



HARROW LODGE PRIMARY SCHOOL
CHALLENGE FOR ALL. ACHIEVEMENT FOR ALL



Partnership Learning

Consultation on the proposed establishment of a Special Educational Needs & Disabilities Unit for young people with Communication & Interaction Needs

Consultation Feedback Report March 2025

<u>Section</u>	<u>Heading</u>	<u>Page</u>
Section 1	Introduction	3
Section 2	Consultation Process	3
Section 3	Consultation Response	4
Section 4	Conclusion and Next steps	11
Section 5	Survey Demographics	12
Appendix 1	Consultation Stakeholder List	16

Section 1: Introduction

The corporate plan for Havering ‘The Havering you want to be part of’, includes the priority to offer inclusive services that raise aspiration and meet the needs of our growing population of children, families, and young adults, including those in our care.

Havering’s Draft SEND and Alternative Provision Strategy emphasises the local authority’s vision to ensure children, young people, and families have access to the same level of high-quality support and education, wherever they live in Havering. That children and young people with SEND can access the help and support they need to thrive and achieve within their local communities, that they can go to local education provision that meets their needs, access services and play an active role in the community close to where they live.

One of the key changes proposed in the Havering High Needs Strategy 2017-2022 is the delivery of an on-going programme to create more SEND units in mainstream settings.

Section 2: Consultation Process

The consultation process covered by this report ran from 10 January 2025 to 07 February 2025. The objective was to inform and gather views regarding the proposal from key stakeholders, particularly parents/carers of pupils and staff at Harrow Lodge Primary School, school governing bodies and other schools within the borough.

An electronic copy information booklet about the consultation proposal, process and a feedback questionnaire was made available as part of the online consultation feedback, published via Citizen Space, the Local Authorities dedicated consultation system. Emails informing key stakeholders which included the link to the online consultation were circulated to as many stakeholders as possible including all the borough schools, special schools, ward members, MPs, Church Diocesan representatives, all early years provision and unions; all were encouraged to respond online via the Havering Citizen Space or by sending an email to the school on any specific questions on the proposal. *Appendix 1* contains a full list of the stakeholders who were emailed, notifying them of this consultation.

A public notice of the consultation exercise together with the consultation document was also posted on Harrow Lodge Primary School’s website throughout the consultation period.

A parents’ consultation meeting was held at Harrow Lodge Primary School on Monday 27 January 2025 as part of the consultation process, there were no attendees.

Section 3: Consultation Response

This section of the report summarises the responses received from the consultation questionnaire. The questionnaire provided an opportunity for consultees to respond to specific questions regarding the proposal as well as allowing for general comments.

In total, **155** responses were received electronically. The categories of the respondents according to the role they defined on the questionnaire are shown below;

Questions 1: Are You?

Option	Total	Percent
A parent/carer of a pupil at Harrow Lodge Primary School	6	3.87%
A parent/carer of a pupil at another School	101	65.16%
Teacher/other staff at Harrow Lodge Primary School	1	0.65%
Teacher/other staff in another school	16	10.32%
Governor at Harrow Lodge Primary School	0	0.00%
Governor at another school	3	1.94%
Trust member of Partnership Learning	0	0.00%
Member of an Academy Trust at another school	0	0.00%
Local resident	22	14.19%
Other	6	3.87%
Not Answered	0	0.00%

Question 2: Do you have a child or young person with an Education, Health and Care (EHC) Plan?

Option	Total	Percent
Yes	57	36.77%
No	98	63.23%

Question 3: Do you support the proposal to establish a SEND Unit for Communication and Interaction Needs at The Royal Liberty School?

155 responses were received in respect of the proposed SEND unit, of this:

- 87.10% were in favour of the proposal (135 respondents)
- 12.90% were not in favour of the proposal (20 respondents)

The table below shows the responses for and against received for each category of respondent.

Respondent	No	Yes
A parent/carer of a pupil at Harrow Lodge Primary School	3	3
A parent/carer of a pupil at another School	4	97
Teacher/other staff at Harrow Lodge Primary School	0	1
Teacher/other staff in another school	2	14
Governor at another school	0	3
Local resident	8	14
Other	3	3

Please state why you support/do not support the proposal:

There were **107** responses to this part of the question.

Respondents were invited to comment or raise questions for or against the SEND unit establishment proposal.

