

Thank you for your email of 20 August 2018 regarding the Consultation Report into the proposed closure of Tarfside Primary School.

As you are aware the consultation period ran from 26 February 2018 to 11 May 2018 inclusive. In line with Scottish Government Guidance (the Schools (Consultation) (Scotland) Act 2010) Angus Council reviewed the proposal in light of the written and oral representations it received and HM Inspector's report. We then prepared and published the consultation report.

Angus Council reviewed the proposal under section 9(1) of the 2010 Act, including carrying out a further assessment of the proposal and each of the alternatives that were set out in the proposal paper. This included the likely effect on the community and the likely effect of different travelling arrangements. The purpose of this further assessment is to take into account any further information that has come forward through the consultation or otherwise. The authority is also required to make this assessment for any new reasonable alternative to the proposal that has been suggested through the written representations.

There were no representations made during the consultation period and no proposed alternatives identified.

In deciding whether to call in a closure decision Scottish Ministers will assess if the education authority has failed:

- (a) in a significant regard to comply with the requirements imposed on it by (or under) this Act so far as they are relevant in relation to the closure proposal, or
- (b) to take proper account of a material consideration relevant to its decision to implement the proposal."

This representation has been made outwith the consultation period and will therefore not form part of the consultation report submitted to Scottish Ministers.

I would note that most of the issues raised in your paper have been addressed in the original proposal document or in the consultation report.

Notwithstanding the above, please find below responses to your comments. This paper will be included as an appendix to the report being submitted to Children and Learning Committee and Angus Council on 18 September 2018.

Tarfside Consultation Paper – Comments & Questions -

Extract from Closure Proposal Document

Page 5 - 1.8

“likely to limit opportunities to develop the positive mental, social, physical, and emotional skills they need at school and throughout life” –

Completely irrelevant. Children from small schools have gone through to further education and beyond into hugely successful careers. Children in this environment bond with their peers and develop a higher level of maturity and can carry themselves well in a social situation. The children engage in a number of different out of school activities in the area to develop their social skills. The school met up with various schools in the area to engage in other activities, widening their social circle. One size does not fit all.

Response

Curriculum for Excellence contains a number of experiences and outcomes that include a set of clear and concise statements about children's learning and progression in each curriculum area. Learning in health and wellbeing is one of these curriculum areas. One of these statements is to ensure that children and young people develop the knowledge and understanding, skills, capabilities and attributes which they need for mental, emotional, social and physical wellbeing now and in the future. A number of features of effective learning and teaching in health and wellbeing are identified in the Curriculum for Excellence, one of which is “uses a variety of approaches including active, cooperative and peer learning and effective use of technology”.

The following is an extract from the School Investment strategy adopted by the Council in June 2017: -

3.1.1 We are committed to providing facilities where all of our children can experience: -

collaborative learning, where children work collectively within a group setting. This allows children to learn from each other, and to share experiences and skills;

individual learning, where children are given opportunities to make choices about their own learning. This encourages children to learn in the most effective way for them;

Peer to peer learning and assessment.

It is recognised that forecasting school rolls is not an exact science and that rolls can be impacted by a number of factors, particularly when there are only very small numbers involved. Based on information from NHS Tayside about children under 5 as at 31 March 2018, our projected school roll for Tarfside is as follows: -

There follows a table with 7 columns and 8 rows. First row is heading.

	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
P 1	0	0	1	0	0	0
P 2	0	0	0	1	0	0
P 3	0	0	0	0	1	0
P 4	0	0	0	0	0	1
P 5	0	0	0	0	0	0
P 6	0	0	0	0	0	0
P 7	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Roll	0	0	1	1	1	1

It is our assertion that a school with so few children of a similar age, or stage of education would limit the opportunities for the type of learning we are committed to providing.

Extract from Closure Proposal Document

“The current school building is not fit for the future as it is at the moment” –

Issue

How so? Explain.

