 years.

Provision of this level of information will greatly assist the Community Council and reflect the *'accurate, high quality consultation documents'* referred to in the Statutory Guidance.

Finally, a point about the Statutory Guidance section on *Consulting with Young People. Paras 24-29*. This is quite explicit in ensuring school pupils are properly included in the consultation process (where, of course, these pupils have the capacity and interest to understand what is being asked of them), and on an equal basis to other statutory consultees. On behalf of the pupil representatives on the Community Council, I would be interested to know to what extent the authority has fulfilled this obligation.

I shall look forward to hearing from you.

Please acknowledge receipt of this email.

Yours Sincerely

A solid black rectangular box used to redact the signature of the sender.

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 28 October 2014 17:23
To: Business Support C & L - HQ & South
Subject: Proposal for Tain 3-18 campus

I am against the proposal for a 3-18 campus on the present site of Tain Royal Academy for the following reasons.

The proposed building will overlook my home if it is four storeys high. The argument given at the consultation meeting, that it will not necessarily be that height, does not make sense. The site has been measured out very precisely, and there is only so much space available. Any loss of height of the buildings will mean a loss of sports facilities and/or recreation spaces - both of which are necessary.

Scotsburn Road and Hartfield Road will be unable to cope with the amount of traffic which require to use them. They are already quite busy roads. People living on them will find it difficult to access/leave their homes by car with the increase in traffic, at the beginning and close of the school days.

I do not believe that it is healthy, fair or advisable for any of our young people to be *cooped up* in the manner that is proposed. I certainly don't believe that primary age children should have to work in such close proximity to high school children, no doubt witnessing some of their behaviours.