Some of the comments received in support of the proposal cited the following reasons:

I believe there is a need for more Speech and Language support in general so I will actively support any unit being built.
Lack of provision of SEND needs in LA Communication and interaction {is the] main area of need in schools currently
My son has communication needs so this such a Brilliant idea.
I think it is great as there are not enough places available in provisions so this is of high need. And also from a mainstream school point of view this is great as they don't usually have enough resources or space to support SEN children enough. I think it is a great form of inclusion as it does not take the children away from the mainstream setting. It just allows them to learn somewhere different and in a different way and also be part of the main school.
I am in support of the proposal knowing that it will help 12 more learners who are struggling in various aspects of SEND to fulfil their talent
It gives more one to one learning that's more adapted to the individual child and their needs. Stops them struggling in mainstream class where their needs may not be met
I do not support the proposal as I understand that in order to fund this SEND unit a proposed SEND Unit at R J Mitchell Primary was then withdrawn due to funding issues. I believe that children who are already in a primary school without the right school infrastructure should take priority.

As a parent and teacher, I can see the number of children in mainstream school with additional needs who would really benefit from specialised teaching. There are not enough places in the area for these children and although mainstream schools try to accommodate their needs, a specialist unit and fully trained staff would be better placed to enable these children to thrive. It would also allow the other children in the classroom more teacher/TA time as they are able to focus on these children more instead of designing separate curriculums and lessons.

I have a 3 year old child and am about to move into the area. I have just moved from close to central London to get away from the dust and noise pollution and will not appreciate this outside my doorstep after spending half a million for a house.

This is just moving the problem and congestion further out. All the issues you have around the school area roads are just pushed that little further out. Does not solve the issue in my opinion

Every child should have the support they need to learn and become a well-rounded adult. It will benefit not only them but our future generations.

As a parent of an autistic non-verbal child it is vital that SEND units should be created wherever possible due to the significant lack of existing units/SEN schools in borough and the overwhelming number of children unable to access appropriate educational settings for their needs.

As the Member of Parliament I am aware that SEND places are always in demand with the Havering Borough and that this demand is always increasing.

A large number of parents within the Romford constituency have raised this with me on the doorstep as they have children with SEND needs and are worried about sufficient places.

I believe Harrow Lodge Primary is well placed within the borough to accommodate these additional places and this proposal therefore has my full backing and support.

An outstanding OFSTED does not mean that they are prepared to have SEND children in their care

Much needed support for teaching staff and class room support whose time is diverted from teaching in trying to support pupils with special needs. Qualified persons will be highly welcomed by current staff.

Issues, comments and questions received against the proposal are as shown in the table below with the Local Authority's/School response to the issues/concerns:

Questions and Comments	Local Authority / School response
<p>I do not support the proposal as I understand that in order to fund this SEND unit a proposed SEND Unit at R J Mitchell Primary was then withdrawn due to funding issues. I believe that children who are already in a primary school without the right school infrastructure should take priority.</p>	<p>Based on the Autumn Term 2024 Census data, 58 (13%) pupils at Harrow Lodge Primary School were recorded as having some kind of SEN requirement. 37 (8%) were SEN Support and 21 (5%) had an EHCP</p> <p>RJ Mitchell Primary School already has a SEND Unit, and discussions regarding the proposed expansion of this provision are ongoing.</p>
<p>Too many SEND units create a barrier for future life, these children should be better supported to fit into mainstream.</p>	<p>The SEND Unit will be specifically for students who are unable to access a mainstream curriculum owing to their SEND needs. Instead they will receive specialist teaching and a bespoke curriculum tailored specifically for their needs. This will mirror our mainstream curriculum as far as possible.</p> <p>They will have access to some mainstream teaching in subjects such as PE, DT and art but will be taught in much smaller groups as suitable for their needs.</p>
<p>I do not agree with this proposal.</p> <p>Firstly, despite having shared my son's ECHP prior to his school enrolment, they failed to adequately prepare for his needs during breakfast club on his very first day. This resulted in his immediate exclusion from the program due to a lack of 1-1 support, a situation that should have been resolved beforehand.</p> <p>Secondly, I requested a communication book to monitor my son's progress, as he was non-verbal at the time. While entries were made sporadically, there were instances of two-week gaps with no updates. Furthermore, the entries primarily focused on activities rather than comments on his progress.</p> <p>Thirdly, due to the lack of evidence regarding his learning and progress, I requested a meeting to discuss strategies for achieving his speech and language targets on his ECHP. While promises were made, consistent implementation was lacking.</p> <p>Finally, the most concerning incident occurred in July 2024 when the SENCO informed me in a ECHP review meeting</p>	<p>The staff in this unit will be highly trained and have SEND experience. They receive training specifically on emotional regulation to help when students become dysregulated. There will be a SEND Unit specific behaviour policy to recognise their specific needs.</p> <p>The SEND Unit will be specifically for students who are unable to access a mainstream curriculum owing to their SEND needs. Instead they will receive specialist teaching and a bespoke curriculum tailored specifically for their needs. This will mirror our mainstream curriculum as far as possible.</p> <p>They will have access to some mainstream teaching in subjects such as PE, DT and art but will be taught in much smaller groups as suitable for their needs.</p> <p>Children and young people with Education, Health and Care Plans (EHCPs) receive funding at a higher rate and weighting than those without, reflecting the specialist nature of the</p>