Response

The development of our long-term strategy for our school estate has committed us to a review of our school buildings over a substantial period of time. It sets out our aspirations as to how our school estate can support all of our children and young people to have the same access to opportunities. The building as it stands, will not meet our aspirations for the future.

Extract from Closure Proposal Document

Page 9 – 3.7.3

“Based on the numbers of children within the catchment who are currently under 3 years of age, it is unlikely there will be sufficient numbers of children”

Issue Raised

Incorrect, there has been changes in the glen, families have moved into the area. 0 has risen to 5, under the age of 3.

Response

As highlighted in the closure proposal document, “It is impossible to predict future school rolls with complete accuracy. Tarfside currently has no pupils. Based on the number of children within catchment who are currently under 3 years of age, it is unlikely there will be sufficient numbers of children in each age group to support collaborative working and

peer to peer learning and assessment.” The information included in the proposal document was correct at the time of writing.

Extract from Closure Proposal Document

“The very small numbers of children that are anticipated are likely to limit opportunities to develop ...”

Issue Raised

disagree and irrelevant. One size does not fit all. (as above). Small numbers were never an issue in the past. Why now?

Response

Learning and teaching has changed over the years. The development of our long-term strategy for our school estate has committed us to a review of our school buildings over a substantial period of time.

Extract from Closure Proposal Document

“The classroom acts as a circulation route between the school office/staffroom and toilets which inhibits how furniture can be laid out and flexible use”

Issue Raised

Utter nonsense. Ridiculous statement. There is a new toilet facility in the nursery department, which means staff don't even need to go through the classroom if they so wished. There is a large computer/library room that can be used as a “flexible” space/use.

Response

The toilets in the nursery are low level for children and not suitable for adults. There is one classroom which is in the centre of the school and also serves as dining facility. All adult toilet facilities are to the right of the classroom and would require office staff and nursery staff to either go through the classroom or around the outside of the building to use. This restricts how flexibly the main classroom space can be used.



Extract from Closure Proposal Document

“The door from the accessible parking bay leads directly into the classroom which is not ideal for visitors”

Issue Raised

There are 4 entrances to choose from. The front door, the classroom door, the back door (which is directly outside the office, where there are signs directing all visitors to report to) and the nursery entrance.

Response

It is anticipated that the accessible parking bay would be used by those people with mobility issues and they would therefore access the building by the nearest possible entrance. This is effectively the fire exit which leads directly into the classroom space. There are other entrances, including that next to the office, but this would require visitors with mobility issues to walk around the school to another entrance.

Extract from Closure Proposal Document

“There are no ramped entrances or accessible toilets” –

Issue Raised

The Nursery entrance door is ramped. The new toilet facilities are kitted out for disabled use (I am sure).

Response

The toilets in the nursery are low level for children and not suitable for adults.

Extract from Closure Proposal Document

“There is no PE hall in Tarfside or any space specifically designed for P.E”

Issue Raised

Yes there is no P.E hall, however there is a large playing field at the back of the school which is perfect for sports. It has also hosted numerous joint sports days with pupils from Tarfside, Lethnot and Stracathro with no issues. Plenty of space. Larger than Stracathro’s playing field.

Response

Physical education provides learners with a platform from which they can build physical competences, improve aspects of fitness, and develop personal and interpersonal skills and attributes. It enables learners to develop the concepts and skills necessary for participation in a wide range of physical activity, sport, dance and outdoor learning, and enhances their physical wellbeing in preparation for leading a fulfilling, active and healthy lifestyle. In school, learners should encounter a variety of practical learning experiences, including working on their own, with a partner and in small and large groups, and using small and large equipment and apparatus, both outdoors and indoors. Whilst Tarfside offers the opportunity for good outdoor experiences, it is not able to offer the same access to indoor equipment and apparatus as is available at Edzell Primary School. Due to the small numbers of children anticipated in catchment, it does not provide the opportunity for children to work in large groups.