<p>that my son will no longer be getting 1-1 support. However, they stated they would not inform the local authority of Havering of this change, explicitly citing a need for the funding, saying I quote 'WE NEED THE MONEY'.</p> <p>Overall, I believe the school's lack of effort and commitment to providing the best possible education for students with special educational needs should preclude them from opening additional facilities.</p>	<p>support and care required to meet their individual needs.</p>
<p>[The consultation document] states the children will be learning in their own private building, and that they will also join in with mainstream learning. While I agree that it will teach the children to see them as valued members of society, I also think that my child will have disrupted learning because of the SEND children. My child is easily distracted and needs to be able to focus while learning. I do not support this proposal.</p>	<p>The SEND Unit will be specifically for students who are unable to access a mainstream curriculum owing to their SEND needs. Instead they will receive specialist teaching and a bespoke curriculum tailored specifically for their needs. This will mirror our mainstream curriculum as far as possible.</p> <p>They will have access to some mainstream teaching in subjects such as PE, DT and art but will be taught in much smaller groups as suitable for their needs.</p>
<p>Council resources are already at breaking point. There are better areas to use this funding.</p>	<p>We are seeing increasing numbers of children and young people with SEND in the borough and also increases in the complexity of presenting need. Havering is opening a 300 place special school for 4 to 19 to meet the increasing demand for special school places.</p> <p>Not all children with SEND needs require a place in special school, however they still need support.</p>
<p>The school is unable to retain staff that work with children with SEND needs. This has been tried in the past but was shut down, by the current leadership.</p>	<p>The staff in this unit will be highly trained and have SEND experience. They receive training specifically on emotional regulation to help when students become dysregulated. There will be a SEND Unit specific behaviour policy to recognise their specific needs.</p>
<p>They have already imposed driving restrictions in the streets surrounding the school as there is too much traffic. This will just add to the traffic in surrounding roads due to non-local residents driving children to attend this facility.</p>	<p>The proposed SEND Unit at Harrow Lodge Primary School is designed to accommodate a maximum of 12 pupils, all of whom will arrive via pre-arranged Local Authority transport (minibuses or taxis/private hire vehicles).</p> <p>The anticipated increase in traffic is minimal, with only four additional vehicle trips per peak period (two minibuses and two taxis/private hire vehicles), all of which will be accommodated within the school grounds, not on surrounding streets.</p>

	<p>Additionally, the school operates a School Street Scheme which restricts vehicular access during peak hours to promote safety and reduce congestion. This scheme will remain in place and continue to mitigate traffic impacts.</p>
<p>The small road can't take more traffic and parking. There will be noise from building work. As residents we already have noise and traffic and parking throughout the week and on evenings.</p>	<p>Regarding traffic and parking, the proposed SEND Unit will generate only a small number of additional vehicle movements, specifically four trips per peak period (two minibuses and two taxis/private hire vehicles), all of which will be accommodated within the school grounds. These vehicles will not contribute to on-street parking or congestion.</p> <p>The school already operates a School Street Scheme which restricts vehicular access during peak hours to promote safety and reduce congestion. This scheme will remain in place and continue to mitigate traffic impacts.</p> <p>Regarding noise from building work, the Noise Impact Assessment confirms that the proposed SEND block will not introduce significant new noise sources once operational.</p> <p>The Noise Impact Assessment also confirms that student activity noise and vehicle movements will remain consistent with current levels, as the site already operates as a school.</p>
<p>I do not support this as I know it will not benefit the children within the borough. There are too many children already in the school with additional needs from outside of Havering, due to the school being part of an Academy. This has an impact on children currently learning at the school and not getting the full attention they need just because they do not have an EHC plan in place.</p>	<p>We are seeing increasing numbers of children and young people with SEND in the borough and also increases in the complexity of presenting need. Havering is opening a 300 place special school for 4 to 19 to meet the increasing demand for special school places.</p> <p>Not all children with SEND needs require a place in special school, however they still need support.</p>
<p>The traffic is already very heavy 7 days a week in a narrow road</p>	<p>The proposed SEND Unit at Harrow Lodge Primary School is designed to accommodate a maximum of 12 pupils, all of whom will arrive via pre-arranged Local Authority transport (minibuses or taxis/private hire vehicles).</p> <p>The anticipated increase in traffic is minimal, with only four additional vehicle trips per peak period (two minibuses and two taxis/private hire vehicles), all of which will be</p>