Extract from Closure Proposal

Page 9 – 3.7.4

Issue

Everything in this section is the “one size fits all approach” – Not everything is about Modern Buildings, Large class sizes etc. Tarfside Primary School is an excellent facility which offers a unique setting in a remote rural area and is an asset to its community. Excellent first rate outdoor facilities which fits the Outdoor Learning Curriculum for Excellence bill perfectly. HMIE report is (not available on website). Tarfside is also one level, therefore accessible to people with mobility issues.

Response

Your comments are noted.

Extract from Closure Proposal Document

Page 10 – 3.8.1

“the budgeted cost per child was £38,806 per annum” –

Issue Raised

Where does this figure come from? The cost per annum in the costings table = £48,978 per pupil per year (multiplied by the 3 pupils on the school roll in Sep 2016 = £146,934.) The total cost subtotal is £147,732. Divided by 3 = £49,244. ?? The total costs minus income for school = £146,935. ??

In the amended consultation it has since been changed to £48,978 in this section, so this is probably irrelevant.

Response

Your comment is noted.

Extract from Closure Proposal Document

“The EPC for Tarfside is an E, issued on 11/11/2013 and is valid until 10/11/2023” –

Issue Raised

What, if any, work has been carried out since 2011 to improve this? How does this effect the rating? Can we request an FOI here?

Response

There have been no energy improvement works carried out at Tarfside during this period.

Extract from Closure Proposal Document

Page 11 – 3.9.1

“There were no school lets during 2014/2015, 2015/2016 or 2016/2017 that were not for the school itself or the parent council”

Issue Raised

Community used the facilities twice a week during 2014 – 2016 for local tots parent and baby/toddler group Tarfie Tots.

Response

Angus Council has no records of this let. At the time of writing the Closure Proposal Document there were no groups being held in the school.

Extract from Closure Proposal Document

Page 12 – 3.10.1

“£54,500 of outstanding planned maintenance has been identified for Tarfside” –

Issue Raised

What is this? More details required here. A new brick wall has been built since the school closed, which doesn't even match the other walls of the school or neighbouring residents, looks ridiculous. There was also some work carried out on the roof we believe.

Response

Details of planned maintenance requirements identified are included in the table below.

There follows a table with 2 columns and 10 rows. First row is header.

Project Description	Estimate
Upgrade 1 No Original External Door & Frame & Paint	£1,800
Strip & Re-slate Roof to Single Storey Building [Replace All Rotten Sarking]	£22,000
Upgrade Electric Heating	£5,000
Replace School & House Valleys	£2,000
External Paint & Repairs	£4,000
Upgrade Boys' Toilet Cubicle	£1,200
Upgrade Lighting to Ground Floor Areas	£3,500
Re-Surfacing to Entrance Roadway	£8,000
Surface Car Park Area at Ex-Dining	£7,000

Extract from Closure Proposal Document

“The building does not lend itself to flexible learning spaces” –

Issue

There is a large computer/library room separate from the class room. There is also the nursery room if vacant and a flexible space that was made under the stairs as a quiet space.

Response

The closure proposal forms part of our long-term strategy for our school estate. In assessing flexibility we have looked at the building as if it was operating as intended. If the school was not under-capacity, the building would not lend itself to flexible learning spaces.

Extract from Closure Proposal Document

Page 13 – 4.3

Issue

Ground Floor missing the toilet facilities in both the nursery and the school.

Response

Noted

Extract from Closure Proposal Document

Page 14 – 4.11

Issue

Projection Figures are incorrect.

$$2020 = 2 \times P1$$

$$2021 = 2 \times P2$$

$$2022 = 1 \times P1 - 2 \times P3$$

$$2023 = 2 \times P1 - 1 \times P2 - 2 \times P4$$

Response

As at Page 5 - 1.8 above, it is recognised that forecasting school rolls is not an exact science and that rolls can be impacted by a number of factors, particularly when there are only very small numbers involved. It is also recognised that families can move out as well as into an area, which could mean that numbers fall again. Based on the figures quoted there would be no children in the school until 2020, when there could be two P1 children, assuming that parents wanted to send their children to Tarfside Primary School. Two children in the school is likely to limit opportunities to develop the positive mental, social, physical, and emotional skills they need at school and throughout life, as is a school with only 5 pupils. Such a small number of pupils would not allow Angus Council to meet its duty to secure best value.