	<p>accommodated within the school grounds, not on surrounding streets.</p> <p>Additionally, the school operates a School Street Scheme which restricts vehicular access during peak hours to promote safety and reduce congestion. This scheme will remain in place and continue to mitigate traffic impacts.</p>
<p>I have a 3 year old child and am about to move into the area. I have just moved from close to central London to get away from the dust and noise pollution and will not appreciate this outside my doorstep after spending half a million for a house.</p>	<p>The proposed SEND Unit at Harrow Lodge Primary School is a small-scale development designed to support 12 pupils and 7 staff members, with minimal impact on traffic and parking. As outlined in the Transport Statement, pupil transport will be via pre-arranged Local Authority vehicles, with drop-offs occurring within the school grounds, not on surrounding streets.</p> <p>The School Street Scheme will remain in operation, continuing to restrict vehicular access during peak hours and helping to maintain a quieter, safer environment for residents and children.</p> <p>In terms of noise, the Noise Impact Assessment confirms that the new SEND block will not introduce significant new noise sources once operational. The report concludes that the development will have a low adverse noise impact on the surrounding area.</p>
<p>I do not support the proposal for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The school already has numerous clubs, extra-curricular activities that are outside of normal hours. 2. The school street scheme helps with the congestion and anti-social behaviour during normal hours, however, outside of this, we still experience speeding cars at all times of day, and particularly during evenings, sometimes at 10.30pm at night. We also have numerous cars using the school playing field during weekends, travelling at speed to and from the school, one after the other in a continuous stream. 3. Increased traffic congestion - it is assumed that any pupils using this new unit are likely to need to arrive by car, or by assisted transport which will add to parking issues as the current provision is inadequate. 4. There will be noise, disruption and disturbance to residents during the works to build the new unit. 5. Where are the plans for the proposed new unit? Will the existing car park still exist? If not, this will cause additional cars needing to park in the roadway causing problems for 	<p>School Activities Outside Normal Hours: The Transport Statement acknowledges that Harrow Lodge Primary School operates breakfast and after-school clubs, which help stagger pupil arrival and departure times and reduce peak-time congestion. These activities are part of the school's existing operation and are not expected to change as a result of the SEND Unit proposal.</p> <p>Traffic Outside School Street Scheme Hours: The School Street Scheme remains in place to manage traffic during peak school hours. However, concerns about speeding and vehicle use outside these hours, particularly on weekends and evenings, fall outside the scope of the Transport Statement and may be better addressed through local enforcement or community safety channels. The SEND Unit proposal itself will not introduce additional</p>

<p>residents. No doubt there will be additional teaching staff travelling in by car, adding to the problem.</p>	<p>evening or weekend traffic, as it operates within standard school hours.</p> <p>Traffic and Parking from SEND Unit Pupils and Staff: The proposed SEND Unit will generate only four additional vehicle trips per peak period, two minibuses and two taxis/private hire vehicles, all of which will drop off and pick up pupils within the school grounds, not on surrounding streets.</p> <p>Staff numbers will increase by seven, with an estimated five additional car trips, based on current travel patterns. While this will slightly increase parking demand, the school is implementing mitigation measures, including 10 new cycle parking spaces and a School Travel Plan to encourage walking, cycling, and car-sharing.</p> <p>Noise and Disruption During Construction: In terms of noise, the Noise Impact Assessment confirms that the new SEND block will not introduce significant new noise sources once operational. The report concludes that the development will have a low adverse noise impact on the surrounding area.</p> <p>Plans for the New Unit and Car Park: The proposed SEND Unit will be located to the south of the existing main school building, and the existing car park will remain unchanged. The school currently has 33 marked bays and 3 unmarked spaces, and while demand will increase to 45 spaces, mitigation measures are in place to reduce car use among staff.</p>
<p>This is just moving the problem and congestion further out. All the issues you have around the school area roads are just pushed that little further out. Does not solve the issue in my opinion</p>	<p>The proposed SEND unit is a small-scale addition to Harrow Lodge Primary School, accommodating only 12 pupils and 7 staff members. As outlined in the Transport Statement, pupil transport will be via pre-arranged Local Authority vehicles (minibuses and taxis/private hire), with drop-offs occurring within the school grounds, not on surrounding streets. Staff travel is expected to generate five additional car trips, with mitigation measures in place to reduce car dependency.</p>

	<p>The Transport Statement concludes that the net increase in traffic is minimal and will not materially impact the local highway network. Importantly, the School Street Scheme remains in place to manage peak-time traffic and discourage congestion near the school.</p> <p>The proposal does not shift the problem outward but rather contains and manages it through on-site drop-off, limited vehicle increase, and active travel promotion. These measures aim to prevent wider disruption and support sustainable travel.</p>
<p>There will be lots of challenges for carers, relatives and deliveries, ideally the current restrictions in place should continue. A camera with ANPR can be installed for violations.</p>	<p>The proposed SEND Unit will accommodate only 12 pupils, all of whom will arrive via pre-arranged Local Authority transport (minibuses or taxis/private hire vehicles), with drop-offs occurring within the school grounds. This is outlined in the Transport Statement. There is no expectation of additional traffic from carers or relatives during school hours.</p> <p>Deliveries will continue as per existing arrangements, within the school car park and outside peak hours, with no change in frequency or routing.</p> <p>The School Street Scheme will remain in place to manage peak-time traffic and discourage unauthorised access. While the Transport Statement does not propose ANPR enforcement, your suggestion aligns with broader traffic management practices and could be considered by the local authority if further enforcement is deemed necessary.</p>
<p>An outstanding OFSTED does not mean that they are prepared to have SEND children in their care.</p>	<p>The staff in this unit will be highly trained and have SEND experience. They receive training specifically on emotional regulation to help when students become dysregulated. There will be a SEND Unit specific behaviour policy to recognise their specific needs.</p>
<p>This school allows parents to be helpers on trips and even to accompany students to swimming trips. These parents are merely volunteers and have not had any DBS checks. This doesn't happen in secondary schools its shocking that this is allowed in a primary school. This school doesn't have strict enough safeguarding policies in place, hence why I disagree with this proposal.</p> <p>Furthermore their breakfast club is absolute chaos with dinner ladies supervising the kids whilst giving breakfast. This is a school that fails to put the safety of kids first.</p>	<p>The staff in this unit will be highly trained, DBS Checked and have SEND experience. They receive training specifically on emotional regulation to help when students become dysregulated. There will be a SEND Unit specific behaviour policy to recognise their specific needs.</p>

- I worked in a Special Needs School for many years. When I was first employed the school was classified as a moderate learning special needs school. Over the years the head-teacher was encouraged to take more and more students until eventually the school had students with more severe learning difficulties, resulting in attacks on some members of staff and hospitalisation of others because of their injuries, leading to staff absence. Some of the full-time staff were qualified special needs teachers, but the majority were assistants who had taken part in various courses and were often inexperienced. As a result of this supply teachers were employed or extra work was placed on other staff and those children who were anxious about seeing new faces, often tried to leave the school.

- In my experience, special needs children very rarely walk to school on their own, and depending from how far they have to travel, parents or guardians bring them to school in cars or they are brought to school by school bus, and this brings me to the point of traffic.

- Employment of more staff inevitably leads to more cars travelling down Rainsford Way.

- Some years ago we were asked to consider the school having an after school activity facility, since then we have had cars constantly driving at speed up and down Rainsford Way.

On a Saturday morning around 9am we are subjected to cars being driven at speed towards the school, taking, one presumes, children to football. There have been occasions when the gates have not been opened and there is a queue of cars waiting to get into the school grounds. We then have a repeat performance when the children are collected and again the road becomes like a race track. This happens on both Saturday and Sunday mornings about 9am.

Recently two parents were seen handing out leaflets encouraging people to join the Saturday football club, which would inevitably add more cars to the number that already come here.

On Tuesday and Thursday evenings between 9pm and after 10pm, cars race backwards and forwards to and from the school presumably attending and then collecting children. Trying to sleep or being woken out of a sleep during these periods is in itself disruptive both to mental health and sleep deprivation.

Out of the seven days in the week, four days both morning and evening the residents are subjected to this race track mentality and traffic noise, the danger of trying to get ones car off the drive during Saturday and Sunday mornings without having some form of crash or altercation is more

The staff in this unit will be highly trained and have SEND experience. They receive training specifically on emotional regulation to help when students become dysregulated. There will be a SEND Unit specific behaviour policy to recognise their specific needs.

Staff-Related Traffic Increase:

The proposed SEND Unit will employ seven additional staff members, with an estimated five additional car trips based on current travel patterns. While this does increase parking demand, the school is implementing mitigation measures including 10 new cycle parking spaces and a School Travel Plan to encourage walking, cycling, and car-sharing.

Weekend and Evening Activity Concerns:

The Transport Statement focuses on the SEND Unit and does not propose any changes to existing weekend or evening activities. The SEND Unit will operate only during standard school hours, and pupil transport will be via pre-arranged Local Authority vehicles, with drop-offs occurring within the school grounds.