Extract from Closure Proposal Document

Page 15 – 6.1.1

“There are no children in the area and no foreseen demand we see no merit in keeping the status quo and thus no positives”

Issue

There are now 5 children in the glen under the age of 3. There is a high demand for community use for a parent and toddler group and for use of the pre-school provisions. This could also be open to others and relieve the catchment area of the current pre-school provisions, which are bursting at the seams.

Response

There is still work on-going to ascertain ownership of the school. If the school is closed, Angus Council would be happy to work with the community and Dalhousie Estates to help them to establish a parent toddler group should there be a desire for this.

Extract from Closure Proposal Document

Page 15 – 6.2.1

Issue

Disagree. Again it is not one size fits all. Tarfside offers a fantastic setting and education for children in the community. It has a unique quality and provides excellent outdoor learning facilities which meet the criteria of the Outdoor Learning Curriculum of Excellence. All the children that are currently in the glen will be of a “similar age and stage”. The layout of the school, has never proved to be distracting or disruptive in the past. Why would it now. There are plenty of schools with open plan classes. Since May there has been changes in the glen. 0 has risen to 5. The nature of the glen will always be peaks and troughs. The families with children at the moment are in secure managerial positions so will be unlikely to change over the coming five years. There are young couples in serious relationships with plans to marry and start families. Jobs arise on the estates. They aspire to fulfil those positions with young families. The school is an attraction to the area and a massive asset to the community.

Response

We note your comments.

Extract from Closure Proposal Document

Page 16 – 10.1

Issue

Community used the facilities twice a week during 2014 – 2016 for local tots parent and baby/toddler group Tarfie Tots. These parents were not on the parent council.

Response

Angus Council has no records of this let. At the time of writing the Closure Proposal Document there were no groups being held in the school.

Extract from Closure Proposal Document

Page 16 – 10.2

Issue

This won't happen. The SCHOOL is the hub of the community. Without this facility the community has lost a lot of engagement with one another. Coffee mornings and engagement with the elderly community. RemembranceDay, Easter, library bus, shopping bus, church nativity at Christmas.

Response

We note your comment. The school has not been used by the community since 2016 and there are a number of other hall facilities in Glenesk. As stated earlier Angus Council would be happy to work with the community and Dalhousie Estates to help them to establish a parent toddler group or other community use should there be a desire for this.

Extract from Closure Proposal Document

Page 16 – 11.2

“The annual recurring revenue savings are estimated to be £146,935”

Issue

This can not be accurate see below:

1) Colum 4 – Annual recurring savings Teaching Costs = £107,157.00

Angus Council are under an agreement with the Scottish Government, teachers are still employed by the council and are redeployed elsewhere in Angus, therefore this is NOT a cost saving.

Response

When no children attended the school, the staff were re-deployed into vacant posts in accordance with the Council's AJNCT agreement and managing change procedures. The budget for Tarfside remains within the Schools and Learning total budget. If Tarfside is closed the budget will be given up as a saving.

Issue

2) “other” - £103 – What is this?

Response

This is the recurring revenue budget for janitorial supplies for the school.

Issue

- 3) Transport – Home to School - £20,704 – How is this a cost saving? The pupils you would have been transporting to and from Tarfside still require transporting to and from Edzell/Strathro.

This issue was raised at the end of the consultation period and in the report reads:

“ An error in the proposal paper was identified after the end of the consultation period which we have determined as a non-material to the consideration of the proposal. The original proposal document identified transport savings of £20, 704. This was incorrect as no savings will accrue in transport costs. This reduces the anticipated savings to £126,231.” – This is still stated in the table as a saving of £20,704.