Construction Noise and Disruption:

While the Transport Statement does not cover construction-phase impacts, these are typically managed through a Construction Management Plan, which sets out controls for noise, dust, working hours, and site access. This plan is submitted separately as part of the planning process and is designed to minimise disruption to residents.

Site Layout and Car Park Retention:

The existing car park will remain unchanged, with no loss of parking spaces. Drop-offs for SEND Unit pupils will occur within the school grounds, and no additional on-street parking is anticipated.

Suitability of Location:

The SEND Unit is being proposed at Harrow Lodge Primary School based on educational and strategic planning considerations. The Transport Statement concludes that the development will have no unacceptable impact on highway safety or the local road

<p>luck than anything.</p> <p>There are also several elderly people living in this area, people who have poor health and there are small children, all of whom are affected more than most.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General traffic in this area is quite high during the day. There are heavy delivery lorries going into the school, in the early hours of the morning there is a milk delivery to some residents and there are also various deliveries to homes which adds to the general noise and dirt in the environment that we breathe throughout the day. <p>I appreciate that opening a special needs unit will add money to the school budget and increase the salary of the headteacher, but I feel that Rainsford Way has 'done its bit' in putting up with the constant stream of traffic and various forms of physical and verbal abuse that we have been subjected to over the last few years.</p> <p>When I first moved here it was a very quiet area, and although I can't see it returning to that time, I do not want the road to turn into a mini main road, which it seems to be becoming, and as tax payers and residents of this area our wellbeing, both mental and physical, should be taken seriously into consideration.</p> <p>Perhaps, with respect to a special needs unit, some thought should be given to placing it in another primary school in the borough.</p>	<p>network, and therefore meets the requirements of Paragraph 111 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).</p>
---	---

Question 4: Do you have any other comments in respect of this proposal?

45 responses were submitted in respect of this question, 15 of those comments were “Not Applicable/ No further comments”. The 30 additional comments are detailed below:

Think this is highly needed, so please think carefully when reading other people's views as I am very passionate about SEN and ensuring that the right support is available.
<p>SEN units should not just be for students with communication difficulties. There are numerous special needs children with other educational difficulties that should meet the criteria of being taught within a SEN unit, as a mainstream classroom can be very distressing for them. Some children will not/cannot keep up with the normal mainstream learning criteria as their peers (of the same age) due to global and education delays.</p> <p>There is an increase in special needs children and not enough schools/teaching staff to support these children. Unfortunately until someone has a child with special needs they do not understand the stress/upset and mental impact it has on the parents when they are fighting their best for their child to receive the treatment/education/care they deserve.</p>
I just think I think it should go ahead
Every mainstream school needs a Sen provision. My son currently struggles at times in mainstream to the point we've thought about when (not if) we'll transfer him to a Sen school because he's going to need to attend one. We also need more Sen schools.
The benefit to other children will also be huge - disruption will be reduced, meaning their interactions with children with additional needs will be more positive, enabling them to be more inclusive and accepting.
I hope this is varied so other children can benefit from the opportunity established for the same purpose of developing good social skills
We need more schools in Havering with ARPs attached so children can go to their local school
It would be a great idea
I support the proposal.
We need more specialised facilities
There probably needs to be more than 12 spaces
I believe this would be very helpful for all those individuals involved. Thank you!
Just that more support and additional units should be available

Kids need all the help they can get.
If you are going to implement a new programme - hire professionals, who know what they are doing and can actually make a difference. Don't just tick the box to have a SEN programme in place like many schools who hire SEN professionals and then give them zero authority to effect change and improve children's lives. I only support a new programme whereby you listen to the specialists and actually implement change in your school for the better welfare of these children.
There was already a large SEND school in Brentwood Road. This could have been used, instead it has been left to rot and is now being sold. Waste of resources.
As residents we haven't been informed about this proposal
The LA needs to be more proactive in looking at the children coming through and ensuring there is enough appropriate provision. Forward planning is vital.
There should be another school built within the borough that can cater for these children with additional learning as it is effecting children who do not necessarily need the help but are having their learning disrupted.
To make sure the staff are qualified to work with SEND kids in order to support their development.
If my understanding is correct, this will enable only 12 student's access to these facilities for each school year, with teaching provided by Harrow Lodge School's mainstream teachers. It may be beneficial to offer some additional support to local schools in the area, increasing the support to C&I SEND children elsewhere, but not increasing the intake beyond 12 for Harrow Lodge School.
Through S106 commitments I hope that further funding is made available to support the needed facilities for more SEND units throughout key/identified areas within the borough of Havering. This can only benefit the community now, and potentially new members of the community who could be considering the borough of Havering as their home.
Our children need this, parents need this.
As residents, we are here 24/7 and experience significant traffic down our small dead end road. We have noticed a significant increase in the volume of traffic over the last 12-18 months. Although we were pleased about the School Street Scheme being introduced, we now have different traffic issues related to the out of school hour's clubs/football etc. We don't have any respite from the traffic except for when the school is closed during holidays. The residents seem to be the last stakeholders to be consulted with issues relating to the school, particularly the houses closest to the Rainsford Way gates. Will the new SEND unit also be used for out of hour's activities or clubs? As this will add to the inconvenience for residents.
Children with SEN need to be supported in childhood to be given the opportunity to develop into their full potential. This will increase their chances of employability, and helps them become contributing adults.

I have an autistic child in Harrow lodge primary school currently and I would like to as much support as possible. I know building the facility will take time, but I would be very grateful if SEND professionals can start as soon as possible to support the students who are already at the school.

We need more send school and opportunities

There are safeguarding issues of the SEND children in their care. Children in the Willow Room (designated as a nurture space) are reportedly subject to neglect. The environment lacks educational structure and resembles a childcare setting rather than a learning space. Provisions outlined in pupils' Education, Health and Care (EHC) plans are frequently not implemented, compromising their development and wellbeing. Communication between school leadership (Head Teacher, Deputy Head Teacher), staff, and SEND parents is consistently poor. Staff are provided with SEND policies but receive no formal training, resulting in a lack of awareness and understanding of SEND needs. Parents and agency staff who raise concerns are often reprimanded by senior leadership, who assert that the safeguarding lead and SENCo are solely responsible and best informed. Agency staff assigned to SEND pupils are not briefed on the child's needs and are expected to manage without adequate preparation. SEND support staff do not routinely read EHC plans and may dismiss parental input, often asserting superior knowledge of the child without basis. Parent's Evening meetings are conducted by mainstream class teachers and the SENCo, who do not always work directly with the child. Key support staff, including those from the Willow Room, are not involved, leading to uninformed discussions and missed opportunities to address individual targets. Support staff in the Willow Room lack appropriate qualifications to work with SEND children. There is a high turnover of agency SEND support staff and midday assistants (MDAs), with no investigation into the underlying causes. Reports of bullying and undermining behaviour by permanent staff towards agency staff and SEND pupils have not been addressed. The Business Manager has been reported for bullying SEND parents and parents of colour. Complaints have been submitted to the Head Teacher and SENCo. Decisions affecting SEND pupils are made without prior consultation with parents, and communication is often unilateral. When parents raise concerns with the SENCo, responses are frequently issued directly by the Head Teacher, excluding the SENCo and placing undue pressure on parents to accept decisions without discussion. Issues reported to the Chair of Governors are selectively addressed, raising concerns about impartiality and transparency. The Head Teacher has publicly stated that funding received from the Local Authority is insufficient to meet the needs of SEND pupils, which may be contributing to the lack of adequate support. As a former staff member advocating for SEND children, I experienced bullying and threats from the Head Teacher, which severely impacted my mental health. My own child, who previously exhibited no behavioural issues, developed anxiety and distress due to neglect at the school. This led to significant emotional trauma, making it difficult for him to attend school.

Fully approve of this proposal and wish the school good luck in their endeavours but more especially I have hope for the children it can serve and support.

Perhaps other schools should be looking to implement such proposals!

Section 4: Conclusion and Next steps

In Summary, the issues raised have been addressed and there is no compelling evidence for Harrow Lodge Primary School not to proceed to the next stage of the process which is to submit an Application Form to the Department for Education.

Harrow Lodge Primary School is an academy, therefore the final decision as to whether this proposal is approved for implementation will be made by the Regional Schools Commissioner on behalf of the Department for Education.

Thank you to all parents, staff, residents and families who have responded and taken time to submit the feedback questionnaire.

The Governing Body and the Academy Trust of the school fully supports the establishment of a SEND Unit at the school.

Section 5: Survey Demographics

As part of our approach in ensuring a best assessment of the impact of our proposed activity and that we are hearing from a wide cross-section of our stakeholder, the consultation questionnaire included additional questions to capture this information.

This information is as follows:

Question 5: I am happy to answer equalities questions

Option	Total	Percent
Yes	129	83.23%
No	26	16.77%
Not Answered	0	0.00%

Question 6: How are old you?

Option	Total	Percent
Under 18	0	0.00%
18-24	2	1.29%
25-34	18	11.61%
35-44	73	47.10%
45-54	22	14.19%
55-64	8	5.16%
65-74	3	1.94%
75-84	3	1.94%
85+	0	0.00%
Prefer not to say	1	0.65%
Not Answered	25	16.13%

Question 7: How would you describe your gender identity?