Response

As stated above, this error was identified after the consultation period and was determined to be non-material. The original proposal had been published and consulted upon. As the assessment was that the error was not material, and the consultation period was closed, the original documents have not been amended.

Issue

£126,231 – as per comment 1) stated above. ($£126,231 - £107,157 = £19,074$)

Response

I think this comment is asserting that the total saving of £126,231 should be reduced by the savings identified in teaching costs of £107,157. This is not the case. As noted above the staff from Tarfside were redeployed into vacant posts in accordance with Angus Council's AJNCT agreement and managing change procedures.

Issue

- 4) Sale of school meals - £747 – Where was this money coming from as the 3 children on the school role would have been entitled to free school meals?

Response

This budget was based on the actual income received during 2016/17.

Issue

- 5) Building repair & Maintenance – page 25 = £886 , page 28 = £500 = £386 difference, why would these costs not be the same? How does this equate with the outstanding maintenance costs of £54,500 stated on page 12 – 3.10.1?

Response

The figure on page 25 is the 2017/18 recurring revenue budget for the school when it was occupied. This was part of the devolved school budget.

The figure on page 28 is the estimated costs being incurred while the school is un-occupied. The identified outstanding planned maintenance is detailed earlier in this response.

Issue

6) What are non-recurring revenue costs of £500?

Response

These are the estimated one-off costs as a result of the school not being used, for example boarding up windows and draining down heating systems etc.

Issue

7) GAE impact - £6,655 – Where does this figure come from? Do the council not receive £3,250 per pupil in a school with 70 pupils or less. So this figure should be $£3,250 \times 3 = £9,750$.

Response

The government grant provision to Angus Council is determined by a number of Grant Aided Expenditure assessments and two of these are relevant to school closures:-

Primary School Teaching assessment: includes a secondary indicator based upon the number of pupils in small schools on an average of the last 2 census. Tarfside is a small school for the purposes of this secondary indicator. As the school had zero pupils for the purposes of the 2017 census onwards, the grant benefit was already making its way out of the assessment mechanism. The impact for 2019/20 will be a further loss of government grant of £5k. However, this grant loss will take place whether the school closes or not due to there currently being zero pupils.

School Security assessment: is based upon the total number of establishments in Angus. The closure of Tarfside will result in a loss of government grant for 2019/20 of £2k.

Note that any grant reduction arising from the school closure will be addressed through the Council's overall 2019/20 budget setting arrangements and not have any specific impact onto the Schools and Learning budget.

Issue

**** (ALTHOUGH AMMENDMENTS HAVE BEEN MADE IN SOME OF THE CONSULTATION PAPER – THE TABLE COSTS HAVE NOT CHANGED! THIS IS CONFUSING) ****

Response

The amendment has been made after the consultation period closed. As the main basis of the proposal is in relation to educational benefit, and as a saving is still anticipated, the error was not considered to be material. As a result, the original consultation proposal has not been amended.

Issue

In Schools Consultation Act 2010

Section 9 – Consultation Report

(1) After the education authority has received HMIE's report, the authority is to review relevant proposal having regard (in particular) to –

(2) (a) any relevant –

(i) Written representation received by the authority (from any person) during the consultation period

(ii) Oral representations made to it (by any person) at the public meeting,

(b) HMIE's report.

(3) (a) publish the consultation report in both electronic and printed form,

(b) make the report available for inspection at all responsible times and without charge –

(i) at its head office and on its website

(ii) at any affected school or at a public library or some other suitable place within the vicinity of the school

(1) HMIE report is unable to be viewed online?

Response

The following is the link to HMIE report: -

<https://education.gov.scot/Documents/AN-TarfsidePSAug18.pdf>

The report is also reproduced in full in the Angus Council Consultation Report: -

https://www.angus.gov.uk/media/tarfside_consultation_report_final

Issue

(4) / (3) (ii) – There was a drop in session held at St. Drostan's Lodge Tarfside on Thursday 15th March 4pm – 7pm. This was poorly attended. Glen residents have expressed their concern that no one, unless a parent of a child that currently attends Edzell or Stracathro Primary schools, were aware of the consultation or the drop in session.