Option	Total	Percent
Male	21	13.55%
Female	105	67.74%
Non-binary	1	0.65%
Another description	0	0.00%
Prefer not to say	2	1.29%
Not Answered	26	16.77%

Question 8: Which of the following best describes your sexual orientation?

Option	Total	Percent
Bisexual	2	1.29%
Gay or Lesbian	1	0.65%
Straight or Heterosexual	121	78.06%
Another description	1	0.65%
Prefer not to say	4	2.58%
Not Answered	26	16.77%

Question 9: What is your marital or civil partnership status?

Option	Total	Percent
Single	34	21.94%
Married	79	50.97%
Civil Partnership	3	1.94%
Co-habiting	10	6.45%
Widowed	1	0.65%
Another description	0	0.00%
Prefer not to say	3	1.94%
Not Answered	25	16.13%

Question 10: Ethnic origin is not about nationality, place of birth or citizenship. It is about the group to which you perceive you belong.

Asian/Asian British

Option	Total	Percent
Asian/Asian British - Indian	4	2.58%
Asian/Asian British - Pakistani	1	0.65%
Asian/Asian British - Bangladeshi	2	1.29%
Asian/Asian British - Chinese	0	0.00%
Asian/Asian British - Other Asian background	3	1.94%
Not Answered	145	93.55%

Black/Black British

Option	Total	Percent
Black/Black British - African	11	7.10%
Black/Black British - Caribbean	1	0.65%
Black/Black British - Any other Black/African/Caribbean background	0	0.00%
Not Answered	143	92.26%

Mixed/multiple groups

Option	Total	Percent
Mixed/multiple groups - White and Black Caribbean	2	1.29%
Mixed/multiple groups - White and Black African	1	0.65%
Mixed/multiple groups - White and Asian	1	0.65%
Mixed/multiple groups - Other mixed background	0	0.00%
Not Answered	151	97.42%

Other ethnic group

Option	Total	Percent
Other ethnic group - Arab	0	0.00%
Any other ethnic group	1	0.65%
Not Answered	154	99.35%

Prefer not to say

Option	Total	Percent
Yes	2	1.29%
No	153	98.71%

White

Option	Total	Percent
White - British	89	57.42%
White - Irish	1	0.65%
White - Gypsy or Irish Traveller	0	0.00%
White - European	9	5.81%
Other - White background	3	1.94%
Not Answered	53	34.19%

Question 11: Faith, Religion or Belief

Option	Total	Percent
Buddhist	1	0.65%
Christian	51	32.90%
Hindu	3	1.94%
Jewish	0	0.00%
Muslim	9	5.81%
No Religion	47	30.32%
Sikh	1	0.65%
Other religion	2	1.29%
Prefer not to say	9	5.81%
Not Answered	32	20.65%

Question 12: Do you consider yourself to have a disability, impairment or health condition?

Option	Total	Percent
Yes	21	13.55%
No	102	65.81%
Prefer not to say	4	2.58%
Not Answered	28	18.06%

Impairment?

Option	Total	Percent
Sensory - e.g. mild deafness; partially sighted; blindness	3	1.94%
Physical - e.g. wheelchair user	3	1.94%
Mental Illness - e.g. bi-polar disorder; schizophrenia; depression	4	2.58%
Development or Educational - e.g. autistic spectrum disorders (ASD); dyslexia and dyspraxia, neurodiversity	8	5.16%
Learning Disability / Condition - e.g. Down's syndrome; Cerebral palsy	0	0.00%
Long-term Illness / Health Condition - e.g. cancer, HIV, diabetes, chronic heart disease, stroke	5	3.23%
Other	2	1.29%
Not Answered	135	87.10%

Appendix 1: Consultation Stakeholder List

Consultees
The governing body of Harrow Lodge Primary School
Parents/carers of pupils at Harrow Lodge Primary School
Teachers and other staff at Harrow Lodge Primary School
The governing bodies of all maintained schools in the borough
Trust Members of Partnership Learning
Teachers and staff of all maintained primary, secondary, special schools and academies in the Borough.
Early Years Providers in the borough
Voluntary organisations and Community groups who work with children with SEND
Representatives of trade unions of any staff at schools who may be affected by the proposal.
All Havering Councillors
MPs whose constituencies include the schools that are the subject of the proposal or whose constituents are likely to be affected by the proposals. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Julia Lopez • Andrew Rosindell • Margaret Mullane
Neighbouring local authorities where there may be significant cross-border movement of pupils. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • London Borough of Barking and Dagenham • London Borough of Newham • London Borough of Redbridge • Essex County Council • Thurrock Council