(5)

It may have been advertised on the councils website (if you know where to look) on their social media platforms, local library and papers. However given the remoteness of the glen, not everyone has access to a shop to buy a local paper. Visiting the local library in Brechin is unlikely and not everyone has or uses social media. This was not highlighted enough to the local rural community. There was nothing on the local notice boards at Tarfside, the Retreat or the Invermark carpark. The drop in session at St. Drostan's was booked and the lady that handed the keys over knew nothing about the meeting. She used to be the head teacher of Tarfside Primary school.

The community are very disappointed by this as they were not given a fair chance to support it's much loved school or have input to the consultation.

It is also stated on the website the drop in sessions were "public meetings, designed as drop in sessions" – this by definition are two separate styles of meeting.

A public meeting is at an agreed location, at a set time, open to all community member.

“Public Meetings are held to engage a wide audience in information sharing and discussion. They can be used to increase awareness of an issue or proposal and can be a starting point for an ongoing means of engaging.”

A drop in session is at a location, over a duration of time, designed for people to drop in throughout that period of time unexpectedly for a short period of time. – NOT THE SAME THING.

There was no public meeting held in Glenesk. There was a “public meeting” in Edzell at Inglis hall held on Tuesday 17th April 2018 6pm-7.30pm. This discussed all four consultations, although mainly discussed Strachtho Primary’s consultation. This was poorly advertised and we feel there should have been a separate formal “public meeting” assigned to each consultation.

After a meeting on Wednesday 1st Aug at 2pm at the Retreat in Glenesk, a suggestion was made by a parent to potentially arrange an open day, hosted by the community. This would give people an opportunity to view the school and it’s facilities and potentially increase placing requests. Elaine Hughes responded at 17:59 on Friday 3rd August offering to open the school for two hours on Thursday 9th or Friday 10th Aug. This offer was declined by the parents due to the fact that it was completely unrealistic and unreasonable to expect something of this grandeur to be arranged in such a short space of time, also given the time of year and peoples commitments to holidays and work.

Response

The following is an extract from the Statutory Guidance which accompanies the School Consultation (Scotland) (Act) 2019. Section 85 is specific that details of how the public meeting is conducted is up to the authority. We have taken the decision to hold the meeting as drop in sessions as this will allow people to come when it is most convenient for them so we can be available to as many people as possible. This approach will also allow those who may not feel able to contribute in a large formal setting the opportunity to have their opinions heard.

We have complied with the provisions in the guidance below and think that the drop in style of event gives as many people as possible the opportunity to be actively involved in having their views heard.

The public meeting – section 7 of the 2010 Act

84. A public meeting at which the authority is represented must be held during the consultation period and advance notice given of its date, time and location to the relevant consultees and to HM Inspectors within Education Scotland. Maximum advance notice of the details of the public meeting is desirable. It is most efficient to give this information in the notice issued just prior to the start of the consultation period advising consultees of the proposal. A separate notice can be issued and would be necessary if the details changed or additional meetings were scheduled after the consultation had started.

85. The 2010 Act leaves the details of how the public meeting is conducted to authorities. In deciding when to hold the public meeting, authorities will wish to balance the need to give interested parties enough time to read and digest the proposal paper, in order to inform discussion and questions at the meeting, with the need to allow sufficient time after the meeting for those consulted to reflect and consider what response to make to the consultation. Unless there are good reasons to do otherwise it would be appropriate to avoid holding the public meeting during the first week of the

consultation period and instead to arrange for it take place around halfway through the period.

86. For the convenience of consultees and other interested parties, the public meeting should take place out with normal/office working hours and at a convenient location.

87. If an authority considers it appropriate to hold more than one public meeting, for example, in each school that is affected by a proposal, the requirement in section 7(2) and this guidance applies in relation to each public meeting.

The meetings were advertised in the local and regional press, on the Council Website, Facebook page and Twitter feed; in the local library; in the local playgroups; in the local soft play centre; in the health centre; and health visitors were asked to let their patients with small children know about the consultation.

The meeting at the Retreat was organised in response to issues parents raised with Education Scotland who said: -

“In taking forward the proposal, the council should work with parents to clarify the proposed savings in relation to staffing and transport costs and how the vacant school might best be used to the benefit of the local Tarfside community. The council should also clearly set out its travel plans for affected children.”

Despite the proposal to consult on the possible closure of Tarfside primary school being approved in January 2018 and the formal consultation period from Monday 26 February 2018 to Friday 11 May 2018 this request was only made on the afternoon of Wednesday 1 August 2018. The period for representations being made ended on 22 August 2018. The short timescale offered was to allow people to visit the school and consider and make any relevant representations before 22 August 2018.

Issue

Section 12 - Factors for rural closure proposals

- (3) (a) any viable alternative to the closure proposal,
- (b) the likely effect on the local community in consequence of the proposal (if implemented),
- (c) the likely effect caused by any different travelling arrangements that may be required in consequence of the proposal (if implemented).

– No alternatives have been presented. Only to close the nursery and school.

Suggested alternative would be to have community use for a community run parent and toddler group and use of the facilities. Glenesk is a remote and distinct community with an increased number of children, who should not be denied a stage of education.

Mothball the school with a five year moratorium.

Quote from the council website under Angus Schools for the Future - “We also need to make the best use of scarce resources “ – preschool provisions in the glen comes under this bracket.

Children would have to travel 40mins plus for pre-school provisions, passing a brand new facility on their doorstep. The community would be denied a stage of education. The cost on fuel for families and it would have an environmental impact.

No travel plans have been presented.

Response

The alternatives to closure in the proposal document were : -

Do nothing - which was not considered feasible as the anticipated small number of children and the constraints of the building would not provide the children of Tarfside with the same access to opportunities as other children;

Refurbish Tarfside – it is not anticipated that there will be sufficient demand to make this a viable option;

Review the catchment area – this proposal is unlikely address the forecast roll as it would necessitate additional travel for families to a remote rural area. It would not deliver any of the educational benefits.

As there are 0 children currently attending the school, each school age child already has a travel plan in place, which the parents are aware of and has been in operation for over a year. If any new children become of school age, travel plans will be developed based on individual circumstances at that time.

As stated earlier Angus Council would be happy to work with Dalhousie Estate and the local community about how the building could be used if the decision is taken to close the school.

Issue

(4) For the purpose of subsection (3) (b), the effect on the community is to be assessed by reference (in particular) to –

- (a) The sustainability of the community
- (b) The availability of the school's premises and its other facilities for use by the community.

- (a) Residents would have to bypass a facility on their doorstep. A facility that was completely renewed two years ago.
- (b) There is a demand to use the facilities and resources for a parent and toddler group and pre-school provision. Potentially the school if numbers continue to increase.

(5) For the purpose of subsection (3) (c) –

(a) the effect caused by such travelling arrangements includes (in particular) –

- (i) that on the school's pupils and staff and any other users of the school's facilities,
- (ii) any environmental impact,

- (c) The travelling arrangements are those to and from the school of (and for) the school's pupils and staff and any other users of the school's facilities.

(5) (a) (i) pre-school children would be expected to travel 40 mins plus to attend their early years education. The school bus could be used in the area to accommodate those in the glen

who do not drive. There used to be a “shopping bus” on a Friday that was used by residents in the glen who can’t drive. It would drop them off in town and collect them later on. This is sorely missed and would benefit the community if it was reinstated.

(ii) the fuel costs and emissions of the cars going up and down the glen.

Should the community be allowed use of the facilities and pre-school provisions, Estates would be willing to make a contribution towards certain costs. There are community members who enjoy supporting the school, whether its gardening projects to local history, they are willing to support the children’s education in any way they can.

Response

Your comments are noted.